

# Do Prompts Really Prompt? Exploring the Prompt Understanding Capability of Whisper

Chih-Kai Yang<sup>1</sup>, Kuan-Po Huang<sup>1,2</sup>, Hung-yi Lee<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Taiwan University, Taiwan <sup>2</sup>ASUS Intelligent Cloud Services, Taiwan

r12921119@ntu.edu.tw, f09922005@ntu.edu.tw, hungyilee@ntu.edu.tw

## Abstract

This research explores the interaction between Whisper, a high-performing speech recognition model, and information in prompts. Our results unexpectedly show that Whisper may not fully grasp textual prompts as anticipated. Additionally, we find that performance improvement is not guaranteed even with stronger adherence to the topic information in textual prompts. It is also noted that English prompts generally outperform Mandarin ones on datasets of both languages, likely due to differences in training data distributions for these languages. Conversely, we discover that Whisper exhibits awareness of misleading information in language tokens by effectively ignoring incorrect language tokens and focusing on the correct ones. In summary, this work raises questions about Whisper’s prompt understanding capability and encourages further studies.

**Index Terms:** speech recognition, Whisper, prompt understanding

## 1. Introduction

The rise of large-scale foundation models in diverse fields, such as natural language processing (NLP) [1, 2, 3] and computer vision [4, 5, 6], has ignited interest in various studies and applications. Among these, prompting, a technique aimed at unleashing the potential of foundation models [7, 8, 9, 10], has become a prominent research focus in the AI community and has been extended to speech processing, like text-to-speech [11, 12] and spoken language understanding [13].

Notably, Whisper [14], a cutting-edge automatic speech recognition (ASR) model, serves as a robust backbone for speech processing systems [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20] and has shown promise in prompting. Prior works showed the effectiveness of prompting with Whisper in scenarios like code-switched ASR [21, 22], audio-visual speech recognition [21], etc.

Typically, these works implicitly assumed that Whisper can understand prompts well and capture useful and task-relevant information from prompts. However, as prior works on language models cautioned against taking the prompting ability for granted [23, 24], this assumption needs scrutiny. Unfortunately, to our best knowledge, whether and how Whisper understands prompts and improves itself remains unexplored. To this end, this work takes the first step toward this open question.

This work explores Whisper’s prompt understanding capabilities by analyzing its performances when given prompts with correct or mismatched information about the testing data in several scenarios. Ideally, the former should outperform the latter. However, we find that Whisper exhibits a limited understanding of textual prompts, as it performs better with mismatched topic information than with matched information. Regression analysis surprisingly reveals that no positive correlation between

prompt understanding and performance exists, showing that prompting Whisper does not work as expected. It is also noted that English prompts typically outperform Mandarin ones even on Mandarin data, showcasing the effect of prompt language that contradicts our intuition. For code-switched ASR, performance degradation is observed as expected when language token pairs with nonexistent components are provided. We further discover that Whisper tends to generate predictions entirely in the correctly provided language, highlighting its ability to filter out irrelevant information within the language tokens, which may benefit from the extensive pre-training.

Overall, our contributions<sup>1</sup> are (1) Pioneering exploration of Whisper’s prompt understanding ability, (2) Uncovering the limited understanding of textual prompts and empirically demonstrating that adhering strongly to topic information in prompts does not guarantee improved performances, (3) Revealing a counterintuitive effect of prompt languages where English prompts outperform Mandarin ones even with Mandarin testing data, and (4) Highlighting its ability to disregard misleading information in language tokens. We hope these findings stimulate further research on prompting methods for Whisper.

## 2. Related works

**Whisper.** Whisper is a family of encoder-decoder ASR models. The input of the decoder includes special tokens, e.g., language tokens like `<|en|>`, task tokens like `<|transcribe|>`, etc., to convey specific information. Specifically, the `<|prev|>` token signifies the transcript of the previous utterance in long-form transcription. Prompting is achieved by replacing previous contexts with custom prompts, termed *textual* prompts. Following Peng et al. [21], the concept of prompts is extended to special tokens. Complete prompts resemble `<|prev|> textual prompt <|startoftranscript|> <|language|> <|transcribe|>`.

**Prompting Whisper.** Prompting Whisper is widely applied. Peng et al. [21] showed that Whisper can be prompted for audio-visual ASR by including objects retrieved by CLIP [25] in textual prompts. They also showed that concatenating the special tokens for the two languages enhanced Whisper on code-switched ASR for those languages. Yang et al. [22] observed improvement in code-switched ASR by indicating the occurrences of code-switching in textual prompts. Wang et al. [26] showcased the efficacy of task-informed prompts, e.g., “recognize dialect speech”, and in-context learning in boosting Whisper on dialect ASR. Zhuo et al. [27] generalized Whisper to lyric transcription via prompting. These works demonstrated the potential of prompting Whisper beyond style imitation.

<sup>1</sup>Resources of this work can be found at [https://anonymous.4open.science/r/whisper\\_prompting-90B2](https://anonymous.4open.science/r/whisper_prompting-90B2).

### 3. Prompt understanding of Whisper

#### 3.1. Problem formulation

This work aims to rethink the prompt understanding capabilities of Whisper. We mainly focus on the following questions:

- Does it understand and capture useful semantic information from the textual prompts for transcribing (Sec. 5.1)?
- Does it benefit from the implicit language information when prompts and testing data are in the same language (Sec. 5.3)?
- Does it understand the language information within language tokens (Sec. 5.4)?

#### 3.2. Method

We evaluate Whisper in two scenarios: one where prompts with correct and relevant information on the testing data are provided, and the other where prompts include mismatched information. Ideally, if the prompts are understood by the model and influence its behaviors, the performances in the former situation outperform those in the latter [23]. Thus, this comparative method assesses Whisper’s prompt understanding capability.

##### 3.2.1. Prompt templates for textual prompts

To explore Whisper’s textual prompt understanding, we construct *prompt templates* to generate textual prompts. These templates transform inputs into strings. For instance, a template `This utterance is about {input}` turns `arts` into a prompt `“This utterance is about arts”`. Using templates helps generate textual prompts with desired input information systematically.

To ensure diversity, templates are first generated manually with various patterns, categorized as follows: (1) identity mappings, which use the input as prompts: `{input}`; (2) task-informed instructions: `Transcribe this video of {input}`; (3) conversation-like templates: `So we were just talking about {input}`; (4) indication of the input information in natural language form: `This utterance is about {input}`; (5) lists of input-related keywords generated by GPT-3.5 [28]: `{keyword_1}, {keyword_2}, ..., {keyword_N}`. Particularly, human-generated templates of patterns (2), (3), and (4) are provided to GPT-3.5 to generate additional templates. All the templates are generated in English. The resulting human-generated templates and the ones generated by GPT-3.5 are collected, and textual prompts are subsequently constructed with the initial character capitalized. For instance, if the input is `arts`, the generated prompts of the aforementioned templates are (1) `“Arts”`, (2) `“Transcribe this video of arts”`, (3) `“So we were just talking about arts”`, (4) `“This utterance is about arts”`, and (5) `“Arts, culture, performing, visual”`.

##### 3.2.2. Understanding of textual prompts

We assess Whisper’s textual prompt understanding using multi-domain monolingual ASR corpora, where each audio clip is labeled with a topic label. We compare its performances when prompted by prompts with matched and mismatched topics, where the textual prompts are generated by the templates created in Sec. 3.2.1 with the topic labels as the inputs. We compare the model’s performances on subsets of each topic, examining prompts with the corresponding topic as well as those with mismatched ones based on metrics specified in Sec. 3.3.




Figure 1: Illustration of PERF, BPERF, and TFR. The used template and corpus are `{topic}` and GigaSpeech. The matrix is WERs of Whisper on subsets of row topics when prompted by the template and column topics. The topics are “Arts”, “Science and Technology”, “Sports”, and “Nonprofits and Activism”.

##### 3.2.3. Effect of textual prompt languages

We explore whether the languages of textual prompts influence the model’s performance, that is, whether Whisper gets enhanced by implicit language information in textual prompts. Intuitively, prompts in the same languages as testing data should induce better transcribing accuracy than those in other languages. We examine this by comparing the resulting transcribing accuracy when prompted by English or Mandarin prompts.

Rather than creating new Mandarin templates, we use the same textual prompts from Sec. 3.2.2, originally in English, and translate them into Mandarin. This approach reduces the potential impact of semantic variations, focusing solely on the language differences between prompts in the two languages. Both sets of prompts are applied to the testing corpora, and the performances are compared based on metrics in Sec. 3.3.

##### 3.2.4. Investigating the understanding of language tokens

To delve into Whisper’s comprehension of language tokens, we utilize code-switched ASR as a probing task. The corresponding language tokens are concatenated for inference [21]. For the testing corpora, either both languages exist, or one of them is absent. Code-switched ASR is chosen over monolingual ASR because providing the wrong language token for the latter leads to speech-to-text translation into that language [21], making the analysis unfair. This is also why we provide one mismatched language token instead of two. We compare Whisper’s mixed error rates when provided with entirely correct language tokens versus those with partially correct ones.

### 3.3. Metrics

#### 3.3.1. Mixed error rate (MER)

MER is adopted for code-switched ASR. Pre-processing on the ground truths and the model’s outputs is first performed, e.g., inserting spaces to treat Mandarin characters as words, standardizing Mandarin parts to simplified Mandarin, converting non-Mandarin parts to lowercase, and removing all punctuation.

#### 3.3.2. Performance (PERF) and best performance (BPERF)

We define two metrics to evaluate the impact of mismatched topic information: *performance* and *best performance* of a prompt template.

To calculate the metrics, we first divide the testing set into subsets with distinct topics and generate textual prompts using

the template and all topics. For each combination of subsets and prompts, we gather the predictions and calculate the word error rate (WER). These WERs are organized into a matrix like Fig. 1, with subset topics as rows and prompt topics as columns.

The performance (PERF) of a template is the WER of the model prompted by *matched* topics across all data via the template, i.e., the overall WER of the predictions associated with diagonal elements in Fig. 1. PERF evaluates the model prompted by purely matched information through a specific template.

Conversely, the best performance (BPERF) of a template assesses the lowest achievable WER when providing various topic information via the template. For each subset, all prompts are used, and the corresponding predictions with the lowest WER, exemplified by elements in red squares in Fig. 1, are gathered. The BPERF is defined as the overall WER of the gathered predictions. The average PERF/BPERF is the average of PERFs/BPERFs across all templates. Comparing the average PERF and the average BPERF measures the impact of mismatched information on improvement or degradation.

### 3.3.3. Topic following rate (TFR)

Ideally, a model that highly understands the prompts should perform the best on a subset of a topic when prompted by the prompt generated with that topic instead of others. This property is measured by the *topic following rate* (TFR).

The TFR of a template is defined as follows. Let  $n$  be the number of topics in the dataset, and  $f$  be the number of subsets where the model obtains the lowest WER on them when prompted by the template with the corresponding topics instead of others. In other words,  $f$  is the number of rows where the minimum occurs on the diagonal of the matrix mentioned in Sec. 3.3.2. The TFR of the template on this dataset is then  $f/n$ . An example is in Fig. 1, where  $n$  is 4 and  $f$  is the number of elements having both star and square, which is 1. Thus, the TFR is 25%. The average TFR is the mean of TFRs of all templates.

## 4. Experimental setups

### 4.1. Model

We employ pre-trained **Whisper-large-v3**, the latest version of Whisper trained on 5M hours of multilingual data with 1.5B parameters. We denote it as Whisper. Greedy decoding is applied.

### 4.2. Datasets

For code-switched ASR, we adopt **CSZS-correct-zh** and **CSZS-correct-fr**, which are Mandarin-English and French-English code-switched datasets extracted from a recent benchmark [29] and feature a substantial amount of high-quality intra-sentential code-switched synthesized speech data. The testing splits are adopted, totaling 4.1 and 15.4 hours, respectively.

Additionally, we adopt the well-known Mandarin-English code-switched corpus, **ASCEND** [30]. It comprises conversational speech data with diverse topics: “education”, “technology”, “persona”, “philosophy”, and “sports”. As the contents of the topics do not highly overlap, ASCEND also serves as a multi-domain corpus for investigating Whisper’s textual prompt understanding. Thus, we adopt the testing split, totaling 0.92 hours, for code-switched ASR and the training split for experiments involving textual prompts. We choose the training split since only that split contains all the topics<sup>2</sup>. To avoid potential bias caused by code-switching [22], we only use data entirely

<sup>2</sup>No models trained. Using training split for evaluation is acceptable.

in Mandarin or English in the training split for experiments involving textual prompts, leading to the creation of two subsets, **ASCEND-zh** and **ASCEND-en**, with 3.5 and 1.7 hours of data.

In addition to ASCEND, we incorporate **GigaSpeech** [31], a multi-domain English ASR corpus. We utilize the training split of its S subset, as other splits lack topic labels. Notably, we notice that some topics in GigaSpeech, e.g. “People and Blogs” and “Entertainment,” are quite general, and their data samples may be related to other topics. To prevent potential overlap, we select highly disjoint topics: “Arts,” “Science and Technology,” “Nonprofits and Activism,” and “Sports”, for our experiments. The duration of the subset of these selected topics is 34.4 hours.

## 5. Results and discussion

We discuss our results. The 95% confidence intervals obtained from bootstrapping [32], with 1k bootstrap sets, are indicated in brackets in the tables. The confidence intervals of TFRs are not indicated because of the limited number of templates. On average, an experiment takes about 10 hours on a V100.

### 5.1. Information in textual prompts

We examine Whisper’s textual prompt understanding by comparing the performances when prompted by the correct and mismatched topics. Our results are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Average TFR(%), PERF(%), BPERF(%) of Whisper. “Relative improvement” is the relative improvement of BPERF to PERF, representing the highest relative gain of using mismatched topics over matched ones for the employed templates.

Dataset	Avg TFR (↑)	Avg PERF (↓)	Avg BPERF (↓)	Relative improvement
ASCEND-zh	38.0%	13.24 [13.24, 13.27]	12.99 [12.98, 13.01]	2%
ASCEND-en	30.0%	23.55 [23.54, 23.60]	22.69 [22.69, 22.70]	4%
GigaSpeech	17.5%	5.50 [5.48, 5.52]	4.90 [4.89, 4.90]	11%

From Table 1, Whisper’s average TFRs are quite unsatisfactory, and the mismatched topic information can induce a relative improvement of up to 11%, showcasing that Whisper got significantly enhanced by irrelevant information. This phenomenon is exemplified in Fig. 1, where the relative improvement caused by mismatched information can be up to 10% for some topics.

As Whisper does not perform better when prompted with correct topics and demonstrates low TFRs, it suggests that **Whisper may not understand the topic information in the textual prompts as expected.**

### 5.2. Relationship of TFR and PERF/BPERF

High TFR and good PERF/BPERF of a template signify the model’s effective focus on topic information and transcription accuracy when prompted via the template. Intuitively, templates with higher TFRs should correspond to better PERFs/BPERFs, and vice versa, as they prompt the model to consider topic information more accurately. We examine this intuition.

The linear regression analysis is illustrated in Fig.2. Interestingly, the results contradict the intuition. We discover that in general, templates guiding Whisper to understand topic information better do not enhance transcribing accuracy simultaneously, indicating that **high TFR and good PERF/BPERF of a prompt template are typically not positively related.**




Figure 2: Linear regression of PERF/BPERF of templates on the corresponding TFR. Points in the figure represent the PERF/BPERF and TFR prompted with specific templates.

As high TFR and good PERF/BPERF are both desired, our findings underscore the need to explore ways to align these properties, such as new learning paradigms for the model or improved strategies for optimal template selection or generation.

### 5.3. Language of the textual prompts

Here, we discuss the effect of the language of the textual prompts. The results of providing English prompts and the translated Mandarin counterparts are in Table 2.

Table 2: Average TFR(%), PERF(%), and BPERF(%) of Whisper on ASCEND-zh, ASCEND-en, and GigaSpeech when prompted by prompts in Mandarin (zh) and English (en).

Prompt language	Avg TFR (↑)		Avg PERF (↓)		Avg BPERF (↓)	
	zh	en	zh	en	zh	en
ASCEND-zh	22.0%	<b>38.0%</b>	15.63 [15.61, 15.68]	<b>13.24</b> [13.24, 13.27]	14.92 [14.90, 14.97]	<b>12.99</b> [12.98, 13.01]
ASCEND-en	14.0%	<b>30.0%</b>	27.93 [27.81, 28.16]	<b>23.55</b> [23.54, 23.60]	26.09 [25.98, 26.24]	<b>22.69</b> [22.69, 22.71]
GigaSpeech	<b>22.5%</b>	17.5%	7.79 [7.74, 7.84]	<b>5.50</b> [5.48, 5.52]	6.23 [6.19, 6.27]	<b>4.90</b> [4.89, 4.90]

Surprisingly, it is observed that, in most cases, **Whisper performs better when prompted in English compared to Mandarin**, despite the prompts having identical meanings. This contradicts the intuition that the model would excel when prompted in the same language as the testing data, as textual prompts might implicitly convey language information.

This can be attributed to the substantial disparity in the amount of training data for English and Mandarin [14]. Whisper was primarily trained on English data and was predominantly prompted by English prompts, i.e., the previous context, during pre-training. Thus, English prompts tend to elicit better performance than their Mandarin counterparts.

### 5.4. Information in language tokens

We investigate the effect of misleading language tokens to understand how Whisper captures language information. Our results are listed in Tables 3 and 4, where  $\langle |zh| \rangle$ ,  $\langle |en| \rangle$ ,  $\langle |es| \rangle$ ,  $\langle |fr| \rangle$ , and  $\langle |it| \rangle$  represents Mandarin, English, Spanish, French, and Italian, respectively. The Mandarin and French words in the predictions are counted using the off-the-shelf language identification package [33].

On average, the model achieves the best performance with entirely correct language tokens. The relative performance degradation when prompted by wrong language tokens is extremely significant, up to 120% for CSZS-correct-zh, 40% for ASCEND, and 19% for CSZS-correct-fr.

From Yang et al. [22], Whisper tends to generate predictions exclusively in or to translate parts of speech into the dominant language of the utterances in code-switched ASR. This is

Table 3: MER (%) of Whisper on CSZS-correct-zh and ASCEND with different combinations of language tokens. The "zh word count" is the number of generated Chinese words on CSZS-correct/ASCEND, respectively. The ground truth of the example is "Let's 趁机 take some pictures".

Language tokens	CSZS-correct-zh	ASCEND	zh word count	Prediction examples
$\langle  zh  \rangle \langle  en  \rangle$	<b>26.76</b> [22.35, 31.72]	<b>21.93</b> [17.21, 29.92]	29491 / 9353	Let's Genji take some pictures
$\langle  zh  \rangle \langle  es  \rangle$	54.24 [48.75, 60.23]	26.51 [24.39, 28.68]	44334 / 10253	让我们来拍一些照片
$\langle  zh  \rangle \langle  fr  \rangle$	58.85 [52.69, 65.78]	26.59 [24.46, 28.72]	46729 / 10242	让我们来拍一些照片
$\langle  zh  \rangle \langle  it  \rangle$	50.05 [44.39, 55.50]	30.73 [25.22, 39.81]	42040 / 10491	让我们来拍一些照片

Table 4: MER (%) of Whisper on CSZS-correct-fr with different combinations of language tokens. The "fr word counts" is the number of French words generated by Whisper. The ground truth of the example is "He is a member of the Discovery Institute un de la droite religieuse of the American right".

Language tokens	CSZS-correct-fr	fr word counts	Prediction examples
$\langle  fr  \rangle \langle  en  \rangle$	<b>30.55</b> [29.74, 31.67]	98467	He is a member of the Discovery Institute, and a member of the American Right.
$\langle  fr  \rangle \langle  es  \rangle$	36.31 [35.46, 37.36]	107071	Il est le même membre de l'Institut de la Découverte, un de la droite religieuse de l'Amérique.
$\langle  fr  \rangle \langle  it  \rangle$	34.07 [33.31, 34.99]	102229	Il même membre de l'Institut Discovery, un des droits religieux de l'Amérique des Nations Unies.
$\langle  fr  \rangle \langle  zh  \rangle$	32.71 [31.86, 33.93]	100840	Il est le même membre de l'Institut de la Découverte, un de la droite religieuse de l'Amérique.

exemplified in the initial rows of Table 3 and 4. Notably, when provided with partially correct language tokens, it predominantly focuses on the correctly provided ones, e.g.,  $\langle |zh| \rangle$  in Table 3 and  $\langle |fr| \rangle$  in Table 4. It generates predictions in these languages rather than English or the wrongly provided languages, despite the dominant language of the utterances being English. This observation is supported by the word counts in Table 3 and 4, where more Mandarin or French words are generated when partially correct language tokens are provided.

This suggests that Whisper can discern and prioritize the relevant language information, resulting in predictions entirely in the correctly provided languages. This ability is likely a result of multi-task pre-training encompassing language identification and ASR. Therefore, we conclude that **Whisper effectively filters out wrong information in the language tokens**.

## 6. Conclusion

We study Whisper's prompt understanding. Notwithstanding the widespread use of prompting Whisper, we discovered that Whisper may not fully grasp textual prompts, and better performance is not guaranteed even when demonstrating better comprehension given a prompt template. We found that English prompts yield superior performance compared to translated Mandarin ones on both English and Mandarin data, possibly due to differences in the training data volume for these languages. It was also noted that Whisper can filter out misleading information in language tokens, likely due to extensive pre-training on language identification and ASR. We encourage the community to carefully revisit Whisper's prompting methods and provide more investigations and valuable insights.

## 7. References

- [1] J. Wei, M. Bosma, V. Zhao, K. Guu, A. W. Yu, B. Lester, N. Du, A. M. Dai, and Q. V. Le, “Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [2] V. Sanh *et al.*, “Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [3] H. Touvron *et al.*, “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” 2023.
- [4] W. Wang, J. Dai, Z. Chen, Z. Huang, Z. Li, X. Zhu, X. Hu, T. Lu, L. Lu, H. Li, X. Wang, and Y. Qiao, “Internimage: Exploring large-scale vision foundation models with deformable convolutions,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2023, pp. 14 408–14 419.
- [5] J. Zhang, J. Huang, S. Jin, and S. Lu, “Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pp. 1–20, 2024.
- [6] W. Wang, Q. Lv, W. Yu, W. Hong, J. Qi, Y. Wang, J. Ji, Z. Yang, L. Zhao, X. Song *et al.*, “Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03079*, 2023.
- [7] J. Wei *et al.*, “Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, Eds., vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022, pp. 24 824–24 837.
- [8] B. Chen, Z. Zhang, N. Langrené, and S. Zhu, “Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in large language models: a comprehensive review,” 2023.
- [9] C. Li, J. Wang, Y. Zhang, K. Zhu, W. Hou, J. Lian, F. Luo, Q. Yang, and X. Xie, “Large language models understand and can be enhanced by emotional stimuli,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11760*, 2023.
- [10] J. Gu, Z. Han, S. Chen, A. Beirami, B. He, G. Zhang, R. Liao, Y. Qin, V. Tresp, and P. Torr, “A systematic survey of prompt engineering on vision-language foundation models,” 2023.
- [11] Z. Guo, Y. Leng, Y. Wu, S. Zhao, and X. Tan, “Prompttts: Controllable text-to-speech with text descriptions,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [12] E. Kharitonov, D. Vincent, Z. Borsos, R. Marinier, S. Girgin, O. Pietquin, M. Sharifi, M. Tagliasacchi, and N. Zeghidour, “Speak, read and prompt: High-fidelity text-to-speech with minimal supervision,” *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 11, pp. 1703–1718, 2023.
- [13] H. Gao, J. Ni, K. Qian, Y. Zhang, S. Chang, and M. Hasegawa-Johnson, “WavPrompt: Towards Few-Shot Spoken Language Understanding with Frozen Language Models,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, 2022, pp. 2738–2742.
- [14] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, T. Xu, G. Brockman, C. Mcleavey, and I. Sutskever, “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett, Eds., vol. 202. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023, pp. 28 492–28 518.
- [15] M. Wang, Y. Li, J. Guo, X. Qiao, Z. Li, H. Shang, D. Wei, S. Tao, M. Zhang, and H. Yang, “WhiSLU: End-to-End Spoken Language Understanding with Whisper,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 770–774.
- [16] S. Rathod, M. Charola, A. Vora, Y. Jogi, and H. A. Patil, “Whisper Features for Dysarthric Severity-Level Classification,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 1523–1527.
- [17] Y. Gong, S. Khurana, L. Karlinsky, and J. Glass, “Whisper-AT: Noise-Robust Automatic Speech Recognizers are Also Strong General Audio Event Taggers,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 2798–2802.
- [18] X. Chen, K. Luo, T. Gee, and M. Nejadi, “Does chatgpt and whisper make humanoid robots more relatable?” 2024.
- [19] H. Ameer, S. Latif, R. Latif, and S. Mukhtar, “Whisper in focus: Enhancing stuttered speech classification with encoder layer optimization,” 2023.
- [20] Z. Ning, Y. Jiang, Z. Wang, B. Zhang, and L. Xie, “Vits-based singing voice conversion leveraging whisper and multi-scale f0 modeling,” 2023.
- [21] P. Peng, B. Yan, S. Watanabe, and D. Harwath, “Prompting the Hidden Talent of Web-Scale Speech Models for Zero-Shot Task Generalization,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 396–400.
- [22] C.-K. Yang, K.-P. Huang, K.-H. Lu, C.-Y. Kuan, C.-Y. Hsiao, and H. yi Lee, “Investigating zero-shot generalizability on mandarin-english code-switched asr and speech-to-text translation of recent foundation models with self-supervision and weak supervision,” 2023.
- [23] A. Webson and E. Pavlick, “Do prompt-based models really understand the meaning of their prompts?” in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, M. Carpuat, M.-C. de Marneffe, and I. V. Meza Ruiz, Eds. Seattle, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2022, pp. 2300–2344.
- [24] S. Min, X. Lyu, A. Holtzman, M. Artetxe, M. Lewis, H. Hajishirzi, and L. Zettlemoyer, “Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work?” in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Y. Goldberg, Z. Kozareva, and Y. Zhang, Eds. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2022, pp. 11 048–11 064.
- [25] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, M. Meila and T. Zhang, Eds., vol. 139. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [26] S. Wang, C.-H. H. Yang, J. Wu, and C. Zhang, “Can whisper perform speech-based in-context learning,” 2023.
- [27] L. Zhuo, R. Yuan, J. Pan, Y. Ma, Y. Li, G. Zhang, S. Liu, R. B. Dannenberg, J. Fu, C. Lin, E. Benetos, W. Chen, W. Xue, and Y. Guo, “Lyricwhiz: Robust multilingual zero-shot lyrics transcription by whispering to chatgpt,” in *Proceedings of the 24th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2023, Milan, Italy, November 5-9, 2023*, A. Sarti, F. Antonacci, M. Sandler, P. Bestagini, S. Dixon, B. Liang, G. Richard, and J. Pauwels, Eds., 2023, pp. 343–351.
- [28] “Openai. (2024). chatgpt (mar 12 version),” <https://openai.com/chatgpt>.
- [29] K.-P. Huang, C.-K. Yang, Y.-K. Fu, E. Dunbar, and H.-y. Lee, “Zero resource code-switched speech benchmark using speech utterance pairs for multiple spoken languages,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03018*, 2023.
- [30] H. Lovenia, S. Cahyawijaya, G. I. Winata, P. Xu, X. Yan, Z. Liu, R. Frieske, T. Yu, W. Dai, E. J. Barezi *et al.*, “Ascend: A spontaneous chinese-english dataset for code-switching in multi-turn conversation,” in *Proceedings of the 13th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)*, 2022.
- [31] G. Chen, S. Chai, G.-B. Wang, J. Du, W.-Q. Zhang, C. Weng, D. Su, D. Povey, J. Trmal, J. Zhang, M. Jin, S. Khudanpur, S. Watanabe, S. Zhao, W. Zou, X. Li, X. Yao, Y. Wang, Z. You, and Z. Yan, “GigaSpeech: An Evolving, Multi-Domain ASR Corpus with 10,000 Hours of Transcribed Audio,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, 2021, pp. 3670–3674.
- [32] “Confidence intervals for evaluation in machine learning (version 0.0.3),” <https://github.com/luferrer/ConfidenceIntervals>.
- [33] “lingua-language-detector (version 2.0.2),” <https://github.com/pemistahl/lingua-py>.