

MVCL-DAF++: ENHANCING MULTIMODAL INTENT RECOGNITION VIA PROTOTYPE-AWARE CONTRASTIVE ALIGNMENT AND COARSE-TO-FINE DYNAMIC ATTENTION FUSION

Haofeng Huang¹, Yifei Han², Long Zhang², Bin Li^{2*}, Yangfan He³

¹University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai, China, ²SIAT, CAS

³ University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

ABSTRACT

Multimodal intent recognition (MMIR) suffers from weak semantic grounding and poor robustness under noisy or rare-class conditions. We propose MVCL-DAF++, which extends MVCL-DAF with two key modules: (1) Prototype-aware contrastive alignment, aligning instances to class-level prototypes to enhance semantic consistency; and (2) Coarse-to-fine attention fusion, integrating global modality summaries with token-level features for hierarchical cross-modal interaction. On MIntRec and MIntRec2.0, MVCL-DAF++ achieves new state-of-the-art results, improving rare-class recognition by +1.05% and +4.18% WF1, respectively. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of prototype-guided learning and coarse-to-fine fusion for robust multimodal understanding. The source code is available at <https://github.com/chr1s623/MVCL-DAF-PlusPlus>.

Index Terms— Multimodal intent recognition, Prototype-aware contrastive alignment, Coarse-to-fine dynamic attention fusion

1. INTRODUCTION

Multimodal intent recognition (MMIR) [1] aims to infer user intentions by integrating heterogeneous signals such as spoken language, facial expressions, and vocal intonations. With the rapid adoption of human-centered AI systems [2], robust and generalizable multimodal understanding has become a cornerstone for building intelligent conversational agents [3, 4]. Recent research has explored diverse strategies to address these challenges. **Attention-based fusion** methods [5–7] adaptively weight informative signals across modalities, and more recent works propose dynamic or hierarchical variants [8, 9] to capture multi-scale interactions better. In parallel, **contrastive learning approaches** [10–14] encourage alignment among modality-specific representations in a shared embedding space, with token-level contrastive objectives [10] and contextual augmentation [15] further enhancing robustness under ambiguous or low-resource settings. Beyond class-level learning, **prototype-based or**

semantic grounding strategies [14, 16] have shown effectiveness in few-shot and long-tailed recognition, though they remain under-explored in multimodal intent recognition. To support systematic evaluation, **benchmark datasets** such as MIntRec [17] and MIntRec2.0 [18] provide realistic conversational scenarios with open-intent, imbalanced, and cross-modal ambiguous samples, driving progress in the community. A representative method, **MVCL-DAF** [6], combines multiview contrastive learning with dynamic attention fusion (DAF) to selectively integrate and regularize multimodal inputs. However, it still faces two critical limitations: (1) contrastive alignment is performed purely at the instance level, without *explicit semantic grounding*, making the model vulnerable to noise and ambiguous samples [19, 20]; and (2) the fusion strategy treats modality inputs as flat token sequences, ignoring hierarchical semantic structures and redundancies, particularly in visual and acoustic modalities [21, 22]. We propose **MVCL-DAF++**, an enhanced MMIR framework with two key innovations to address these limitations. First, we introduce *prototype-aware contrastive alignment*, in which class-level semantic prototypes are learned and instance-to-prototype contrastive learning is performed. This enables explicit semantic grounding that improves robustness to noisy and ambiguous inputs. Second, we design a *coarse-to-fine dynamic attention fusion* mechanism, where a Modality-Aware Transformer Encoder extracts coarse-grained global summaries for each modality, which are then dynamically integrated with fine-grained token-level features via the DAF module, enabling hierarchical and adaptive cross-modal interaction. **Our main contributions are as follows:** (1) **Prototype-aware contrastive alignment:** We introduce class-level prototypes to ground contrastive learning in shared semantics explicitly, improves cross-modal alignment robustness. (2) **Coarse-to-fine dynamic attention fusion:** We design a modality-aware encoder that unifies global and token-level features through dynamic attention fusion. (3) **Extensive empirical validation:** We establish new state-of-the-art performance on MIntRec [17] and MIntRec2.0 [18], with consistent gains in standard, rare-class, and noisy-input scenarios, demon-

*Corresponding author.




Fig. 1. MVCL-DAF++ architecture with four modules: (1) Modality encoders with coarse-to-fine DAF, (2) Cross-modal coarse feature extraction, (3) Contrastive learning for representation regularization, and (4) Prototype-aware contrastive alignment.

strating the generalizability of our approach to real-world MMIR tasks.

2. METHOD

2.1. Model Overview

As illustrated in Fig. 1, the proposed **MVCL-DAF++** consists of four components: (1) multi-view representation learning to encode textual, visual, and acoustic inputs and coarse-to-fine DAF fusion to integrate global and token-level features; (2) Coarse feature extraction to capture global modality-level signals; (3) Representation regularization with contrastive learning; and (4) Prototype-aware contrastive alignment for robust semantic grounding. The final outputs are optimized with both classification and contrastive objectives. Following MVCL-DAF [6], we also retain the CTC Align Module, the BiPeephole LSTM for audio, and the decoder with BERT pooling, which are reused without modification.

Formally, let $\mathcal{X} = \{X^t, X^v, X^a\}$ denote the multimodal input, where $X^m \in \mathbb{R}^{L_m \times d_m}$ represents the sequence of L_m tokens from modality $m \in \{t, v, a\}$ with embedding dimension d_m . After modality-specific encoders, we obtain low-level embeddings E_a (acoustic), E_v (visual), E_{tm} (text-masked), and E_{tl} (text-labeled). These are transformed into contextualized features M_a, M_v, M_{tm}, M_{tl} , which are further fused into a coarse representation M_c . For each instance i , its final hidden embedding is denoted as \mathbf{h}_i (e.g., $\mathbf{h}_a, \mathbf{h}_v, \mathbf{h}_{tm}, \mathbf{h}_{tl}$). The fused representation M_{cf} is then passed to the decoder and classifier to produce logits for intent and The target y denotes the ground-truth intent label of the input sample.

2.2. Prototype-Aware Contrastive Alignment

To enhance semantic consistency, we introduce class-level prototypes as anchors. For each class c , its prototype \mathbf{r}_c is

computed within a mini-batch as

$$\mathbf{r}_c = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_c|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_c} \mathbf{h}_i, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_c = \{i | y_i = c\}$ and \mathbf{h}_i is the instance embedding. Prototypes are L2-normalized, and a prototype-aware InfoNCE loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{proto}} = -\log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{r}_{y_i})/\tau)}{\sum_{c=1}^C \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{r}_c)/\tau)}, \quad (2)$$

where τ is a temperature hyperparameter. This enforces class-level structure and improves robustness against noisy and imbalanced data.

2.3. Coarse-to-fine Dynamic Attention Fusion

We next capture hierarchical interactions via a coarse-to-fine strategy. Given token embeddings, we compute a coarse representation M_c using a modality-aware Transformer:

$$M_c = \text{Enc}(Q = \text{Text}, K = \text{Visual}, V = \text{Acoustic}), \quad (3)$$

where $\text{Text}, \text{Visual}, \text{Acoustic}$ denote text, visual, and acoustic features. M_c is combined with token-level features through two DAF modules, yielding fine-grained M_f and coarse-enhanced M_{cf} . M_f supports contrastive learning, while M_{cf} is used for classification.

2.4. Multi-View Representation Learning

To align modalities, we adopt InfoNCE loss. For anchor $\mathbf{h}_{\text{anchor}}$ and positive \mathbf{h}_p :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}} = -\log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{\text{anchor}}, \mathbf{h}_p)/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_{\text{anchor}}, \mathbf{h}_j)/\tau)}. \quad (4)$$

Table 1. Performance comparison on MIntRec [17] and MIntRec2.0 [18] datasets. All results are averaged over 10 random seeds (0–9). Best results are highlighted in bold.

Methods	MIntRec [17]				MIntRec2.0 [18]			
	ACC (%)	WF1 (%)	WP (%)	R (%)	ACC (%)	WF1 (%)	WP (%)	R (%)
MuT [5]	72.52	71.80	72.60	67.44	56.95	54.26	54.49	40.65
MAG-BERT [13]	72.16	71.30	72.03	67.61	55.87	52.58	53.71	39.93
TCL-MAP [10]	73.69	73.38	73.90	71.59	56.99	54.33	55.07	41.87
MVCL-DAF [6]	74.72	74.61	75.07	71.94	57.80	55.05	55.82	42.03
MVCL-DAF++ (Ours)	76.18	75.66	76.17	74.39	60.40	59.23	60.51	53.96
Performance Improvement	+1.46	+1.05	+1.10	+2.45	+2.60	+4.18	+4.69	+11.93

Using text \mathbf{h}_{tl} as anchor, we define

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{text}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}(\mathbf{h}_{tl}, \mathbf{h}_{tm}), \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{vis}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}(\mathbf{h}_{tl}, \mathbf{h}_v), \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{aud}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}(\mathbf{h}_{tl}, \mathbf{h}_a), \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fine}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}}(\mathbf{h}_{tl}, \mathbf{h}_f), \quad (8)$$

and sum them up:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{contrastive}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{text}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{vis}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{aud}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{fine}}. \quad (9)$$

2.5. Classification Objective

The classifier is trained with cross-entropy over logits from M_{cf} :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} = \text{CrossEntropy}(W M_{cf} + b, y). \quad (10)$$

The final loss combines all objectives:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{proto}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{contrastive}}. \quad (11)$$

3. EXPERIMENTS

3.1. Datasets

We conduct experiments on two widely used benchmarks for multimodal intent recognition: **MIntRec 1.0** [17] contains 2,224 high-quality samples with 20 intent classes, collected from multimodal human-machine interactions. Each instance is composed of a textual query, an aligned video segment, and its corresponding acoustic signal. **MIntRec2.0** [18] extends MIntRec 1.0 to a more challenging setting with 30 intent classes, incorporating long-tailed distributions and open-intent utterances. This dataset encompasses 1,245 high-quality dialogues, aggregating a total of 15,040 samples that incorporate text, video, and audio modalities.

3.2. Baselines and Experiment Setting

We compare our proposed MVCL-DAF++ with the following competitive baselines: **MuT** [5], **MAG-BERT** [13], **TCL-MAP** [10], and **MVCL-DAF** [6]. These baselines represent the state-of-the-art in multimodal intent recognition under both aligned and unaligned settings. We report results on four widely used metrics: **Accuracy (ACC)**, **Weighted F1 (WF1)**, **Weighted Precision (WP)**, and **Recall (R)**. All models are trained with AdamW (learning rate 2×10^{-5} , weight




Fig. 2. Ablation study on MIntRec [17] and MIntRec2.0 [18].

decay 0.2, batch size 32, and temperature $\tau=0.1$) for up to 100 epochs with early stopping of 10 epochs, using a single NVIDIA A100-40GB GPU. The reported results are averaged over 10 random seeds to ensure statistical robustness.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Performance Evaluation

Our experimental results are presented in Table 1, demonstrates that MVCL-DAF++ consistently outperforms strong baselines on both the MIntRec and MIntRec2.0 datasets. Specifically, MVCL-DAF++ achieves an accuracy of 76.18%, a weighted F1 score of 75.66%, a weighted precision of 76.17%, and a recall of 74.39% on MIntRec, establishing a new state-of-the-art performance. On the more challenging MIntRec2.0 benchmark, the model attains a weighted F1 score of 59.23% and a recall of 53.96%, outperforming all previous approaches.

4.2. Ablation Study

To evaluate the effectiveness of each component and training objective in **MVCL-DAF++**, we conduct ablation studies on both MIntRec and MIntRec2.0. We compare the full model with two variants: (1) *Coarse-only*, which removes the prototype-aware contrastive alignment and keeps only the coarse-to-fine fusion; and (2) *Proto-only*, which discards the coarse-to-fine fusion while retaining prototype alignment. As shown in Fig. 2, removing either module results in consistent performance drops across all metrics, confirming that both prototype-aware contrastive alignment and coarse-to-fine fusion are indispensable. For instance, on MIntRec, accuracy decreases from 76.18% to 75.17% and 75.06% when removing the prototype or fusion, respectively. Similar trends are

Table 2. Ablation Study over different loss functions on MIntRec [17] and MIntRec2.0 [18]. The best performance for each metric is highlighted in bold.

Loss Functions			MIntRec [17]				MIntRec2.0 [18]			
Classifier	Contrastive	Prototype	ACC (%)	WF1 (%)	WP (%)	R (%)	ACC (%)	WF1 (%)	WP (%)	R (%)
✓	×	×	74.16	73.88	73.99	71.30	59.47	58.49	58.32	52.37
✓	✓	×	74.61	74.42	75.55	71.87	60.11	58.74	59.32	52.53
✓	×	✓	74.83	74.60	74.97	71.46	60.01	58.96	59.49	52.71
✓	✓	✓	76.18	75.66	76.17	74.39	60.40	59.23	60.51	53.96

observed on the more challenging MIntRec2.0 benchmark, where the absence of either component reduces WF1 by average than 1.27 points. We further examine the role of different loss functions (Table 2). Using only the classification loss (Classifier) yields poor generalization, especially on MIntRec2.0 (59.47% ACC). Adding contrastive loss (Contrastive) substantially improves robustness (60.11% ACC), while prototype-aware contrastive alignment (Prototype) also provides notable gains. The best performance is achieved when combining all three losses, reaching 76.18% ACC on MIntRec and 60.40% ACC on MIntRec2.0. These results demonstrate that prototype-aware and contrastive objectives provide complementary benefits to classification, particularly under noisy and imbalanced conditions. Overall, the ablation results highlight that both proposed modules and loss designs are essential for the robustness and generalizability of MVCL-DAF++.




Fig. 3. Distribution of attention scores across modalities and datasets.




Fig. 4. t-SNE visualization of learned embeddings (dots) and class prototypes (black crosses).

4.3. Model Analysis

To further understand the inner mechanisms of our model, we analyze the modality attention and the prototype distributions. Fig. 3 compares the attention scores assigned to the visual, acoustic, and coarse distributions within the coarse-to-fine fusion module. On the **MIntRec2.0** dataset, the model assigns relatively higher attention weights to coarse features, suggesting that in noisy and diverse environments, global cross-modal semantics are more reliable than token-level inputs. In contrast, for the cleaner **MIntRec** dataset, the attention weights are more evenly distributed between the modalities, indicating the sufficiency of fine-grained signals for intent inference. To assess the effectiveness of prototype-aware contrastive learning, we visualize the learned embeddings and class prototypes using t-SNE in Fig. 4. Each dot represents a sample, colored by class label, while black crosses indicate the corresponding prototypes. We observe that samples belonging to the same class are well clustered around their prototype anchors, confirming that the model has learned semantically consistent representations. Moreover, inter-class separability is enhanced, contributing to more discriminative alignment across modalities. These analyses demonstrate that (1) the coarse-to-fine dynamic attention fusion mechanism enables context-aware fusion of modality cues, and (2) prototype-aware contrastive alignment promotes robust, label-consistent feature learning, both of which are crucial for generalization in real-world MMIR scenarios.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose **MVCL-DAF++**, an enhanced MMIR framework that integrates prototype-aware contrastive alignment and coarse-to-fine dynamic attention fusion. By incorporating class-level semantic prototypes and leveraging global modality summaries alongside fine-grained features, our method achieves stronger semantic consistency and robustness. Extensive experiments on the MIntRec and MIntRec2.0 benchmarks demonstrate that the MVCL-DAF++ significantly outperforms previous state-of-the-art models. Visualization and ablation analysis further validate the effectiveness of our method. In future work, we plan to extend this framework to few-shot or continual learning scenarios for broader applicability in the real world.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Zhao, L. Wang, and H. Chen, “Deep learning approaches for multimodal intent recognition: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.22934*, 2025.
- [2] Xingjian Diao, Chunhui Zhang, Weiyi Wu, Zhongyu Ouyang, Peijun Qing, Ming Cheng, Soroush Vosoughi, and Jiang Gui, “Temporal working memory: Query-guided segment refinement for enhanced multimodal understanding,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025*, 2025, pp. 3393–3409.
- [3] Shutao Li, Bin Li, Bin Sun, and Yixuan Weng, “Towards visual-prompt temporal answer grounding in instructional video,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 8836–8853, 2024.
- [4] Xinlei Yu, Zhangquan Chen, Yudong Zhang, Shilin Lu, Ruolin Shen, Jiangning Zhang, Xiaobin Hu, Yanwei Fu, and Shuicheng Yan, “Visual document understanding and question answering: A multi-agent collaboration framework with test-time scaling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03404*, 2025.
- [5] Y.-H. H. Tsai et al., “Multimodal transformer for unaligned multimodal language sequences,” in *Proceedings of the ACL*, 2019, pp. 6558–6569.
- [6] B. Hu, K. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and Y. Ye, “Adaptive multimodal fusion: Dynamic attention allocation for intent recognition,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2025.
- [7] S. Yu, Y. Wang, Z. Lin, and L.-P. Morency, “Multimodal transformer with multi-scale alignment for multimodal sentiment analysis,” in *Proceedings of ACL*, 2021.
- [8] W. Han, H. Chen, and S. Poria, “Improving multimodal fusion with hierarchical mutual information maximization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00412*, 2021.
- [9] Z. Xue and R. Marculescu, “Dynamic multimodal fusion,” in *Proceedings of the CVPR Workshop on Multimodal Learning and Applications (MULA)*, 2023.
- [10] Q. Zhou, H. Xu, H. Li, H. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Wang, and K. Gao, “Token-level contrastive learning with modality-aware prompting for multimodal intent recognition,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024, vol. 38.
- [11] P. Liang et al., “Factorized contrastive learning: Going beyond multi-view redundancy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05268*, 2023.
- [12] A. van den Oord, Y. Li, and O. Vinyals, “Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2019.
- [13] M. K. Hasan, M. T. Rahman, M. S. Akhtar, A. Ekbal, and P. Bhattacharyya, “Mag-bert: Multimodal adaptation gate bert for multimodal sentiment analysis,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING)*, 2020, pp. 3615–3626.
- [14] P. Khosla, P. Teterwak, C. Wang, A. Sarna, Y. Tian, P. Isola, A. Maschinot, C. Liu, and D. Krishnan, “Supervised contrastive learning,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020, vol. 33, pp. 18661–18673.
- [15] K. Sun, Z. Xie, M. Ye, and H. Zhang, “Contextual augmented global contrast for multimodal intent recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024, pp. 26963–26973.
- [16] J. Snell, K. Swersky, and R. Zemel, “Prototypical networks for few-shot learning,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- [17] H. Zhang, H. Xu, X. Wang, Q. Zhou, S. Zhao, and J. Teng, “Mintrec: A new dataset for multimodal intent recognition,” in *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM)*, 2022, pp. 1688–1697.
- [18] H. Zhang et al., “Mintrec2.0: A large-scale benchmark dataset for multimodal intent recognition and out-of-scope detection in conversations,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [19] Tongzhou Wang and Phillip Isola, “Understanding contrastive representation learning through alignment and uniformity on the hypersphere,” in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2020, pp. 9929–9939.
- [20] Joshua Robinson, Ching-Yao Chuang, Suvrit Sra, and Stefanie Jegelka, “Can contrastive learning avoid shortcut solutions?,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021, pp. 4974–4986.
- [21] Shijie Geng, Jianbo Yuan, Yu Tian, Yuxiao Chen, and Yongfeng Zhang, “Hiclip: Contrastive language-image pretraining with hierarchy-aware attention,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02995*, 2023.
- [22] Arsha Nagrani, Shan Yang, Anurag Arnab, Aren Jansen, Cordelia Schmid, and Chen Sun, “Attention bottlenecks for multimodal fusion,” in *ICLR*, 2021.