

# HeySQuAD: A Spoken Question Answering Dataset

Yijing Wu      Sai Krishna Rallabandi      Ravisutha Srinivasamurthy

Parag Pravin Dakle      Alolika Gon      Preethi Raghavan

Fidelity Investments

{yijing.wu, saiKrishna.rallabandi, ravisutha.srinivasamurthy,  
paragpravin.dakle, alolika.gon, preethi.raghavan}@fmr.com

## Abstract

Human-spoken questions are critical to evaluating the performance of spoken question answering (SQA) systems that serve several real-world use cases including digital assistants. We present a new large-scale community-shared SQA dataset, HeySQuAD that consists of 76k human-spoken questions and 97k machine-generated questions and corresponding textual answers derived from the SQuAD QA dataset.

The goal of HeySQuAD is to measure the ability of machines to understand noisy spoken questions and answer the questions accurately. To this end, we run extensive benchmarks on the human-spoken and machine-generated questions to quantify the differences in noise from both sources and its subsequent impact on the model and answering accuracy. Importantly, for the task of SQA, where we want to answer human-spoken questions, we observe that training using the transcribed human-spoken and original SQuAD questions leads to significant improvements (12.51%) over training using only the original SQuAD textual questions.

## 1 Introduction

Spoken language question answering (SQA) (Li et al., 2018; You et al., 2020b, 2021b,a; Chen et al., 2021) has become increasingly pervasive in our day-to-day lives as we frequently talk to digital assistants on devices including our phones, and smart watches, asking them to retrieve factual information or take actions to help us. For e.g., “Hey Agent, when does the World Cup start?”

The problem of SQA is complex and challenging since it first requires a clear understanding of the semantic meaning of both speech and text data, followed by a mechanism to provide appropriately accurate answers to the posed question. This translates to automatic speech recognition (ASR) followed by textual question answering (QA). How-

**Context:** This Main Building, and the library collection, was entirely destroyed by a fire in April 1879, ... The hall housed multiple classrooms and science labs needed for early research at the university.

**Original question:** In what year was the Main Building at Notre Dame razed in a fire?

**Transcribed human-spoken question:** a might yet was the main building in another name raised in a fire

**Transcribed machine-generated question:** in what year was the main building at notre dame raised in a fire

**Answer:** {"text": "1879", "answer\_start": 90}

Table 1: An example instance from HeySQuAD consisting of passage context, original SQuAD question, ASR transcriptions of human-spoken and machine generated questions and the answer.

ever, these tasks are difficult because they involve dealing with the variability and complexity of human speech (Li et al., 2018), noisy transcriptions (Chen et al., 2021; You et al., 2020a), as well as the ambiguity and context-dependence of natural language. An example of this is shown in Table 1, where the ASR transcriptions are fraught with noise that may be a result of pronunciation differences or background noises or the inaccuracy of the underlying ASR model.

In order to address this problem, and help develop models that can effectively handle transcription noise in SQA, we develop a new dataset called HeySQuAD, derived from the popular SQuAD reading comprehension data sets (Rajpurkar et al., 2016). We use an ASR model (facebook/s2t-small-librispeech-asr) (Wang et al., 2020) to obtain the transcription of human-spoken and machine-generated questions, and create the following HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> and HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> datasets for the SQA experiments.

- **SQuAD train and dev:** Contains SQuAD context and questions in the SQuAD 1.1 format.
- **HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> train and dev:** Contains SQuAD context and transcribed human-spoken questions in the SQuAD 1.1 format.
- **HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train and dev:** Contains SQuAD context and transcribed machine-generated questions in SQuAD 1.1 format.

All three datasets consist of 48849 training and 1002 dev examples. An example instance of HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>, HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>, and SQuAD is shown in Table 1.

Our main contributions are as follows.

(1) We release (post acceptance) the first large-scale community-shared dataset of 76k human-spoken questions and textual answers consisting of both recorded human-spoken audio and the ASR transcripts. This is accompanied by 97k machine-generated audio questions and their ASR transcripts. These annotated instances may be used towards variety of important tasks including ASR or SQA model improvement, audio-text multi-modal models, and better matching/retrieval efficiency, which allow for extensive benchmarking and model development to propel community efforts towards better spoken language question answering models (Section 3).

(2) We introduce a SQA leaderboard based on the HeySQuAD dataset and filled it with extensive benchmarks using state-of-the-art models for question answering across HeySQuAD transcribed questions and original SQuAD questions. The experiments leading up to these benchmarks allow us to make key observations that impact the training mechanisms and performance of SQA models (Section 6, Table 5).

- i We observe that training using SQuAD textual questions and transcribed human-spoken questions achieves an f1 score of 90.18%, which is a significant improvement (12.51%) over training using only the SQuAD textual questions (77.67%) when evaluated on human-spoken questions, shown in Table
- ii Even training using just machine-generated questions (low-cost) is significantly better (by 11.34%) than training with original SQuAD, which sets the stage for easily obtainable

machine-generated question transcripts to be used for training more accurate models for SQA.

## 2 Related Work

### Spoken Question Answering

Spoken Question Answering (SQA) (Li et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2018, 2019, 2018) involves a set of approaches aimed at appropriately answering a spoken question. There are two types of SQA systems: in context SQA systems (Li et al., 2018; You et al., 2020b, 2021b,a; Chen et al., 2021) and open domain SQA systems. While open domain SQA systems are built with the aim to answer questions without context, in context SQA systems typically take the form of Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) (Huang et al., 2021) where the question is accompanied by a passage. Models employing the pipeline architecture have highlighted the effects of errors arising from the ASR component (Li et al., 2018). (Su and Fung, 2020) explored the use of sub-word strategy while (Chuang et al., 2019) utilized BERT based model to learn joint audio-text features with the aim of mitigating the errors from ASR. However, such techniques do not explicitly consider the mapping between ASR transcript and the corresponding human transcription. In our work, we present experiments with models explicitly aimed at exploiting this mapping as well, by attempting to directly learn the said mapping in a translation fashion. In (You et al., 2021c) authors present a method to learn representations using contrastive learning and show improved performance on three SQA datasets. While the augmentation strategies presented may implicitly contribute to improvements in representations learned, it is not clear how they explicitly improve the performance of an SQA system. In this paper, we employ contrastive learning as a regularizer thereby explicitly regulating the final objective.

**SQA Datasets** (Li et al., 2018) is a large scale dataset for SQA with 37k and 5.4k question-answer pairs in training and test sets respectively. The dataset was created by converting the passage part of SQuAD dataset into speech by using Text-to-Speech. While this dataset paves the way for research into SQA, the spoken part of the dataset contains just the passages. The noise characteristics captured in the dataset reflect those of synthetic data. In our work, we present a dataset made of both synthetic as well as human recorded questions,

thereby characterizing a larger and close to real life variability. (You et al., 2020a) is a conversational question answering dataset that consists of question answering pairs from 7 domains. This dataset while is closer to the real life scenario (since it captures a conversation with dialog turns), it still uses synthetic data (and we were not able to independently verify the existence of this dataset even after our best efforts). Our dataset reflects the real world scenario more closely since it captures human variability while asking the questions. (Lee et al., 2018) present a small dataset with reading comprehension recorded from ToEFL. While this dataset contains real human speech data, it is created based on just 6 test candidates and hence is very limited. Our dataset contains around 80K human recorded questions. (Faisal et al., 2021) presents SD-QA dataset derived from TyDi-QA dataset with human-spoken questions. In English, 1k questions in dev set and 1k in test set are recorded in 11 English dialects by native speakers, and in total, SD-QA contains more than 68k questions in 5 languages and 24 dialects. Though this dataset contains questions spoken in different languages and dialects, only questions in dev and test set are included and the number of questions are very limited.

### 3 HeySQuAD Dataset Description

#### 3.1 Annotation details

The annotators were recruited after approval from an internal ethics board. All questions corresponding to a SQuAD context were shown to the speaker one after another. The speaker was required to record one question at a time; thus, sentences of the same context were spoken by the same speaker. We believe this is closer to a real-life scenario where the user has a multi-turn interaction with the system. We have employed a total of 12 speakers - 5 females and 7 males - who are all native-English speakers with no accents. For synthetic audio questions, we use Amazon Polly service and choose single speaker “Joanna” with “neural” engine to output mp3 files with sample rate of 16KHz.

#### 3.2 Transcriptions of Spoken Questions

Experiments on SQA require train and dev datasets with SQuAD textual questions, transcribed human-spoken questions, and transcribed machine-generated questions. We use an automatic speech recognition ASR model (facebook/s2t-small-librispeech-asr) (Wang et al., 2020) to obtain

the transcription of human-spoken and machine-generated questions, and create the human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> and machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> datasets (Section 1) for the SQA experiments.

#### 3.3 Dataset Characteristics

In order to quantify the noise in the transcribed human-spoken and machine-generated questions, we analyze the Word Error Rate (WER). Lower WER implies less mistakes and better transcription quality of the transcribed audio. The WER for transcribed human-spoken and machine-generated questions using ASR model (facebook/s2t-small-librispeech-asr) in Table 3 shows that there are more errors in human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> than machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>.

We also analyze the WER of HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> and HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> dev set for each question type as shown in Table 8 in the Appendix. The question type “others” contains questions in which we are unable to find any question word. For each question type, HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> dev have better transcribed questions than HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>. Especially, we notice that there are more HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev questions (10.88%) in “others” compared to HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> dev (8.89%) and SQuAD dev (4.19%). We also note that the WER of HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> in “others” is significantly higher than the HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>.

Typically, errors in the transcribed human-spoken utterances is known to be a result of errors from the ASR model and also because of noises such sampling errors from microphone, background noise, speaker speed, pronunciation and etc. in the recorded audio (Goldwater et al., 2008). In comparison, the errors in the transcribed machine-generated questions result from the ASR model while transcribing audio to text, and TTS models while generating synthetic audio.

We now specifically investigate the noise signals in HeySQuAD by sampling 100 random examples from the dev set where we have the SQuAD textual questions, transcribed human-spoken and transcribed machine-generated questions. In Table 2, we show examples and quantities of the errors of proper nouns/technical words, and errors from the same pronunciations in the 100 random examples of transcribed Human-spoken and machine-generated questions. The rest of the transcription errors, marked as “Others”, can arise from any source such as ASR model error or sampling error

Error Category	Example Ground Truth - Transcription	Machine-generated questions	Human-spoken questions
Proper nouns Technical words	Wahhabi - wad be	29%	31%
Error from the same pronunciation	1907 - ninteen and seven, policymakers - policy makers, site - sight	17%	16%
Others	In what year - in white year	25%	44%

Table 2: Examples and quantities of errors in the transcription of 100 random human-spoken and machine-generated questions, showing the higher WER for human-spoken than machine-generated questions mainly results from the “others” category which is a combination of ASR model error, sampling error while recording human voice or generating synthetic audio, and etc.

ASR Transcription Error	WER
HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> Train	0.3423
HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> Dev	0.2722
HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> Train	0.2087
HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> Dev	0.1961

Table 3: WER of transcribed human-spoken and machine-generated questions by ASR model : facebook/s2t-small-librispeech-asr, showing transcribed human-spoken questions has higher WER and thus more errors than machine-generated questions.

while recording or from bad microphone quality or because of background noise etc, and it is difficult to identify the sources of an error when it occurs.

From this result, we can infer that the human pronunciation and recording quality vs text-to-speech machine-generated synthetic audio quality is the main reason impacting the transcription quality and results in the lower WER of transcribed machine-generated questions than human-spoken questions. In addition, 44 examples contain proper nouns and technical words, which means in human-spoken questions, 70.45% of these proper nouns and technical words are wrong, and in machine-generated questions, 65.91% are wrong. We also provide the part-of-speech (PoS) tags using spaCy “en\_core\_web\_sm” model (Honnibal et al., 2020) after normalizing the 1002 original questions, transcribed machine-generated questions and human-spoken questions, shown in Table 10 in the Appendix.

## 4 Models

In this section, we present the models aimed at solving the task of Spoken Question Answering (SQA).

### 4.1 Spoken Query Answering with ASR (QuASR)

Let  $Q_i$  be the input question and  $S_i$  be  $Q_i$  in spoken form. Also let  $P_i$  be the passage in textual form. We pass  $S_i$  through an ASR system to obtain the transcription  $T_i$ . Also consider  $A_i$  as the answer to the question. QuASR learns the conditional distribution  $P(A_i / T_i)$ . Our model can be summarized by the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i &= \mathbf{H}^{ASR}(S_i) \\ A_i &= \mathbf{QuASR}(T_i) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Our  $H^{ASR}$  is a Connectionist Temporal Classification(CTC) based Speech2Text model(Wang et al., 2020; Ott et al., 2019). We employ it to generate  $T_i$  in the form of characters directly from  $S_i$ . We have built multiple QuASR models that differ in the LLM used for question answering. Previous work has identified that the ASR errors have a significant impact on the performance of such systems. In order to mitigate this effect, we also build a set of systems that attempt to learn a mapping from the output of ASR system to the original question. This set of models can be summarized by the following set of equations.:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i &= \mathbf{H}^{ASR}(S_i) \\ T_i^m &= \mathbf{H}^{MT}(T_i) \\ A_i &= \mathbf{QuASR}(T_i^m) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $H^{MT}$  represents a model that learns mapping from transcribed question  $T_i$  to original question  $Q_i$ . We employ (Raffel et al., 2022) as our  $H_{MT}$ . In addition, we also built a set of models that are first trained using the original questions and then fine-tuned using the transcribed questions.

Model Name	Human Spoken Context		Human Spoken Questions		Machine Spoken Context		Machine Spoken Questions	
	Yes?	Size	Yes?	Size	Yes?	Size	Yes?	Size
SQuAD1.1 (Rajpurkar et al., 2016)	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0
Spoken SQuAD (Li et al., 2018)	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0	✓	T: 37k D: 5.4k	×	T: 0 D: 0
SCQA (You et al., 2020a)	✓	T: 0 D: 500	✓	T: 0 D: 500	✓	T: 7.1k D: 0	✓	T: 7.1k D: 0
TOEFL (Tseng et al., 2016)	✓	T: 963 D: 124 TT: 122	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0
SD-QA (Faisal et al., 2021)	×	T: 0 D: 0	✓	T: 0 D: 1k*11	×	T: 0 D: 0	×	T: 0 D: 0
<b>HeySQuAD (ours)</b>	×	T: 0 D: 0	✓	<b>T: 72k</b> <b>D: 4k</b>	×	T: 0 D: 0	✓	<b>T: 87k</b> <b>D: 10k</b>

Table 4: Different spoken QA datasets are compared along with their **train** (referred to as **T**), **dev** (referred to as **D**) and **test** (referred to as **TT**) sizes. HeySQuAD is the first large-scale community-shared dataset contains both 76k human-spoken and 97k machine-generated questions which is unique across these datasets. For SCQA dataset, the train and test size represents number of conversations instead of turns. For SD-QA, “1k\*11” represents 1k questions that are recorded in 11 English dialects. In addition, SD-QA has 68k dev+test set (but no train set) across 5 languages and 24 dialects.

Our hypothesis in building these models is to investigate the possible effect of employing curriculum learning for transcribing the spoken questions. This set of models can be summarized by the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_i &= \mathbf{QuASR}(Q_i) \\
 T_i &= \mathbf{H}^{ASR}(S_i) \\
 A_i &= \mathbf{QuASR}(T_i)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3}$$

## 4.2 Loss Functions

As the output for our models is the span of the answers, we use cross entropy loss function to penalize the errors made in prediction.

## 4.3 Evaluation Metrics

With the ASR transcriptions of human-spoken and machine-generated questions, the Question Answering models can return a text answer based on the questions and contexts. Since the task involves retrieval of a span of text, we employ two types of evaluation metrics to gauge the performance of models: (1) Computing the exact match (EM) between the predicted text answer and the ground truth text answer and (2) F1 scores between the predicted text answer and the ground-truth text answer. For instance, if the predicted text answer is exactly the same as the ground-truth text answer the EM score is 1 and F1 is 1. However, when there is a mismatch between them, EM score is 0 where F1 scores are between 0 and 1, based on the precision and recall. Precision is the percentage of words in

the predicted answer existing in the ground-truth answer, while the recall is the percentage of words in the ground-truth answer also appearing in the predicted answer.

## 5 Experiments

In order to explore our QuASR models, we built six question answering (QA) systems. All the systems employ a common ASR system to obtain the transcription  $T_i$  from  $S_i$ . We have employed a CTC based ASR model (facebook/s2t-small-librispeech-asr) which achieves a Word Error Rate (WER) given in Table 3. The six systems differ in the QA model employed. The QA models are bert-base-uncased, bert-large-uncased, roberta-base, roberta-large, albert-base-v2 and albert-large-v2 (Wolf et al., 2020). Each system is fine-tuned in four different methods as follows:

- **SQuAD**: QA models are finetuned on the SQuAD training dataset.
- **HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> / HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>**: QA models are finetuned on the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> training dataset or HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> training dataset.
- **SQuAD and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> / HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>**: QA models are finetuned on both SQuAD and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> training dataset, or finetuned on both SQuAD and HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> training dataset.
- **SQuAD then HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> / HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>**: QA models are finetuned first on SQuAD,

and then finetuned on HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> or HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> training dataset.

Each system was trained for 2 epochs with learning rate of 3e-5 and maximum length of tokens in the sequence being 512. To mitigate the effects of ASR errors, we also train the systems governed by equation 2: We build models that take the transcribed machine-generated questions as input and the original question as output. We run the experiments to evaluate the obtained dev set (corrected-SQuAD-machine dev) using the fine-tuned QA models.

## 6 Results

In this section, we present results on Spoken Question Answering (SQA) task using QA models fine-tuned on SQuAD, machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> and human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>, evaluated on the SQuAD, HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set in Table 5. When evaluated on the human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set which is the closest to the real life use case of SQA, the best accuracy score (F1: 90.18) is obtained by using roberta-large QA model fine-tuned on the SQuAD and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dataset, which is 12.51% higher than roberta-large QA model fine-tuned only on the SQuAD dataset (77.67%). In addition, using roberta-large QA model fine-tuned on even HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train which is low-cost achieves 89.01%. We make the following observations:

1. **Models fine-tuned on the human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> or machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> train perform significantly better than fine-tuned only on the SQuAD:** Each QA model fine-tuned on the HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> or HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> train has a significant improvement compared with the model fine-tuned only on the original textual questions dataset SQuAD (Row a, b and e; Column HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev in Table 5).
2. **Models fine-tuned on the human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> train have higher scores than models fine-tuned on the machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train, but not significantly:** The accuracy scores of each QA model fine-tuned on the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> train are higher but not significantly higher than fine-tuned on the HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train (Row b and e; Column HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev in Table 5). Although the WER in Table 3 implies less

noisy HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> than HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>train, their performance is similar.

3. **Adding SQuAD to training has no significant improvement:** This does not significantly improve the QA models when evaluating on the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>dev (Row b to d for fine-tuning with human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> and Row e to g for machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>; Column HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev in Table 5). This implies, without original textual questions, training using only HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> or HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> train is sufficient.

In addition, we notice that when evaluated on the SQuAD dev set, training with machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> or human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train does not have a significant impact on the QA performance (Row a, b and e; Column SQuAD dev in Table 5).

We also notice that for each model, accuracy scores when evaluated on SQuAD dev set is higher than evaluated on machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> dev set, higher than evaluated on human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>dev set. With the comparison of WER of HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>dev and HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub>dev, this implies getting higher-quality transcription of the dev set will improve SQA performance.

We also include SQA accuracy results using bert-base-uncased, roberta-base, albert-base-v2 QA models fine-tuned on HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>, HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> and SQuAD train dataset in Appendix Table 11. It shows that when evaluated on the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set, the best accuracy score (F1: 87.34%) is obtained by using roberta-base QA model fine-tuned on the SQuAD and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dataset, which is 7.40% higher than fine-tuned only on the SQuAD dataset (79.94%). In addition, using roberta-large QA model fine-tuned on even HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train which is low-cost achieves 85.93%.

The performance of model for different question types is tabulated in table 9 in the Appendix. The highest WER is seen for the question type “how” (ignoring the WER for “others”) and it can be seen that the model performance degrades significantly when the model is not trained on transcribed data. Hence, training model on transcribed data (either generated by machine or spoken by humans) make the model robust.

QA Model		Train Dataset	SQuAD dev		HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> dev		HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> dev	
			F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM
bert-large-uncased	a	SQuAD train	90.01	81.74	77.38	64.57	75.29	62.67
	b	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	88.95	81.14	86.70	78.84	84.88	77.25
	c	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	88.85	80.94	85.64	77.74	83.82	75.65
	d	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	88.72	80.94	85.07	77.64	83.88	75.95
	e	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	89.81	82.03	86.51	78.64	84.56	78.45
	f	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	89.25	81.43	86.32	77.64	83.23	73.75
	g	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	89.60	81.74	85.83	77.44	84.23	75.25
roberta-large	a	SQuAD train	93.71	86.52	80.78	67.26	<b>77.67</b>	63.87
	b	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	92.71	84.83	92.05	85.22	89.14	81.93
	c	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	93.60	86.72	92.11	85.62	<b>90.18</b>	83.73
	d	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	93.11	86.52	91.12	84.03	88.52	81.23
	e	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	93.41	86.32	92.46	85.72	<b>89.01</b>	82.03
	f	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	93.41	86.52	92.11	85.92	89.13	81.93
	g	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	93.23	86.32	91.13	83.73	89.01	82.03
albert-large-v2	a	SQuAD train	91.49	84.03	65.05	41.91	62.01	38.82
	b	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	90.67	82.33	88.03	80.03	87.18	79.04
	c	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	91.50	84.23	89.02	81.43	87.77	79.74
	d	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	91.51	84.73	88.73	80.93	87.33	79.64
	e	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	90.98	82.73	89.09	81.53	86.78	78.84
	f	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	91.60	84.43	89.00	81.13	85.85	77.24
	g	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	92.51	85.12	89.29	80.63	86.94	78.34

Table 5: QA accuracy results (%) using bert-large-uncased, roberta-large, albert-large-v2 QA models fine-tuned on HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>, HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> and SQuAD train dataset; numbers in bold show when evaluated on the human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set, the best accuracy score (F1: 90.18%) is obtained by using roberta-large QA model fine-tuned on the SQuAD and human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dataset, which is 12.51% higher than fine-tuned only on the SQuAD dataset (77.67%), and using roberta-large QA model fine-tuned on even machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train which is low-cost achieves 89.01%.

## 7 Error Analysis

In order to quantify the challenges involved in dealing with variability and complexity of human speech, the best model (roberta-large) from the section 6 was tested on transcribed human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set.

One of the important aspect the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set is the amount of transcription error. If we consider clean textual questions from SQuAD set (denoted as  $q$ ) and human speech transcribed question from HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> set (denoted as  $\hat{q}$ ), we get two sets of possibilities: (a) When  $\hat{q} \approx q$  and (b) When  $\hat{q} \neq q$ . To measure the similarity between  $q$  and  $\hat{q}$  we first get the embeddings for both by using a sentence transformer (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) to compute the cosine similarity between  $q$  and  $\hat{q}$ . When the similarity between the  $q$  and  $\hat{q}$  is greater than 0.9, we consider the transcription to be free of transcription errors ( $\hat{q} \approx q$ ). In this setting, the model trained on the clean dataset (referred to as SQuAD model) is expected to perform on par with the model trained on transcribed human-spoken

dataset (referred to as HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> model). Table 6 shows the performance difference ( $\sim 7\%$ ) when the questions are very similar. As the questions are very similar, the error form these models are mostly *model errors*.

When the similarity between  $q$  and  $\hat{q}$  is less than 0.9, we assume that the transcribed text contains significant transcription errors ( $\hat{q} \neq q$ ). In this setting, the only difference between model trained on SQuAD and the model trained on HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> is that the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> model is aware of *transcription errors*. From Table 6, it can be inferred that the performance of the SQuAD model degrades significantly ( $\approx 16\%$  deficit compared to HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> model’s F1) in presence of transcription errors.

**Discussion.** From the above analysis, it is clear that the *transcription errors* have huge impact on the model performance. The types of transcription errors have been discussed in section 3. Additional analysis of how WER for different question types (who/when/why etc.) affects model performance is presented in the the Appendix A.

Model	$q \approx \hat{q}$ F1	$q \neq \hat{q}$ F1
HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> Model	94.36	87.66
SQuADModel	87.23	71.90
Difference in F1	7.12	<b>15.76</b>

Table 6: When transcribed questions are very similar to clean textual questions ( $q \approx \hat{q}$ ), we expect the model trained on clean set to perform as well as model trained on transcribed set. And when different ( $q \neq \hat{q}$ ) (mostly due to transcription error), we observe that the performance of HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> model is ( $\sim 16\%$ ) more than SQuAD model’s performance

We also notice that mapping the transcribed questions to original questions (as depicted in eqn 3) does not significantly improve the performance of QA models. The BLEU score of the 10k corrected-SQuAD-machine dev questions is 75.4, which shows an improvement compared with the BLEU score of the 10k transcribed machine-generated questions being 44.8. However, compared with results in Table 5, the results in Table 7 show that the text-based correction of the transcribed machine-generated questions does not improve the performance of QA models fine-tuned on machine-generated train dataset. Qualitative analysis shows that the improvements in BLEU come from grammatical correction while the proper nouns were still ambiguous for the model. Therefore, alleviating proper noun based errors in ASR transcripts can be a future approach to improve SQA performance.

Overall, our best model on HeySQuAD, roberta-large, performs with f1 accuracy 90.18% whereas the corresponding best model on SQuAD performs at 79.94%. This leaves tremendous scope for improving performance with noisy spoken questions. Future work to this effect may include models that help mitigate transcription error including joint modeling of audio-text in several ways including multi-modal models. This also opens up another potential avenue where both the contexts and questions are transcribed from speech. We performed some exploratory analysis to this effect using BERT-style models but noticed a significant decrease in performance.

## 8 Limitations and Potential Risks

**Limitations.** We use only the transcription of the audio files in our models, and we do not build models directly with audio files in the dataset. The SQA models we build contain ASR errors which

Model	Corrected-SQuAD -machine dev	
<b>bert-large-uncased</b>	<b>F1</b>	<b>EM</b>
SQuAD1.1 train	87.85	80.64
SQuAD1.1 machine train	87.12	79.72
<b>roberta-large</b>	<b>F1</b>	<b>EM</b>
SQuAD1.1 train	88.12	81.14
SQuAD1.1 machine train	90.44	83.75
<b>albert-large-v2</b>	<b>F1</b>	<b>EM</b>
SQuAD1.1 train	86.30	79.11
SQuAD1.1 machine train	89.27	82.30

Table 7: bert, roberta and albert QA model fine-tuned on SQuAD1.1 train and SQuAD1.1 machine-generated train, evaluated on corrected-SQuAD-machine dev set. This implies mapping the transcribed questions to original questions as depicted in eqn 3 does not significantly improve the performance of QA models.

percolate thru other modules, leading to error propagation.

**Potential Risks.** A fully realized SQA system might pose privacy risks to the end customer.

**Impact.** We present HeySQuAD that includes both human-spoken and machine-generated audio and transcribed questions. This will help future researchers study various effects of variability in human speech and design approaches to alleviate spurious transcriptions.

## 9 Conclusion

We present a new large-scale SQA dataset, HeySQuAD, that consists of 76k human-spoken and 97k machine-generated audio and transcribed questions and corresponding textual answers derived from the SQuAD QA dataset. We run extensive benchmarks on the human-spoken and machine-generated questions to quantify the differences in noise from both sources and its subsequent impact on the model and answering accuracy. Importantly, we observe that training using the SQuAD and transcribed human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dataset leads to significant improvements (12.51%) over training using only the original textual questions when evaluated on human-spoken questions. Even training using just a machine-generated dataset which is low-cost improves 11.34% over training using the original textual questions.



## References

- Nuo Chen, Chenyu You, and Yuexian Zou. 2021. Self-supervised dialogue learning for spoken conversational question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.02182*.
- Yung-Sung Chuang, Chi-Liang Liu, and Hung-Yi Lee. 2019. Speechbert: Cross-modal pre-trained language model for end-to-end spoken question answering.
- Fahim Faisal, Sharlina Keshava, Md Mahfuz Ibn Alam, and Antonios Anastasopoulos. 2021. **SD-QA: Spoken dialectal question answering for the real world**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 3296–3315, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sharon Goldwater, Daniel Jurafsky, and Christopher Manning. 2008. Which words are hard to recognize? prosodic, lexical, and disfluency factors that increase asr error rates. pages 380–388.
- Matthew Honnibal, Ines Montani, Sofie Van Lan-deghem, and Adriane Boyd. 2020. **spacy: Industrial-strength natural language processing in python**.
- Zhiqi Huang, Fenglin Liu, Xian Wu, Shen Ge, Helin Wang, Wei Fan, and Yuexian Zou. 2021. Audio-oriented multimodal machine comprehension via dynamic inter-and intra-modality attention. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 13098–13106.
- Chia-Hsuan Lee, Yun-Nung Chen, and Hung-Yi Lee. 2019. Mitigating the impact of speech recognition errors on spoken question answering by adversarial domain adaptation. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7300–7304. IEEE.
- Chia-Hsuan Lee, Shang-Ming Wang, Huan-Cheng Chang, and Hung-Yi Lee. 2018. Odsqa: Open-domain spoken question answering dataset. In *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 949–956. IEEE.
- Chia-Hsuan Li, Szu-Lin Wu, Chi-Liang Liu, and Hung-yi Lee. 2018. Spoken squad: A study of mitigating the impact of speech recognition errors on listening comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.00320*.
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019: Demonstrations*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2022. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(1).
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. **SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text**. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. **Sentencebert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Su and Pascale Fung. 2020. Improving spoken question answering using contextualized word representation. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 8004–8008. IEEE.
- Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Sheng-Syun Shen, Hung-Yi Lee, and Lin-Shan Lee. 2016. Towards machine comprehension of spoken content: Initial toefl listening comprehension test by machine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.06378*.
- Changhan Wang, Yun Tang, Xutai Ma, Anne Wu, Dmytro Okhonko, and Juan Pino. 2020. fairseq s2t: Fast speech-to-text modeling with fairseq. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference of the Asian Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL): System Demonstrations*.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. **Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chenyu You, Nuo Chen, Fenglin Liu, Dongchao Yang, and Yuexian Zou. 2020a. Towards data distillation for end-to-end spoken conversational question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08923*.
- Chenyu You, Nuo Chen, and Yuexian Zou. 2020b. Contextualized attention-based knowledge transfer for spoken conversational question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11066*.
- Chenyu You, Nuo Chen, and Yuexian Zou. 2021a. Knowledge distillation for improved accuracy in spoken question answering. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7793–7797. IEEE.
- Chenyu You, Nuo Chen, and Yuexian Zou. 2021b. Mrd-net: Multi-modal residual knowledge distillation for spoken question answering. In *IJCAI*, pages 3985–3991.

Chenyu You, Nuo Chen, and Yuexian Zou. 2021c. Self-supervised contrastive cross-modality representation learning for spoken question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03381*.

## **A WER analysis**

WER analysis of HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> dev and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev grouped by question types is shown in the table 8. The performance of model for different question types is tabulated in table 9. The highest WER is seen for the question type “how” (ignoring the WER for “others”) and it can be seen that the model performance degrades significantly when the model is not trained on transcribed data. Hence, training model on transcribed data (either generated by machine or spoken by humans) make the model robust.

## **B POS analysis**

PoS tagging of 1002 SQuAD questions, transcribed machine-generated questions and human-spoken questions.

Question Type	SQuAD dev	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> dev		HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> dev	
	Percentage	Percentage	WER	Percentage	WER
who	8.38%	8.18%	0.2320	7.98%	0.2555
what	63.97%	62.28%	0.1830	56.69%	0.2394
where	2.79%	2.69%	0.2350	3.19%	0.2414
when	7.29%	6.79%	0.1607	7.09%	0.2301
why	1.90%	1.80%	0.1257	2.79%	0.2740
how	11.48%	11.38%	0.2010	11.38%	0.2533
others	4.19%	6.89%	0.3016	10.88%	0.5111
overall	100%	100%	0.1961	100%	0.2722

Table 8: WER analysis of HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> dev and HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev grouped by question types

Question Type	Question Percentage	WER	Fine-tuned on SQuAD train		Fine-tuned on SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train		Fine-tuned on HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	
			F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM
who	7.98%	0.2555	81.89	72.5	96.69	93.75	94.48	92.5
what	56.69%	0.2394	80.44	68.31	90.45	83.3	90.42	83.63
where	3.19%	0.2414	70.32	43.75	92.86	87.5	88.48	78.13
when	7.09%	0.2301	82.53	83.24	98.7	97.18	95.65	92.96
why	2.79%	0.2740	75.92	39.28	80.65	64.29	77.44	57.14
how	11.38%	0.2533	76.46	52.63	89.65	73.4	90.85	83.33
others	10.88%	0.5111	60.88	52.29	80.71	73.39	74.53	65.14
overall (macro-avg)	100%	0.2722	77.67	64.58	90.19	82.52	89.01	82.04

Table 9: roberta-large QA model macro-average accuracy scores on HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev of different question types

PoS Tagging	Original	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub>	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub>
DET	297	329	319
NOUN	3124	3281	3344
AUX	857	819	817
PROP	8	11	15
VERB	1336	1367	1391
ADP	1429	1449	1531
ADV	443	435	469
ADJ	1042	1062	1094
PRON	684	720	771
NUM	145	314	313
INTJ	2	3	4
PART	171	170	180
CCONJ	114	159	174
SCONJ	78	75	85
X	5	9	19
SYM	0	0	2

Table 10: PoS tagging of 1002 SQuAD questions, transcribed machine-generated questions and human-spoken questions.

QA Model		Train Dataset	SQuAD dev		HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> dev		HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> dev	
			F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM
bert -base -uncased	a	SQuAD train	87.31	78.64	71.82	55.49	67.34	50.80
	b	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	85.25	75.95	82.36	73.55	80.89	71.16
	c	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	86.33	77.25	82.39	72.65	81.13	71.66
	d	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	85.62	75.85	82.12	71.66	80.71	70.06
	e	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	86.34	77.15	83.44	74.05	80.18	70.96
	f	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	86.04	77.15	82.33	72.85	80.02	69.76
	g	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	86.88	77.84	82.53	72.45	80.65	70.66
roberta -base	a	SQuAD train	90.14	82.53	83.94	74.65	<b>79.94</b>	69.86
	b	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	91.13	83.73	88.84	81.93	<b>87.34</b>	79.84
	c	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	91.07	84.03	88.16	80.73	86.87	79.14
	d	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	89.89	82.33	86.95	79.14	85.93	78.14
	e	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	90.83	83.93	88.75	81.8	<b>86.00</b>	78.74
	f	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	90.87	84.23	88.28	80.83	85.13	76.84
	g	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	89.25	82.03	87.45	79.04	84.8	76.74
albert -base-v2	a	SQuAD train	88.93	81.33	70.10	50.89	66.52	48.00
	b	HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	89.19	81.63	86.69	79.14	85.28	77.34
	c	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	90.10	82.83	86.43	78.94	84.92	77.44
	d	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>h</sub> train	89.24	81.73	85.40	77.54	83.89	76.04
	e	HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	89.97	82.63	87.26	79.64	85.28	77.34
	f	SQuAD and HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub> train	88.77	80.73	83.98	75.44	82.58	72.35
	g	SQuAD then HeySQuAD <sub>m</sub>	88.93	81.33	70.06	50.89	66.52	48.00

Table 11: QA accuracy results using bert-base-uncased, roberta-base, albert-base-v2 QA models fine-tuned on HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub>, HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> and SQuAD train dataset. The bold numbers show that when evaluated on the HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dev set, the best accuracy score (F1: 87.34%) is obtained by using roberta-base QA model fine-tuned on the human-spoken HeySQuAD<sub>h</sub> dataset, which is 7.40% higher than fine-tuned only on the SQuAD dataset (79.94%). In addition, using roberta-large QA model fine-tuned on even machine-generated HeySQuAD<sub>m</sub> train which is low-cost achieves 86.00%.