

Graphical Abstract

**Causal Analysis of ASR Errors for Children:
Quantifying the Impact of Physiological, Cognitive, and Extrinsic Factors**

Vishwanath Pratap Singh, Md. Sahidullah, Tomi H. Kinnunen

Highlights

Causal Analysis of ASR Errors for Children: Quantifying the Impact of Physiological, Cognitive, and Extrinsic Factors

Vishwanath Pratap Singh, Md. Sahidullah, Tomi H. Kinnunen

- A causal framework to analyze factors contributing to ASR errors for children.
- We include physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors in our analysis.
- Two self-supervised (Wav2Vec2.0 and Hubert) and two weakly supervised (Whisper and MMS) SFMs in analysis.
- Insights into fine-tuning of speech foundation models.

Causal Analysis of ASR Errors for Children: Quantifying the Impact of Physiological, Cognitive, and Extrinsic Factors

Vishwanath Pratap Singh^a, Md. Sahidullah^{b,c}, Tomi H. Kinnunen^a

^aUniversity of Eastern Finland, Tulliportinkatu 1, Joensuu, 80130, Finland

^bInstitute for Advancing Intelligence, TCG CREST, Kolkata, 700091, India

^cAcademy of Scientific and Innovative Research (AcSIR), Ghaziabad, 201002, India

Abstract

The increasing use of children’s automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems has spurred research efforts to improve the accuracy of models designed for children’s speech in recent years. The current approach utilizes either open-source speech foundation models (SFMs) directly or fine-tuning them with children’s speech data. These SFMs, whether open-source or fine-tuned for children, often exhibit higher word error rates (WERs) compared to adult speech. However, there is a lack of systemic analysis of the cause of this degraded performance of SFMs. Understanding and addressing the reasons behind this performance disparity is crucial for improving the accuracy of SFMs for children’s speech. Our study addresses this gap by investigating the causes of accuracy degradation and the primary contributors to WER in children’s speech. In the first part of the study, we conduct a comprehensive benchmarking study on two self-supervised SFMs (wav2vec 2.0 and Hubert) and two weakly supervised SFMs (Whisper and MMS) across various age groups on two children speech corpora, establishing the raw data for the causal inference analysis in the second part. In the second part of the study, we analyze the impact of physiological factors (age, gender), cognitive factors (pronunciation ability), and external factors (vocabulary difficulty, background noise, and word count) on SFM accuracy in children’s speech using causal inference. The results indicate that physiology (age) and particular external factor (number of words in audio) have the highest impact on accuracy, followed by background noise and pronunciation ability. Fine-tuning SFMs on children’s speech reduces sensitivity to physiological and cognitive factors, while sensitivity to the number of words in audio persists.

Keywords: Children’s ASR, Speech Foundational Models, Causal Inference, Physiology, Cognition, Pronunciation

1. Introduction

Children of the twenty-first century are frequently referred to as *digi-natives* due to their upbringing in an era where digital technology is ubiquitous and readily accessible [2]. Consequently, they constitute one of the primary demographics for daily usage of smartphones, tablets, and other digital devices [1]. This increased digital proficiency has catalyzed a surge in research on speech technology for children, including the task of transcribing speech into text, i.e. *automatic speech recognition* (ASR) [11, 5]. However, ASR models’ efficacy for children remains (by a large margin) below those designed for adults [7, 6]. Addressing this shortcoming necessitates a deeper understanding of the factors contributing to the accuracy gap and the formulation of strategies to mitigate the identified challenges.

Similar to other speech tasks, modern children’s ASR leverages from *speech foundation models* (SFMs) [12, 13] pre-trained on diverse and large quantities of speech data to learn generalizable representation space usable in various speech tasks. SFMs can be utilized directly as pre-trained open-source models [7, 10] or be further fine-tuned to children’s speech data [20, 21, 26]. Nonetheless, despite fine-tuning, SFMs designed for children consistently exhibit higher *word error rates* (WER)—the proportion of words incorrectly transcribed by the ASR system—compared to those optimized for adults [10, 21]. For instance, the current state-of-the-art WERs reported on the Librispeech corpus [73] (adult’s read speech) are under 2% [24], whereas WERs on the CSLU Kids corpus [3] (children’s read speech) is approximately 40% [20]. This order-of-magnitude performance gap underscores the need for a **systematic analysis** to explain the root causes of accuracy degradation in children’s ASR, including a detailed analysis of different

components of WER (i.e. substitution, deletion, and insertion errors). We put this methodologically forward through a causal analysis framework, detailed below.

While our present study is not the first one to quantify the impact of factors responsible for ASR performance degradation for children, we address several methodological shortcomings of prior research. Previous studies, such as [17], have investigated the impact of children’s pronunciation abilities on classic statistical (pre deep learning era) ASR systems within a small classroom setup and a fixed age group. Even if more recent work [11, 14] has addressed the impact of age and the number of words in context on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors on modern deep learning era ASR, the studies typically analyze explaining factors in isolation, i.e. overlooking their interdependent effects. To see why this can be problematic, consider the joint development of physiological characteristics and cognitive skills in children. Both of them depend on *age*—the possibly most studied performance variable in children ASR. Nonetheless, age is a potential *confounder* which can mask the more subtle, actual cause of ASR errors.

In general, when commonplace correlational methods are used to analyze data that includes confounders, there is a risk to draw erroneous conclusions. A known shortcoming of traditional correlational (aka, *associative* or *statistical*) approaches is that they analyze co-variation between the variables included (e.g. age vs. WER)—but do not explicitly differentiate between causes and effects. Causality, however, is arguably among the fundamental building blocks for refining any scientific theory or model. By incorporating relevant background knowledge to random variables and their assumed causal relations, causal methodologies aim at findings with stronger generalization potential, compared to (purely) correlational findings. Compare this, for instance, to well-established equations in physics (like Newton’s second law) that are arguably more universal compared to a linear regressor fitted to a random data sample but without explicit understanding of the mechanisms that give rise to the observations. Even if causal methodologies are rarely used in the speech field, causality itself is well-matured [48]. We hope the present study, in the context of children speech processing, to serve as possible inspiration for further research in the field.

Besides the complex relation of physiological and cognitive factors that underlie speech production, *extrinsic* factors (ranging from the characteristics of the acoustic environment to the complexity of the text material) are expected to influence ASR errors—again, however, these factors are rarely included in the error analysis. Finally, the selected SFM model (a “machine listener”) itself influences the ASR error patterns. In fact, any model contains built-in *inductive bias* which is impacted by the properties of the training data, the model architecture, and the training loss [11] to name a few. To account for the risks related to selections of specific ASR models and datasets, we conduct experiments using four modern ASR models that are representative of both self- and weakly-supervised models. To account for the risks related to choice of datasets, we include two different datasets—CSLU Kids [3] and MyST [4]—in our experiments. To go beyond the default metric of ASR, WER, we also analyze the substitution, deletion, and insertion errors.

To sum up, there is a clear need for a generalizable causal analysis framework that takes these various considerations into account holistically and help to pave way towards addressing challenges that underlay children ASR. Understanding the delicate interdependencies of the various potential contributing factors is essential for accurately characterizing the underlying causes of ASR degradation. This understanding may help to guide the design of novel features, model architectures, and datasets. To the best of our knowledge, our study marks the first known effort of its kind. With the help of the proposed framework, we seek to answer the following, more specific research questions:

1. **What is the relative impact of physiological, cognitive, and external factors on the performance of open-source SFMs for children’s speech?**
2. **Pronunciation of children’s impacts the WER [17]. But, what influences children’s pronunciation ability more: their age or the complexity of the vocabulary they use?**
3. **How does fine-tuning speech foundation models on child-specific speech datasets reduce the model’s sensitivity to children’s age, pronunciation ability, and extrinsic factors? Which aspect benefits the most from fine-tuning, and which remains largely unaffected?**

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. After situating our study to the broader landscape of explainability and causality (Section 2), the main experimental part follows in the next two Sections. Section 3 establishes the necessary, more traditional analysis of ASR errors. This section provides insights beyond WER, a detailed analysis of SFM model complementarities, including both their off-the-shelf and fine-tuned use cases). The causal modeling approach, detailed Section 4, details the variables (not used in prior studies) and their specific causal structure, in addition to reporting the inference of causal strength between the variables through both linear and nonlinear approach,

detailed below. The big-picture take-home messages and provided through the two last sections of Discussion and Conclusion.

2. Related Work

Methodologically, our study is situated within the broader field of *explainability*. As such, explainability is central to scientific knowledge discovery aimed at improving one’s understanding of a given phenomenon. In the scope of artificial intelligence and machine learning, explainability is described as the degree to which a human can understand the cause of a decision [?], or the ability to explain in ways that are intelligible to a human [28]. Explainability approaches are generally categorized into two main groups. (1) The first one, *inherently explainable* models, generates explanations during training [37]. These models generate explanations directly through their structure, enabling straightforward understanding. Canonical examples include *decision trees* that represent their decisions through hierarchical “if-then” rules; *linear regression* that can be used for quantifying feature importance through analysis of the learned weights; and *attention networks* that highlight important input features [29, 71, 37]. (2) The second, *post-hoc* category of explainability approaches, provides explanations for decisions *after* they have been made [30, 31]. Examples for post-hoc explanations include *local interpretable model-agnostic explanations* (LIME), which approximates complex black-box models locally [34] (applied for ASR analysis in [35]), *saliency maps* that identify influential pixels in machine vision tasks [33], and *feature visualization* that shows what neural networks learn via activation maximization [32].

A unifying methodology framework that covers both inherent and post-hoc explainable models is **causal inference** (CI) [39]. CI considers hidden or unobserved factors influencing decision-making and enabling counterfactual explanations [39]. Historically, CI methods have been used more in the clinical domain, where understanding the underlying mechanisms of disease progression and determining the impacts of treatment effects are clearly of paramount importance. This includes explainable decision-making processes in data collection, annotation, and pre-processing [66]. More recently, causality-aided machine learning has also been addressed through *causal representation learning* [65]. Overall, the CI mindset, targeted at understanding the underlying cause-effect mechanisms, has been less common in machine learning, including research in speech technology. Although machine learning and CI share common *tools* (e.g., graphical models and latent variables), the sentiment in the former is to optimize predictive performance, as opposed to interpreting the parameters to learn about causal relations, as in the latter. In a sense, predictive performance and explainability can be conflicting goals: heavily over-parameterized deep neural network models (including ASR) apparently generalize well, whereas the individual parameters (nowadays billions of network weights) are hardly meaningful to us, as humans.

Our aim in the present study is to provide a post-hoc explainable analysis of the general error mechanisms underlying children’s ASR, addressed through the current state-of-the-art SFMs. While ASR technology has always been a fast-moving target (and dependent on the availability of data, compute, interests of researchers among other factors), arguably the physiological and cognitive factors that underlie children language learning, including their speech production development, are more fundamental. In order to understand better the current challenges, as well as pave way for future ASR development for children, it is important to be able to quantify how the physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors interact and jointly contribute to ASR performance. Here, CI provides a natural analysis framework. Accordingly, we employ CI to generate post-hoc explanations for SFMs tailored to children’s speech, enabling a deeper understanding of the factors contributing to the degraded word error rate (WER).

Causality provides a principled framework for recovering and estimating cause and effect variables from data observations. Any causality problem can be divided into two consecutive sub-problems of *causal structure discovery* and *causal inference* [40]. Whereas the former aims at recovering the structure of causal relations, in the form of a *directed acyclic graph* (DAG), the latter estimates the functions that link the nodes in a given DAG. The causal structure can either be learned automatically [44, 50, 51], or be constructed from prior human knowledge [45]. Once the causal structure has been established, CI can be used to estimate the links between variables. While the classic CI approaches include *do-calculus* [48], Bayesian inference frameworks, and regression methods [46], recent approaches (e.g. [49]) also leverage from deep neural networks—particularly, the graph neural network [47]—to estimate causal dependency functions. We provide a summary of the causal structure discovery and quantification methods being used for post-hoc explanation of machine learning models in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Causal methods being used in post-hoc explainability in machine learning.

Publication	Task	Causal Structure Discovery Method	Causal Quantification Method
[41]	Animal Behavioral Modeling	PCMI [42]	Graph Neural Network
[43]	Explainability in Recommendation System	Domain Knowledge	Logistic Regression
[45]	Sentiment Classification in NLP	Domain Knowledge	Bayesian Network
Our	Causes of degradation in children’s ASR	Domain Knowledge	Bayesian Network

Table 2: CSLU kids Corpus (scripted): # speakers and # of utterances from different genders in the scripted set of the CSLU kids corpus. This protocol was developed in our previous study [9].

Split	Boys			Girls		
	# Spk	# Utt	# Hours	# Spk	# Utt	# Hours
Original Dataset	605	39184	38.0	513	32815	31.8
Cleaned	602	39167	37.9	511	32811	31.8
With good tag	602	25454	22.6	511	22071	19.7
Test-good	542	22960	20.4	451	19561	17.6
Dev-good	30	1290	1.1	30	1260	1.1
Train-good	30	1204	1.1	30	1250	1.1




Figure 1: Gender-wise speaker distribution per grade (age in years) group in the CSLU Kids corpus.

Table 3: Comparison of speech foundation models (SFMs) in terms of architecture, loss, training data, and the number of parameters.

Model	Architecture	Training Strategy	Pretraining Data	Training Data	# Params
Wav2Vec2.0-large	Encoder only	Self-supervised	Libri-light	Libri-960	317M (large)
HuBERT-large	Encoder only	Self-supervised loss	Libri-light	Libri-960	317M million (base)
Whisper-base	Encoder-Decoder	Weakly-supervised	-	Unknown 680K Hours	244M (small)
MMS-1.1B	Encoder only	Weakly-supervised	-	Unknown	300M

For simplicity and to leverage existing domain knowledge, we construct our DAG based on domain knowledge presented in [19]. Then, we use the Bayesian inference framework [48] to estimate the link between nodes in the causal graph. The strength of the causal relationship between the cause and the effect nodes in DAG can then be quantified using either the *average causal effect* (ACE) or *conditional mutual information* (CMI) [63, 62]. While ACE captures linear cause-effect relationships, CMI accounts for non-linear dependencies between cause and effect. We point the interested reader to Appendix [Appendix A](#) for a more detailed explanation of causal inference, and to [64] for further details.

Table 4: Comparison of overall ASR errors on MyST and CSLU Kids with open-source SFMs and fine-tuned SFMs. Subs, Del, and Ins indicate substitution, deletion, and insertion errors (in %). We only fine-tune the best open-source self-supervised, and best open-source weakly supervised SFMS. Hence, the result corresponding to fine-tuned HuBERT and MMS models remains empty.

Model	Error	Open Source			Fine-Tuned		
		MyST Dev	MyST Test	CSLU Read	MyST Dev	MyST Test	CSLU Read
Wav2Vec	WER	21.6	25.2	54.0	13.2	15.6	32.4
	Subs	9.0	10.8	21.6	6.0	7.2	14.4
	Del	5.4	5.4	10.8	3.6	3.6	7.2
	Ins	7.2	9.0	21.6	4.8	6.0	14.4
HuBERT	WER	19.8	23.4	48.6	-	-	-
	Subs	7.2	9.0	16.2	-	-	-
	Del	3.6	5.4	10.8	-	-	-
	Ins	9.0	10.8	27.0	-	-	-
Whisper	WER	18.0	21.6	26.28	18.23	19.71	25.2
	Subs	5.4	7.2	16.95	3.6	4.8	10.8
	Del	3.6	3.6	3.64	2.4	2.4	3.6
	Ins	7.2	9.0	6.39	4.8	6.0	14.4
MMS	WER	23.4	27.0	59.4	-	-	-
	Subs	10.8	12.6	27.0	-	-	-
	Del	7.2	7.2	16.2	-	-	-
	Ins	9.0	10.8	27.0	-	-	-

Table 5: Detailed WER analysis across gender and age groups on CSLU Test set using open-source and fine-tuned speech foundation models. OS indicates the open source models, while FT indicates the models fine-tuned on MyST train split. Subs, Del, and Ins indicate substitution, deletion, and insertion errors (in %). Oracle Hypo. Selection results are after selecting the best hypothesis (best on WER) of an utterance from four models.

Model	Error	Grades	Grades										
			(%)	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
OS	wav2vec	WER	66.8	42.4	36.1	30.4	23.8	22.3	64.6	56.8	55.0	56.9	55.6
		Subs	46.8	30.3	26.4	21.3	17.2	15.8	46.2	40.3	39.1	39.9	38.1
		Del	7.6	3.3	2.5	1.3	0.9	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HuBert	WER	71.6	42.5	34.6	29.5	21.0	20.8	53.3	45.8	44.1	49.2	45.5
		Subs	46.9	28.9	23.6	19.0	14.8	14.5	37.9	33.6	32.0	34.6	31.1
		Del	4.9	2.6	1.8	1.0	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	whisper	WER	84.6	37.5	28.0	23.1	17.5	18.7	30.3	26.3	22.0	23.1	22.4
		Subs	34.8	22.4	18.0	14.1	10.4	11.3	21.3	18.5	16.9	16.5	16.1
		Del	2.4	4.9	4.0	4.2	4.7	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MMS	WER	122.4	85.8	87.6	68.4	60.0	57.3	193.3	168.3	131.5	166.6	150.9
		Subs	62.0	46.2	43.5	36.7	32.5	31.4	78.3	73.2	70.5	76.4	71.1
		Del	7.6	4.4	4.0	2.1	1.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oracle Hypo. Selection	WER	42.47	27.34	21.33	18.26	14.18	15.47	23.63	20.13	17.83	17.62	17.60	
	Subs	30.18	18.47	14.41	11.59	8.57	9.62	17.46	15.28	13.81	13.19	13.09	
	Del	2.19	4.00	2.90	3.23	4.16	3.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
FT	wav2vec	WER	88.1	62.2	58.3	52.0	45.7	50.5	107.9	109.6	112.0	106.6	92.8
		Subs	54.3	41.3	39.0	35.2	31.3	33.8	64.2	65.5	67.4	63.9	59.8
		Del	6.9	2.4	2.1	1.5	1.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	whisper	WER	62.8	45.9	40.7	43.6	31.7	33.4	57.2	51.5	54.2	53.4	47.2
		Subs	38.9	26.3	23.7	20.9	17.7	18.3	37.6	34.9	36.1	33.7	32.2
		Del	3.3	7.1	6.5	6.7	6.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Oracle Hypo. Selection	WER	36.52	23.51	18.35	15.70	12.20	13.31	20.32	17.31	15.32	15.15	15.14
		Subs	25.34	15.89	12.39	9.96	7.37	8.28	15.21	13.14	11.88	11.30	11.22
		Del	1.89	3.44	2.49	2.78	3.58	3.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Oracle Hypo. Selection	WER	9.29	4.18	3.47	3.08	1.25	1.61	5.11	4.17	3.44	3.85	3.92
		Subs	1.89	3.44	2.49	2.78	3.58	3.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Del	9.29	4.18	3.47	3.08	1.25	1.61	5.11	4.17	3.44	3.85	3.92




Figure 2: Correlation heat maps between different open-source speech foundation models across various age groups of children in the CSLU Test corpus.

3. Analysis of ASR Errors

The causal post-hoc modeling experiments presented in Section 4 requires ASR models to be constructed. This section serves for this purpose, producing the raw data needed for causal modeling.

3.1. Experimental Setup

3.1.1. Dataset

We consider two standard children speech corpora in our experiments: CSLU Kids [3] and My Science Tutor (MyST) [4]. The former comprises both spontaneous and scripted recordings from approximately 1100 children. It includes approximately a gender-balanced group of roughly 100 children per grade, spanning from kindergarten (age 5-6 years old) to grade 10 (age 15-16 years old). Gender-wise speaker distribution per age group is shown in Figure 1. Following [8], we focus exclusively on the scripted subset in the CSLU kids corpus. It includes isolated words and sentences from 605 boys and 513 girls, categorized as “Good” (only target word), “Maybe” (target word with extra content), “Bad” (no target word), and “Puff” (target word with inhaling noise). For our experiments, we include only the “Good” recordings. This gives a customized, speaker-disjoint train, development, and test sets for summarized in Table 2. The age and gender metadata enables SFM performance evaluation across age and gender groups.

The second and more recent corpus, MyST, consists of 470 hours of English speech from 1371 students in grades 3 to 5 engaged in conversations with a tutor. The corpus includes speaker-disjoint subsets for training (1052 speakers), development (153 speakers), and testing (156 speakers). Some of the MyST recordings are longer than 30 seconds, where self-supervised models such as Hubert and Wav2Vec2.0 may fail as they are trained on audio lengths of 0.5 seconds to 30 seconds. Hence, we removed recordings in excess of 30 seconds. Different from CSLU Kids, the age and gender metadata are not available for the MyST dataset, which restricts us from presenting age- and gender-specific results on MyST.

3.1.2. Automatic Speech Recognition Systems

As summarized in Table 3, we consider four ASR systems in our experiments: Wav2Vec 2.0, HuBERT, Whisper, and MMS. The first one, Wav2Vec2.0 [22], is a self-supervised model, which leverages contrastive [72] training to learn contextually informed speech representations from unlabeled audio data. The model comprises a pre-trained transformer encoder and a quantized feature encoder, enabling efficient and effective representation learning from raw audio. The second model, HuBERT [23], is also self-supervised, based on a similar architecture to Wav2Vec2.0.

Different from Wav2Vec2.0, however, HuBERT applies a classification task, forcing the model to classify hidden sequences into pre-defined categories. Finally, the two last models, Whisper [24] and MMS [25], are *weakly supervised* models that rely on limited labeled data and large amount of unlabeled data for training. While Whisper utilizes a semi-supervised approach to learn from both labeled and unlabeled data, MMS adopts a weakly supervised multi-task learning framework to jointly optimize for various speech processing tasks. In the first part of the analysis, we utilize these open-source SFMs ‘as-is’, while in the second part, we address the impact of fine-tuning on best performing models.

3.2. Results and Discussion

We present the overall WER, substitution, deletion, and insertion errors for the open-source models and their fine-tuned variants in Table 4. Whisper [24] outperforms the other three models, indicating its generalizability, which might be due to a large number of parameters, inclusion of diverse training data, or both. Furthermore, we note that the substitution errors are consistently higher compared to the two other types of errors across the models and test sets. A further breakdown of the results according to age and gender is provided in Table 5. Again, Whisper outperforms the other models, while MMS [25] yields the highest WERs. We observe an overall decreasing trends in all the metrics with increasing grade (a proxy for age), following trends reported in other studies [7, 10, 11, 21]. The apparent ‘jump’ between grades 5 and 6 can be attributed to the use of different sentences in grades K to 5 and 6 to 10. The latter consists primarily of single-word utterances, which results in notably high WERs. A higher WER for the single word utterances can be attributed to the architecture limitation of SFMs: it is known that models trained with attention-based architectures [71] benefit from the larger context size, which is less common in the upper grades, where shorter utterances prevail. Additionally, the two self-supervised models, Wav2Vec2.0 [22] and HuBERT [23], exhibit a relatively larger increase in errors between grades 5 and 6, indicating their increased sensitivity to shorter context. This might be attributed to the use of *contrastive loss* [72], which requires large context to predict the masked input representation. Finally, as for gender, we observe no notable change in WER trends between boys and girls.



Overall, the performance of the four ASR models is far from perfect, with notably high error rates for the younger age groups and the for single-word utterances. It is therefore interesting to consider the combined potential of the four models under an oracle selection strategy. In this “oracle hypothesis selection” strategy, summarized in the last group of results in Table 5, we output the transcript from whichever model yields the lowest WER *on the specific utterance*. This is an oracle experiment aimed at providing insights into the complementarity of the different SFMs at the level of individual utterances. As one may expect, this reduces WERs substantially, suggesting that the four models produce differing transcripts for the same utterance in the CSLU Kids corpus. Since this analysis does not reveal *which* groups of models are more/less complementary to each other, we further report the correlation coefficient between each model pair on the utterance-level WER data. The results, summarized in Fig. 2, indicate that Wav2Vec and HuBERT are most strongly correlated. This might be due to the similarity in the architectures and training datasets of these two models; both are trained in a self-supervised manner on LibriSpeech [73]. Interestingly, Whisper shows the lowest correlation with the remainder of the models, which might be due to its distinct training data and architecture.

Up to this point, we have focused on generic open-source models whose checkpoints (neural network weights) are publicly available. None of the four models are particularly optimized for children ASR. While the above *zero-shot* evaluation of ASR on an unseen target domain (here, childrens’ speech) is justified from a practical deployment point of view, whenever speech data *is* available from the target domain, it is beneficial to employ model fine-tuning [10, 11, 21]. For this experiment, based on the above zero-shot results, we select Wav2Vec2.0 and Whisper to represent self- and weakly-supervised model families, respectively. These two models are fine-tuned on the MyST train split, the MyST dev data being used to select the best checkpoint. We do not use CSLU Train-good (defined in Table 2) as it is too small for training (compared to MyST train split). The overall results are presented in Table 4, with the breakdown by age being presented in Table 5.

While the fine-tuned models show a reduced WER for on both MyST Test and CSLU Test-good, the relative reduction in the former is greater. This might be due to the diverse age groups in the CSLU Kids corpus, whereas the age distribution in the MyST training and test sets is limited to grades 5 to 8. Furthermore, the age-wise results of the fine-tuned models in Table 5 are better than those of the open-source models, but they show a similar trend of WER reduction as the grade level increases. Similar to open source models, we see the ‘jump’ between grades 5 and 6, indicating that fine-tuning did not reduce the sensitivity to shorter contexts.

Type of Response	Modeling Variable	Available in Metadata/Inferred	Node Type in Causal Graph
Physiological	Age	Available	Confounder
	Gender	Available	Fork
Cognitive	GoP	Inferred	Collider
Extrinsic	SNR	Inferred	Fork
	Vocab Difficulty	Inferred	Fork
	#Words in Audio	Available	Fork


(a)



(b)

- Rule 1 : Age → {Subs, Del, Ins Error}
- Rule 2 : Gender → {Subs, Del, Ins Error}
- Rule 3 : Vocab Diff → {Subs, Del, Ins Error}
- Rule 4 : GoP → {Subs, Del, Ins Error}
- Rule 5 : Age → GoP
- Rule 6 : Vocab Diff → GoP
- Rule 7 : SNR → {Subs, Del, Ins Error}
- Rule 8 : No. Words → {Subs, Del, Ins Error}

(c)



(d)

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_{\text{child}} &= p(\text{Age}) \times p(\text{Gender}) \times p(\text{SNR}) \\
 &\quad \times p(\text{GoP} \mid \text{Vocab Difficulty}) \\
 &\times p(\text{Vocab Difficulty}) \times p(\text{No. Words}) \times p(\text{GoP} \mid \text{Age}) \\
 &\quad \times p(\text{Ins Error} \mid \text{Age, Gender, SNR, GoP, No. Words}) \\
 &\quad \times p(\text{Del Error} \mid \text{Age, Gender, SNR, GoP, No. Words}) \\
 &\quad \times p(\text{Subs Error} \mid \text{Age, Gender, SNR, GoP, No. Words})
 \end{aligned}$$

(e)

Figure 3: Proposed causal model for explaining substitution (subs), deletion (del), and insertion (ins) errors in children’s automatic speech recognition. (a.) Categorization of variables used in the causal graph. In node type, the fork indicates nodes with multiple children. A collider is a node influenced by two or more nodes. A confounder is a node that influences both the dependent and independent variables, causing a spurious association. (b.) Factors affecting children’s speech production, reconstructed based on findings in [19]. (c.) Rules for causal graph construction. (d.) Proposed causal graph for explainable children’s ASR based on the rules in subfigure 3c. (e.) Joint probability distribution of physiology, cognitive response, extrinsic factors, and ASR errors for the causal graph in subfigure 3d, which forms the basis for CI [63].

4. Causal Modeling

The results presented thus far indicate substantially high ASR error rates for children, particularly in the younger age groups. While our analysis goes beyond WER and includes two corpora in addition to an extensive set of four modern ASR models, our results primarily confirm (and extend) similar findings reported in prior studies. We now take one further step towards understanding the role of the various factors that contribute to the error rates, through causal post-hoc modeling motivated in Section 2. The rationale for the proposed cause-effect analysis emerges from studies that indicates that speech production by children is impacted by a number of hidden factors including cognitive and physiological factors [19, 18]. Our causal approach provides a principled way to quantify these effects.




Figure 4: (a) The distribution of the Goodness of Pronunciation (GoP) scores in the CSLU Kids corpus, categorized into three levels: High, Average, and Low. The categorization is based on the GoP score’s distance from the mean, where scores within $\pm\sigma$ (standard deviation) are classified as “Average,” while scores beyond this range are labeled as “Low” or “High.”; (b) Distribution of word difficulty scores in the CSLU Kids corpus, categorized as “Low”, “Average”, and “High”. The categorization of vocabulary difficulty scores is based on local minima in the kernel density estimates of the CSLU Kids corpus.

4.1. Causal Structure for Explainable Children’s ASR

The proposed causal model for explaining the causes of degradation in children’s ASR is shown in Figure 3. The high-level, abstract view of the model (see Figure 3b) is inspired from the findings reported in [19]. We assume the observed acoustic realization of speech produced by children to depend on three broad categories of factors—**physiological**, **cognitive**, and **extrinsic** ones. The first relates to the anatomical constraints (the physical speech production system) and the second to the cognitive constraints that influence speech production. Finally, the extrinsic factors relate to the environment and linguistic factors; they do not depend on the particular individual, but are nonetheless expected to influence ASR performance.

Each of the three broad categories of factors are characterized through specific sets of random variables, displayed in Fig. 3a. Some of these variables are available in the corpus metadata (directly observed), whereas others need to be extracted (inferred) from either the audio or text data. The variables listed in Table 3a are assumed to influence the three types of errors (for a given ASR system) either directly or indirectly. The assumed cause-effect relationships between the included variables can be described in a number of alternative, equivalent ways: Fig. 3 shows (c) a list of cause \rightarrow effect rules; (d) a directed acyclic graph (DAG) where the direction of arrows points similarly from cause to effect; and (e) a factorized joint probability distribution.

Following [18, 19], we characterize the physiological response through age and gender, and cognitive response through so-called *goodness of pronunciation* (GoP) score [53], which will be detailed below. The extrinsic factors include background noise, vocabulary difficulty [54], and the number of words in the audio. While age and gender metadata are given, the other variables indicated need to be inferred. Besides age, GoP is assumed to be impacted by the vocabulary difficulty (detailed below). This is based on the premise that children learn the easy and common words first. Additionally, extrinsic factors, including background noise (measured through estimated signal-to-noise ratio or SNR), and the number of words in context, impacts ASR error rates.

4.2. Experimental Setup

In the first part of the analysis, we analyze the sensitivity of the open-source SFMs to children’s physiology (characterized by age and gender [19]), cognition (characterized by pronunciation ability [18]), and extrinsic factors. In the second part, we repeat the analysis with fine-tuned SFMs.

Let us first detail how the variables requiring inference are computed in practice, starting with GoP. Various confidence measures [57] have been proposed for automatic pronunciation quality assessment. This includes likelihood ratio [58] and posterior probability [59] of target phonemes obtained through forced alignment. The GoP score [53] is a variation of posterior probability, which can be used for pronunciation assessment in [60]. It normalizes the posterior

probability of the target phoneme the maximum posterior probability across all possible phonemes, as follows:

$$GOP(p) \approx \log \frac{P(p|o_t; t_s, t_e)}{\max_{q \in Q} P(q|o_t; t_s, t_e)},$$

where p represents the target phone and Q indicates the set of all possible phones in the vocabulary. Here, the log posterior of phone p is computed as,

$$\log P(p|o_t; t_s, t_e) \approx \frac{1}{t_e - t_s} \sum_{t_s}^{t_e} \log \sum_{s \in p} P(s|o_t),$$

where t_s and t_e are the start and end indices of the phone (obtained using forced alignment); $s \in p$ is the set of context-dependent phones; o_t is the input feature at frame t ; and $P(s|o_t)$ is the frame-level posterior score obtained by aligning the utterance with the corresponding target phone sequence; we use the *Montreal forced aligner* (MFA) [61] tool.

The average of per-phoneme GoP scores is used as the utterance level pronunciation quality score. For causal inference, we further discretize the utterance-level score into three ordinal categories, *Low*, *Average*, and *High*. This allows us to stratify the data into meaningful groups, which helps in identifying cause-effect relationships more precisely. By analyzing each category separately, we can understand how different levels of pronunciation quality influence the model’s performance, and identify specific factors that contribute to degraded outcomes. The categorization of the GoP-based pronunciation score in the CSLU Kids corpus is depicted in Fig.4a.

As for the word difficulty, certain words can be considered *a priori* more complex to produce, whether due to simply being rare, or otherwise expected to involve a complex sequence of articulatory gestures. Since *vocabulary difficulty* measures—computed solely from text (prompts)—are dependent neither on the individual, nor the acoustic realization, it is of great interest to consider their role in the analysis of ASR errors. To determine word difficulty, we employ a *rarity* score based approach. Following [54], rarity can be measured by the inverse of the word’s frequency across various text corpora [54]. To this end, we include the following 6 datasets, *movie-reviews* (movie sentiments), *Reuters* (news articles), *brown* (American English texts), *Gutenberg* (classic literature), *webtext* (informal web content), and *nps-chat* (online chat conversations). Words that are less frequent in these corpora possess higher rarity scores and are potentially more difficult to speakers [55]. To obtain a sentence-level difficulty score, we average the difficulty scores of the individual words. Similar to GoP, for causal inference we discretize the score to three difficulty categories: *Low*, *Average*, and *High*. The categorization of vocabulary difficulty scores is based on finding local minima in the kernel density estimates, on the CSLU Kids corpus, as visualized in Fig. 4b.

4.3. Results and Discussion

We first analyze the relative impact of the above causes on open-source speech foundation models through ACE values. The results are presented in Table 6. A higher ACE of a particular cause indicates a higher impact of that cause on a particular error. Clearly, the number of words in audio and the age have the highest impact on all the three types of errors and for all the four ASR models. The negative sign for these two causes indicates that the errors decrease, as the age or the number of words increases. The impact of these two causes is strongest on substitution errors, and lowest on deletion errors. Out of the four models, *Whisper* possesses the lowest ACEs for these two causes, suggesting it to be best suited for children’s ASR. Apart from the number of words and age, GoP and SNR are other major causes that influence the error rates, whereas gender has the lowest effect across the models.

Additionally, we also present the causal DAG for different models in Fig. 5. Unlike ACE, which is limited to assessing *linear* association between the cause and effect, CMI quantifies *non-linear* association between cause and effect [63]. A higher CMI value on the edge of DAG indicates stronger impact of the parent on its child node(s). Confirming to the findings of ACE, CMI also points to highest dependence of the three types of errors on the number of words and age, followed by GoP and SNR. As before, *Whisper* shows the lowest CMI between age/number-of-words and ASR errors. This part of the analysis answers the first question in Section 1.

- **Q-1: What is the relative impact of physiological, cognitive, and external factors on the performance of open-source SFMs for children’s speech?**

Table 6: Average causal effect analysis of different factors on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors on CSLU Test-good dataset.

Model	Cause	Open-source			Finetuned		
		Subs	Del	Ins	Subs	Del	Ins
Wav2Vec	Age	-4.36	-0.10	-1.60	-2.12	-0.04	-2.81
	Gender	0.80	0.17	0.87	0.25	0.06	0.22
	GoP	-1.07	-0.25	-0.88	-0.63	-0.14	-0.54
	SNR	-1.08	0.09	0.28	-0.58	0.11	0.09
	# Words in Audio	-9.20	0.30	-4.23	-7.14	0.36	-3.12
HuBERT	Age	-4.10	-0.06	-2.99	-	-	-
	Gender	0.86	0.02	1.04	-	-	-
	GoP	-1.51	-0.20	-1.45	-	-	-
	SNR	-0.99	0.091	1.42	-	-	-
	# Words in Audio	-7.96	0.27	-5.31	-	-	-
Whisper	Age	-3.25	-0.20	-2.16	-3.0	0.32	-2.22
	Gender	0.62	0.37	1.15	1.90	0.10	1.33
	GoP	-1.25	-0.18	0.35	-1.10	-0.49	-0.05
	SNR	-1.21	0.14	-0.21	-1.02	0.15	-0.36
	# Words in Audio	-5.10	1.02	-3.45	-5.53	1.20	-3.59
MMS	Age	-3.60	-0.06	-5.89	-	-	-
	Gender	0.66	-0.17	1.96	-	-	-
	GoP	-1.51	-0.33	3.78	-	-	-
	SNR	-2.19	0.06	-7.86	-	-	-
	# Words in Audio	-12.54	0.52	-13.22	-	-	-

- *Answer: Our results indicate that the SFMs have the highest sensitivity towards a particular extrinsic factor, the number of words in context. The second highest sensitivity is towards the physiological factor Age, while the other physiological factor Gender has negligible sensitivity. The cognitive factor has the least sensitivity among the physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors.*


Finally, we also present CMI between Age \rightarrow GoP, and VocabDiff \rightarrow GoP Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. These two edges in our Causal DAGs help us to understand the factor affecting the pronunciation ability in children. We observe that the CMI between VocabDiff \rightarrow GoP is higher than that of Age \rightarrow GoP, indicating vocabulary difficulty affects the pronunciation ability more than the Age. This part of the analysis answers the third question in Section 1.

- **Q-2: Pronunciation of children’s impacts the WER [17]. But, what influences children’s pronunciation ability more: their age or the complexity of the vocabulary they use?**
- *Answer: While both age and vocabulary difficulty affect pronunciation ability, vocabulary difficulty has a higher impact than that of age.*


The average causal effect (ACE) of the fine-tuned Wav2Vec2.0 and Whisper models is shown in Table 6, with conditional mutual information (CMI) on the edges of the causal directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) in Fig. 6.

As per the ACE presented in Table 6 and Fig. 6, fine-tuning gives the largest reduction in ACE for the Age, which indicates that fine-tuning reduces the sensitivity of SFM towards children’s physiology. While a moderate reduction in ACE and CMI for cognitive factor GoP is observed. This might be due to the mismatch in vocabulary between MyST train and the CSLU Test corpus, as GoP depends on vocabulary. On the other hand, the sensitivity of fine-tuned Wav2Vec2.0 and Whisper remains high for a particular extrinsic factor, the number of words in context. This indicates the limitation of SFMs towards transcribing shorter contexts. This part of the analysis addresses the third question Section 1.


- **Q-3: How does fine-tuning speech foundation models on child-specific speech datasets reduce the model’s sensitivity to children’s age, pronunciation ability, and extrinsic factors? Which aspect benefits the most from fine-tuning, and which remains largely unaffected?**
- *Answer: Our findings indicate that fine-tuning largely reduces the sensitivity of SFMs towards the physiological factor characterized by age. While the sensitivity towards extrinsic factor, shorter context, remains.*




(a) Wav2Vec2.0.



(b) HuBERT.



(c) Whisper.



(d) MMS.

Figure 5: Conditional Mutual Information based cause and effect analysis for different open-source models.




Figure 6: Conditional Mutual Information based cause and effect analysis for different fine-tuned models.

5. Discussion

The primary contribution of this study is the development of a causal framework for the post-hoc explanation of children’s ASR, marking it the first such effort, to the best of our knowledge. With the help of the proposed framework, the findings obtained from our experiments can be categorized into two main parts: confirmative findings and novel findings. In the **confirmative findings** aspect, we demonstrated through ACE and CMI that WER shows a decreasing trend with respect to the prominent physiological factor—age—confirming that older children tend to have lower WERs. On the other hand, the other physiological factor, gender, was confirmed to have a negligible effect on WER. These findings align with the previous studies [7, 11, 8] conducted on the CSLU Kids Corpus through non-causal approaches. From a methodological perspective, the causal approach provides a principled way to define a model that encodes cause-effect assumptions between the variables included. Hence, even if our results concerning age and gender variables merely confirm the findings reported in prior studies, the approaches used for reaching this conclusion are entirely different—from *statistical* associative approaches (past work) to *causal* analysis (our work). The consistency of our findings with the past research strengthens the reliability of our causal analysis and confirms that physiological factors, particularly age, play a significant role in children’s speech recognition accuracy.

As for the **novel findings** aspect, our proposed causal model provides a quantitative understanding of the cognitive factor, measured through Goodness of Pronunciation (GoP), and its impact on WER in children’s speech. With help of ACE in 6 and CMI in Fig 5, we observe the ACE and CMI values corresponding to GoP are lower than that of physiological factors, however, comparable with other factors such as signal-to-noise ratio, indicating the importance of pronunciation on children’s ASR. Further, the CMI in 5 indicates that pronunciation is more impacted by difficulty of target vocabulary than age.

Beyond physiology and cognition, our study highlights the influence of extrinsic factors, including vocabulary difficulty, SNR, and the number of spoken words, that collectively affect children’s WERs. Our framework also quantifies these extrinsic factors, offering a holistic view of their role in ASR performance. From the ACE and CMI values in 6 and CMI in Fig 5, we observe that all the SFMs are extremely sensitive towards the number of words in audio, the SNR being another important factor. Most importantly, with the growing trend of fine-tuning self-supervised speech foundation models (SFMs) for children’s speech, our framework explains the differential impact of fine-tuning across factors, addressing which among physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors benefit most and which remain unaffected.

Our findings suggest that ASR researchers, even those not employing causal inference, can consider incorporating variables such as vocabulary difficulty, background noise, number of spoken words, and GoP into their modeling and experimental designs. These variables offer actionable insights into performance trends and can guide the development of more robust and generalizable ASR systems for children. By emphasizing the stability and interpretability of these relationships, our study provides a foundation for future research to refine and extend these principles.

6. Conclusion

To recap our initial motivation: children are a growing group of speech technology users who, unfortunately, are not treated fairly by this technology. In this study we focused on ASR implemented through large-scale foundational models, a class of models that is otherwise influential in the speech field. Rather than proposing another ASR architecture, or proposing to collect another large-scale children dataset (which is not without stringent privacy and ethical considerations), we have capitalized the importance to understand what factors, for given datasets and ASR models, lead the models to fail transcribe children’s speech correctly. Causal methodology provide a principled way to approach this problem. More specifically, we proposed a post-hoc causal analysis approach to quantify the sensitivity of SFMs to children’s physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors, addressing the existing knowledge gap in explainability for children’s automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems. Unlike prior work that primarily examines the impact of age on WERs, our study incorporates cognitive factors (e.g., GoP) and extrinsic variables (e.g., vocabulary difficulty, signal-to-noise ratio) to provide a more detailed understanding of ASR errors in children. These findings open new avenues for future research, such as developing data augmentation techniques to enhance ASR robustness against mispronunciations.

While our causal inference framework presents a step forward in explainable children’s ASR, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. First, the choice of variables in our analysis and their relation established through DAG, though inspired by existing studies, remains somewhat subjective. It is good to point though that the choice of the variables to be included (and those to be excluded), as well as the choice of the causal model are eventually subjective (see, e.g. [74])—the infamous ‘domain expertise’. The choices of the variables and the causal model are also dictated by the purpose of a study (here, an attempt to explain ASR errors in a post-hoc way). The second limitation is that our findings are derived from a single dataset, limited to a specific language and demographic, which may constrain their generalizability. Even if, currently, there are limited data resources to address ASR in broader demographic populations, we deem these important additions. Apart from the gender and age variables addressed in our modeling, factors such as language could be incorporated to more complete causal models.

Looking ahead, we plan to expand this framework to address these limitations by incorporating causal structure discovery on variables and testing on multiple datasets. More importantly, although we apply our causal inference approach to children’s ASR, it can be easily extended to other speech-processing tasks, such as assessing the sensitivity of speech systems to different speech attributes in spoofed speech detection, paving the way for explainable speech AI. We plan to share the analysis scripts and code via a public repository (e.g., GitHub) to facilitate future research and support reproducibility.

Appendix A. Causal Inference

Causal inference aims to establish cause-and-effect relationships, that go beyond mere statistical (correlational) associations [62, 63]. Concretely, causal relations are formalized through *directed acyclic graphs* (DAGs). Given a joint distribution over n random variables, a DAG encodes all information about how interventions on one variable affect the others. Formally, let G be a causal DAG with nodes X_1, \dots, X_n (one per each variable). An edge $X_i \rightarrow X_j$ implies that X_i causally influences X_j .

In the example shown in Figure A.7, X_1 has no parents, X_2 has X_1 as its parent (denoted by $PA_2 = \{X_1\}$), X_3 has X_2, X_1 as its parent ($PA_3 = \{X_2, X_1\}$), and X_2 and X_3 are descendants of X_1 . According to the factorization rule [75], the joint probability distribution $P(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ can be written as:

$$P(X_1, X_2, X_3) = P(X_1) \cdot P(X_2 | X_1) \cdot P(X_3 | X_2).$$




Figure A.7: Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) illustrating the causal relationships where X_2 is a parent of X_3 , X_1 is a parent of both X_2 and X_3 , making X_1 a confounder. X_2 and X_3 are descendants of X_1 .

This factorization reflects the structure of the DAG, where $P(X_1)$ is the marginal probability of X_1 since X_1 has no parents. $P(X_2 | X_1)$ is the conditional probability of X_2 given X_1 . $P(X_3 | X_2)$ is the conditional probability of X_3 given X_2 .

According to the so-called *causal Markov condition* (CMC) [62, 63], assumed for the models used in this study, every node X_j is conditionally independent of its non-descendants, given its parents with respect to the causal DAG. CMC is important in simplifying the analysis of complex systems. By identifying a *Markov sufficient set* (defined as the smallest set of variables that renders a node conditionally independent of all others, ensuring no information is lost in terms of causal dependencies), one can reduce the dimensionality of the problem and focus on a subset of variables that captures all the dependency information. By assuming CMC sufficiency, the joint probability distribution $P(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ factorizes according to the DAG structure as:

$$P(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n P(X_j | \text{PA}_j), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where PA_j denotes the set of parent variables of X_j in G .

Once the causal DAG is constructed, the next task is to measure the strength of the causal association between nodes in the DAG. Two common approaches for measuring the strength of causal relation are (1) *average causal effect* (ACE) [63], and (2) *mutual information*. The former measures the average difference in outcomes between two hypothetical scenarios: one where a particular variable (the ‘treatment’) is set to one value (e.g., 1) and another where it is set to an alternative value (e.g., 0). In our ASR context, ‘treatment’ simply refers to the presence or absence of a specific factor under investigation (e.g., whether a child’s speech is influenced by a particular physiology, cognitive or extrinsic variable). For a binary treatment variable, ACE is defined as:

$$\text{ACE}(X_i \rightarrow X_j) = P(X_j = 1 | \text{do}(X_i = 1)) - P(X_j = 1 | \text{do}(X_i = 0)) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This allows us to quantify the causal impact of specific variables on ASR performance, helping identify which factors considerably influence outcomes such as word error rates.

The second measure of causal strength, mutual information [76], quantifies the amount of information that one random variable contains about another random variable. It quantifies the reduction in uncertainty about one variable given knowledge of the other. For two discrete random variables X and Y , mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is defined as:

$$I(X; Y) = \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} P(x, y) \log \left(\frac{P(x, y)}{P(x)P(y)} \right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $P(x, y)$ is the joint probability distribution of X and Y , and $P(x)$ and $P(y)$ are the marginal probability distribu-

tions. Mutual information can alternatively be expressed as,

$$I(X; Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $H(X)$ is the entropy of X , and $H(X|Y)$ is the conditional entropy of X given Y . Entropy $H(X)$ is defined as,

$$H(X) = - \sum_{x \in X} P(x) \log P(x), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and the conditional entropy as,

$$H(X|Y) = - \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} P(x, y) \log P(x|y). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Mutual information is always non-negative and is zero if (and only if) X and Y are independent.

References

- [1] Graafland, J. H. (2018). "New technologies and 21st century children," Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (179), www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/paper/e071a505-en.
- [2] Bittman, M., Rutherford, L., Brown, J., and Unsworth, L. (2011). "Digital natives? new and old media and children's outcomes," Australian Journal of Education 55, 161–175.
- [3] Shobaki, K., Hosom, J.-P., and Cole, R. (2000). "The OGI kids' speech corpus and recognizers," in *Proc. Interspeech*.
- [4] Pradhan, S., Cole, R., and Ward, W. (2024). "My Science Tutor (MyST) – a large corpus of children's conversational speech.," In Proc. Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024).
- [5] Yu, F., Yao, Z., Wang, X., An, K., Xie, L., Ou, Z., Liu, B., Li, X., and Miao, G. (2021). "The SLT 2021 children speech recognition challenge: Open datasets, rules and baselines.," In Proc. the 2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT).
- [6] Singh, V. P., Sailor, H., Bhattacharya, S., and Pandey, A. (2022). "Spectral modification based data augmentation for improving end-to-end ASR for children's speech," *Proc. Interspeech*.
- [7] Patel, T. and Scharenborg, O. (2024). "Improving end-to-end models for children's speech recognition," *Applied Sciences* 14(6), 2353.
- [8] Fan, R., Shankar, N., and Alwan, A. (2024). "Benchmarking children's ASR with supervised and self-supervised speech foundation models," *Proc. Interspeech*.
- [9] Singh, V. P., Sahidullah, M., and Kinnunen, T. (2024). "ChildAugment: Data augmentation methods for zero-resource children's speaker verification," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 155, 2221–2232.
- [10] Jain, R., Barcovschi, A., Yiwere, M. Y., Bigioi, D., Corcoran, P., and Cucu, H. (2023). "A Wav2Vec2-based experimental study on self-supervised learning methods to improve child speech recognition," *IEEE Access* 11, 46938–46948.
- [11] Gurunath Shivakumar, P. and Narayanan, S. (2022). "End-to-end neural systems for automatic children speech recognition: An empirical study," *Computer Speech & Language* 72, 101289.
- [12] Yang, Shu-wen, et al. (2024). "A large-scale evaluation of speech foundation models," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 32, 2884–2899.
- [13] Hu, Shujie, et al. (2024). "Self-supervised ASR models and features for dysarthric and elderly speech recognition," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 32, 3561–3575.
- [14] Cao, Jie, et al. (2023). "A comparative analysis of automatic speech recognition errors in small group classroom discourse," In Proc. of the 31st ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization.
- [15] Bent, T., et al. (2021). "How pronunciation distance impacts word recognition in children and adults," *J Acoust Soc Am* 150, 6, 4103.
- [16] Southwell, R., et al. (2024). "Automatic speech recognition tuned for child speech in the classroom," In Proc. ICASSP.
- [17] Li, Qun, and Martin Russell. (2002). "An analysis of the causes of increased error rates in children's speech recognition," In Proc. of the International Conference on Spoken Language Processing (ICSLP).
- [18] Zhang, M., and Hudson, J.A.. (2018). "The development of temporal concepts: linguistic factors and cognitive processes," *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 12, 2451.
- [19] Committee on the Science of Children Birth to Age 8: Deepening and Broadening the Foundation for Success, Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Institute of Medicine, National Research Council, Allen, L., Kelly, B.B. (2015). "Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation,". National Academies Press (US), Washington (DC). PMID: 26269871.
- [20] Attia, A.A., et al. (2024). "Kid-Whisper: towards bridging the performance gap in automatic speech recognition for children vs. adults," In Proc. Proceedings of the Seventh AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES).
- [21] Jain, Rishabh, et al. (2023). "Adaptation of Whisper models to child speech recognition," In Proc. Interspeech.
- [22] Baevski, A., Yuhao, Z., Abdelrahman, M., and Auli, M.. (2020). "wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations," In Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [23] Hsu, Wei-Ning, et al. (2021). "HuBERT: self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 29, 3451–3460.
- [24] Radford, A., et al. (2023). "Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision," In Proc. ICML.
- [25] Pratap, Vineel, et al. (2024). "Scaling speech technology to 1,000+ languages," *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 25, 97, 1–52.
- [26] Fan, R., Zhu, Y., Wang, J., and Alwan, A. (2022). "Towards better domain adaptation for self-supervised models: a case study of child ASR," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 16, 6, 1242–1252.

- [27] Miller, T. (2019). "Explanation in artificial intelligence: insights from the social sciences," *Artificial Intelligence*, **267**, 1–38.
- [28] Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). "Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning," arXiv preprint, arXiv:1702.08608.
- [29] Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., & Bengio, Y. (2015). "Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate," In Proc. ICLR.
- [30] Kim, B., Khanna, R., & Koyejo, O. O. (2016). "Examples are not enough, learn to criticize! criticism for interpretability," In Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [31] Renkl, A. (2014). "Toward an instructionally oriented theory of example-based learning," *Cognitive Science*, **38**(1), 1–37.
- [32] Erhan, D., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., & Vincent, P. (2009). "Visualizing higher-layer features of a deep network.," Technical Report, University of Montreal, **1341**, 1. Available at: <https://papers.baulab.info/papers/also/Erhan-2009.pdf>.
- [33] Simonyan, K., Vedaldi, A., & Zisserman, A. (2013). "Deep inside convolutional networks: visualising image classification models and saliency maps," In Proc. ICLR Workshop.
- [34] Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). "Why should I trust you?: Explaining the predictions of any classifier," In Proc. ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining.
- [35] Wu, X., Bell, P., & Rajan, A. (2024). "Can we trust explainable AI methods on ASR? An evaluation on phoneme recognition.," In Proc. ICASSP.
- [36] Wu, Y., Zhang, L., Wu, X., & Tong, H. (2019). "Pc-fairness: A unified framework for measuring causality-based fairness," In Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [37] Yang, Z., Yang, D., Dyer, C., He, X., Smola, A., & Hovy, E. (2016). "Hierarchical attention networks for document classification," In Proc. HLT-NAACL.
- [38] Yang, F., Du, M., & Hu, X. (2019). "Evaluating explanation without ground truth in interpretable machine learning," arXiv preprint, arXiv:1907.06831.
- [39] Moraffah, R., Karami, M., Guo, R., Raglin, A., & Liu, H. (2020). "Causal Interpretability for Machine Learning - Problems, Methods and Evaluation," *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, **22**, 1, 18–33.
- [40] Gendron, G., Witbrock, M., & Dobbie, G. (2023). "A survey of methods, challenges and perspectives in causality," arXiv preprint, arXiv:2302.00293.
- [41] Gendron, G., Chen, et al. (2024). "Behaviour modelling of social animals via causal structure discovery and graph neural networks," In Proc. International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [42] Runge, J., Nowack, P., Kretschmer, M., Flaxman, S., & Sejdinovic, D. (2019). "Detecting and quantifying causal associations in large nonlinear time series datasets.," *Science Advances*, **5**(11), eaau4996.
- [43] Xu, S., Li, Y., Liu, S., Fu, Z., Ge, Y., Chen, X., & Zhang, Y. (2020). "Learning post-hoc causal explanations for recommendation," arXiv preprint, arXiv:2006.16977.
- [44] Colombo, D., Maathuis, M. H., Kalisch, M., & Richardson, T. S. (2012). "Learning high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with latent and selection variables.," *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 294–321.
- [45] Zhou, J., Lin, Y., Chen, Q., Zhang, Q., Huang, X., & He, L. (2024). "CausalABSC: Causal inference for aspect debiasing in aspect-based sentiment classification.," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, **32**, 830-840.
- [46] Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2006). "Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models.," Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [47] Zecevic, M., Dhimi, D. S., Velickovic, P., & Kersting, K. (2021). "Relating graph neural networks to structural causal models.," arXiv preprint, arXiv:2109.04173.
- [48] Pearl, J. (2009). "Causality (2nd ed.).," Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [49] Xia, K., Lee, K. Z., Bengio, Y., & Bareinboim, E. (2021). "The causal-neural connection: expressiveness, learnability, and inference.," In Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [50] Spirtes, P., & Glymour, C. (1991). "An algorithm for fast recovery of sparse causal graphs.," *Social Science Computer Review*, **9**, 1, 62–72.
- [51] Spirtes, P., Glymour, C. N., & Scheines, R. (2000). "Causation, Prediction, and Search (2nd ed.).," MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- [52] Walker, E. A., Redfern, A., Oleson, J. J. (2019). "Linear mixed-model analysis to examine longitudinal trajectories in vocabulary depth and breadth in children who are hard of hearing," *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, **62**, 3, 525–542.
- [53] Wei, X., et al. (2022). "Automatic speech recognition and pronunciation error detection of Dutch non-native speech: Cumulating speech resources in a pluricentric language.," *Speech Communication*, **144**, 1–9.
- [54] Duskin, O. (2023). "Estimating Word Difficulty in English Using Python: A Practical Guide.," Available online: <https://medium.com/@omerduskin/estimating-word-difficulty-in-english-using-python-a-practical-guide-8f6812de5122>.
- [55] Shi, R., Werker, J., & Cutler, A. (2003). "Function words in early speech perception," In Proc. International Congress of Phonetic Sciences.
- [56] Hornung, C., Martin, R., & Fayol, M. (2017). "The power of vowels: Contributions of vowel, consonant, and digit RAN to clinical approaches in reading development.," *Learning and Individual Differences*, **57**, 85–102.
- [57] Jiang, H. (2005). "Confidence measures for speech recognition: A survey.," *Speech Communication*, **45**(4), 455–470.
- [58] Franco, H., Neumeyer, L., Ramos, O., and Bratt, H. (1999). "Automatic detection of phone-level mispronunciation for language learning," In Proc. the European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology.
- [59] Zhang, Fan, Chao Huang, Frank K. Soong, Min Chu, and Ren-Hua Wang. (2008). "Automatic mispronunciation detection for Mandarin," In Proc. ICASSP.
- [60] Mathad, V. C., Mahr, T. J., Scherer, N., Chapman, K., Hustad, K. C., Liss, J., and Berisha, V. (2021). "The impact of forced-alignment errors on automatic pronunciation evaluation.," In Proc. Interspeech.
- [61] McAuliffe, M., Socolof, M., Mihuc, S., Wagner, M., and Sonderegger, M. (2017). "Montreal forced aligner: Trainable text-speech alignment using Kaldi," In Proc. Interspeech.
- [62] Yao, L., Chu, Z., Li, S., Li, Y., Gao, J., and Zhang, A. (2021). "A survey on causal inference," *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, **15**(5).
- [63] Janzing, Dominik, et al. (2013). "Quantifying causal influences," *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**(5), 2324–58.
- [64] Pearl, Judea. (2010). "The foundations of causal inference.," *Sociological Methodology*, **40**, 75–149.

- [65] Schölkopf, B., Locatello, F., Bauer, S., Ke, N. R., Kalchbrenner, N., Goyal, A., & Bengio, Y. (2021). "Causal representations for reinforcement learning," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, **109**(5), 612–634.
- [66] Castro, D. C., Walker, I., & Glocker, B. (2020). "Causality matters in medical imaging," *Nature Communications*, **11**, 3673.
- [67] Termine, Andrea, Antonucci, Alessandro, and Facchini, Andrea. (2023). "Machine learning explanations by surrogate causal models (MaLESCaMo)," In *Proc. xAI (Late-breaking Work, Demos, Doctoral Consortium)*.
- [68] Liu, Xiaoyu, et al. (2024). "Large language models and causal inference in collaboration: A comprehensive survey," *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2403.09606*.
- [69] Feder, A., et al. (2022). "Causal inference in natural language processing: Estimation, prediction, interpretation and beyond," *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, **10**, 1138–1158.
- [70] Graves, A., et al. (2006). "Connectionist temporal classification: Labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks.," In *Proc. ICML*.
- [71] Vaswani, Ashish, et al.. (2017). "Attention is all you need," In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [72] Chen, T. et al. (2020). "A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations.," In *Proc. ICML*.
- [73] Panayotov, V., Chen, G., Povey, D., & Khudanpur, S. (2015). "LibriSpeech: An ASR corpus based on public domain audio books.," In *Proc. ICASSP*.
- [74] Halpern, J. Y., & Pearl, J. (2001). "Causes and explanations: A structural-model approach. Part I: Causes.," *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, **56**(4), 194–202.
- [75] Bishop, C. M. (2024). "Deep Learning: Foundations and Concepts," Springer, Chapter 11, 327.
- [76] Cover, T. M. (1999). "Elements of Information Theory.," John Wiley & Sons.

Graphical Abstract

Causal Inference for Quantifying the Impact of Physiology, Cognition, and Extrinsic Factors on Children's ASR

Vishwanath Pratap Singh, Md. Sahidullah, Tomi Kinnunen

Highlights

Causal Inference for Quantifying the Impact of Physiology, Cognition, and Extrinsic Factors on Children's ASR

Vishwanath Pratap Singh, Md. Sahidullah, Tomi Kinnunen

- Study employs the goodness of pronunciation scores (GOP), word difficulty metrics, and character level edit distance to elucidate the underlying causes of Word Error Rate (WER) degradation in Speech Foundation Models (SFMs) in children's speech.
- With help of word difficulty metric and GOP scores, our study shows that the children have under developed pronunciation skills which results into higher substitution errors. As the children grow, their GOP scores improves which results into reduced substitution error rate and hence reduced WER.
- Research is conducted using popular and most frequently used two self-supervised SFMs (`wav2Vec2.0` and `Hubert`) and two weakly supervised SFMs (`whisper` and `MMS`) to reduce the model and training datasets bias in our analysis.
- Study sheds light on the benefit of fine-tuning SFMS on Children's Speech by analyzing the WER across different age groups and genders in children's speech. Our findings indicate that fine-tuned models have better adaptability to under developed pronunciation and hence the lower substitution error rate.

Causal Inference for Quantifying the Impact of Physiology, Cognition, and Extrinsic Factors on Children’s ASR

Vishwanath Pratap Singh^a, Md. Sahidullah^{b,c}, Tomi Kinnunen^a

^aUniversity of Eastern Finland, Tulliportinkatu 1, Joensuu, 80130, Finland

^bInstitute for Advancing Intelligence, TCG CREST, , Kolkata, 700091, India

^cAcademy of Scientific and Innovative Research (AcSIR), , Ghaziabad, 201002, India

Abstract

The increasing use of children’s automatic speech recognition (ASR) systems has spurred research efforts to improve the accuracy of models designed for children’s speech in recent years. The current approach utilizes either open-source speech foundation models (SFMs) directly or fine-tuning them with children’s speech data. These SFMs, whether open-source or fine-tuned for children, often exhibit higher word error rates (WERs) compared to adult speech. However, there is a lack of systemic analysis of the cause of this degraded performance of SFMs. Understanding and addressing the reasons behind this performance disparity is crucial for improving the accuracy of SFMs for children’s speech. Our study addresses this gap by investigating the causes of accuracy degradation and the primary contributors to WER in children’s speech. In the first part of the study, we conduct a comprehensive benchmarking study on two self-supervised SFMs (Wav2Vec 2.0 and Hubert) and two weakly supervised SFMs (Whisper and MMS) across various age groups and genders on two children speech corpus. In the second part of the study, we present the relative impact of age, gender, goodness of pronunciation (GoP), vocabulary difficulty, background noise, and number of words in audio on SFM’s accuracy in children’s speech using causal inference(CI). We also provide insights into the impact of fine-tuning SFM on children’s speech.

Keywords: Children’s ASR, SFMs, Wav2Vec2.0, HuBERT, MMS, Whisper, Causal Inference, Physiology, Cognitive, Pronunciation

1. Introduction

Children of the twenty-first century are frequently referred to as *digi-natives* due to their upbringing in an era where digital technology is ubiquitous and readily accessible [2]. Consequently, they constitute one of the primary demographics for daily usage of smartphones, tablets, and other digital devices [1]. This increased digital proficiency has catalyzed a surge in research on speech technology for children, including the task of *automatic speech recognition* (ASR) [10, 5]. However, ASR models’ efficacy for children remains below those designed for adults [7, 6]. Addressing this shortcoming necessitates a deeper understanding of the factors contributing to the accuracy gap and the formulation of strategies to mitigate these challenges.

Similar to other speech tasks, modern children’s ASR leverages from *speech foundation models* (SFMs) [11, 12] pre-trained on diverse and large quantities of speech data to learn generalizable representation state usable in various speech tasks. They can be utilized directly as pre-trained open-source models [7, 9], or alternatively, further fine-tuned to children’s speech data for improved performance [19, 20, 26]. Nonetheless, despite fine-tuning, SFMs designed for children consistently exhibit higher *word error rates* (WER)—the proportion of words incorrectly transcribed by the ASR system—compared to those optimized for adults [9, 20]. This discrepancy underscores the need for a systematic analysis to uncover the root causes of accuracy degradation in children’s ASR, as well as a detailed analysis of different components of WER (i.e. substitution, deletion, and insertion errors).

Our study **quantifies** the impact of factors responsible for the degradation of SFM’s accuracy in children’s speech. While our study is not the first one in this direction, we address several prior research shortcomings. Previous studies, such as [16], have investigated the impact of children’s pronunciation abilities on classic *Gaussian mixture model-hidden Markov model* (GMM-HMM) based ASR systems within a small classroom setup and a fixed age group.

More recent studies [10, 13] have studied the impact of age and number of words in context on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors. However, as depicted in Fig. 1, these prior studies typically analyzed the impact of these factors (age, pronunciation ability, number of words in context) in isolation, overlooking their interdependent effects.

Firstly, physiological and cognitive responses work in conjunction for children’s speech production [18]. Hence, the impact of physiological responses, characterized by age and gender [18], and cognitive responses characterized by pronunciation ability [17], should not be studied in isolation but in a joint manner. Secondly, extrinsic factors such as the environmental factor, characterized by the severity of background noise, linguistic complexity, characterized by vocabulary difficulty, and the number of spoken words in utterance that provide the context for SFMs, impact the children’s ASR. Therefore, a comprehensive analysis of the factors contributing to the degradation of WER in SFMs for children’s speech must examine their impacts collectively, as understanding their interdependencies is essential for accurately identifying the underlying causes.

Further, the SFM bias such as training data, architecture, and particular loss being used in training also impacts the children’s ASR [10]. Hence, for generalization our finding, we conduct experiments with a total of four ASR systems belonging to two categories of SFMs: self-supervised models, including Wav2Vec2.0 [22] and HuBERT [23], and weakly supervised models, including Whisper [24] and MMS [25]. Our study answers the following questions:

1. **What is the extent of sensitivity in open-source SFMs to children’s physiology, cognitive ability, and extrinsic factors?**
2. **To what degree does the cognitive ability of children characterized by pronunciation ability impacted by physiology characterized by age vs extrinsic factor characterized by linguistic complexity (e.g., vocabulary difficulty)?**
3. **Does fine-tuning speech foundation models on child-specific speech datasets reduce the model’s sensitivity to children’s physiology, cognitive ability, and extrinsic factors? Which aspect benefits the most from fine-tuning, and which remains largely unaffected?**
4. **Given the wide array of open-source speech foundation models available, is it feasible to develop a principled, explainable framework for selecting the most appropriate model for specific applications? For instance, how would such a framework take into account the trade-offs between model performance for short command-type interactions versus long conversational discourse, speaker characteristics (e.g., age, gender, pronunciation ability), and acoustic conditions (e.g., signal-to-noise ratio), and can these decisions be guided by interpretable metrics such as feature importance scores or model uncertainty measures?**

Our experiments are organized in the following order, we first benchmark these SFMs across gender and age groups using two widely used children’s speech corpora: the CSLU Kids [3] and MyST [4] datasets. To go beyond the default metric of ASR, WER, we also analyze the substitution, deletion, and insertion errors. Then we obtain the correlation between SFMs by analyzing the correlation matrices of WER at the utterance level, and age group level. The correlation analysis highlights the model bias in analysis, as a low correlation between two SFMs means more prone to model bias in analysis.

Then, we conduct the cause and effect analysis of SFMs on children’s speech using *causal inference* (CI) [62], where physiological factors (age, gender), cognitive factors (*pronunciation ability* [53]), and extrinsic factors (*signal-to-noise ratio*(SNR), vocabulary difficulty [54], and number of words in utterance) are considered as causes for impact on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors. CI enables us to understand the relative sensitivity of a particular SFM towards the above factors.

Finally, we explore the impact of fine-tuning of SFMs on children’s speech using cause-effect analysis. The causal-effect analysis of fine-tuned models provides insights into how fine-tuning the SFMs on children’s speech improves their sensitivity towards pronunciation variation, age, gender, and vocabulary difficulty.

2. Related Work on Explainable Decision Making

Explainability in decision-making is described as the degree to which a human can understand the cause of a decision [27], or the ability to explain in ways that are intelligible to a human [28]. Explainable algorithms are generally categorized into (1) inherently interpretable models, which generate explanations during training [37], and (2) post-hoc interpretations, which provide explanations for decisions after they are made [30, 31].

Abbreviation	Full Name
ASR	Automatic Speech Recognition
SFM	Speech Foundation Model
WER	Word Error Rate
GOP	Goodness of Pronunciation
MyST	My Science Tutor Dataset
CSLU	CSLU Kids Corpus
Utt	Utterances
Spk	Speakers
Ins	Insertions
Del	Deletions
Subs	Substitutions
CI	Causal Inference
ACE	Average Causal Effect
CMI	Conditional Mutual Information

Table 1: Abbreviations used in this paper.

Inherently interpretable models include:

Decision Trees: These models use a tree structure where each internal node checks a condition on a feature, leading to a decision path. Each path to a leaf node can be interpreted as an “if-then” rule, making predictions explainable.

Rule-Based Models: Rule-based classifiers generate human-readable explanations by using a series of “if-then” rules to infer class labels.

Linear Regression: Linear regression models the linear relationship between a dependent variable and a set of features. Feature weights indicate the mean change in the prediction for a one-unit increase in each feature, allowing for a straightforward understanding of feature impact.

Attention Networks: These networks [29, 35] provide the importance of specific input features or learned representations in predictions.

Post-hoc interpretability methods explain the decision-making of black-box models after training. Key approaches include:

Local Explanations: Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations (LIME) [34] generate local, model-agnostic explanations by approximating complex models with simpler, interpretable ones around individual predictions.

Saliency Maps: Saliency maps [33] identify the most influential pixels in an input image that contribute to a specific classification, making them especially useful for interpreting image models.

Feature Visualization: This approach clarifies what a model has learned by visualizing activations in neural network layers. Erhan et al. [32] propose activation maximization to visualize neuron computations across layers, particularly effective for image inputs.

A method that spans both inherently interpretable models and post-hoc explanations is **Causal Inference (CI)** [39]. CI gives an advantage over traditional interpretability by considering hidden or unobserved factors influencing decision-making and enabling counterfactual explanations [39]. In this paper, we employ CI to provide post-hoc explanations for SFMs focused on children’s speech, allowing an understanding of factors contributing to the degraded WER.

Causality provides a theoretical framework for recovering and estimating cause and effect variables from data observations. Any causality problem can be divided into two tasks: Causal Structure Discovery and Causal Inference [40]. The former recovers the structure of the graph, whereas the latter estimates the functions linking the effect variables to their causes. Causal Structure can either be learned automatically [41, 47, 48], or can be constructed based on prior knowledge [42]. Once the causal structure is known, Causal Inference methods can be used to estimate the links between variables. Traditional approaches include do-calculus [45], a Bayesian inference framework, and regression methods [43]. More recent Causal Inference methods called NeuralCausal models rely on deep neural networks, in particular, Graph Neural Networks [44], to estimate causal dependency functions [46]. In our work,

we construct the causal structure of using *directed acyclic graph* (DAG) based on the domain knowledge presented in [18]. Then, we use the Bayesian inference framework [45] to estimate the link between nodes in the causal graph. The strength of the causal relationship between cause and effect nodes in DAG can be quantified using either the *average causal effect* (ACE) or *conditional mutual information* (CMI) [62]. While ACE captures linear cause-effect relationships, CMI accounts for non-linear dependencies between cause and effect. Refer to Appendix Appendix A for a detailed explanation of causal inference.

CI has been used to explain how machine learning models make decisions [63], and in representation learning [64] in recent years. In [65], authors applied causal inference to explainable decision-making processes in data collection, annotation, pre-processing, and learning strategies, addressing challenges in medical imaging. Additionally, [66] proposed generating causal counterfactual queries for *explainable artificial intelligence* (XAI). A counterfactual represents an alternative scenario where a key factor is changed to observe how the outcome differs, providing a deeper understanding of the cause-and-effect relationships in a model’s decisions. CI has also been instrumental in analyzing biases, fairness, and safety in *natural language processing* (NLP) models [67, 68]. Notably, our work is pioneering in devising a methodology for utilizing causal inference conditioned on various factors (children’s physiology, cognition ability, and extrinsic factors) for **explaining the degraded performance of SFMs on children’s speech**.




Figure 1: Overview of existing studies. These studies consider the effect of Age, number of words in context, and pronunciation ability on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors in isolation.

3. Proposed Method

Proposed causal CI-based relation between speech attributes such as age, gender, *pronunciation ability*, *vocabulary difficulty*, *signal-to-noise ratio* (SNR), number of words in utterance, and their effect on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors are shown in Figure 3. Our rationale behind the proposed cause-effect relation emerges from the children’s speech production studies. Speech production in children is impacted by a number of hidden factors such as cognitive response (characterized by pronunciation ability), followed by a physiological response (characterized by age, gender) [18, 17]. As shown in Fig. 2 and studied in [18], cognitive response works in conjunction with physiological response in children’s work in children’s speech production. Hence, the impact of age, gender, and pronunciation ability on children’s ASR should be studied jointly. Age and gender are generally known from the recording’s metadata, while we use *goodness of pronunciation* (GoP) [53] explained in Section 4.3 to measure pronunciation ability in children’s speech. Vocabulary difficulty also impacts pronunciation ability, as children learn the easy and common words first. Our approach for computing the vocabulary difficulty is discussed in Section 4.4.

Further, extrinsic factors, including environmental factors characterized by background noise, linguistic complexity characterized by vocabulary difficulty, and number of words in context, impact the children’s ASR. All these factors jointly impact the final accuracy of *speech foundation models* (SFMs) on children’s speech. Hence, we include age, gender, and vocabulary difficulty directly impacting the *substitution*(subs), *deletion*(del), and *insertion*(ins) errors { Age \rightarrow Subs Error, Age \rightarrow Del Error, Age \rightarrow Subs Error, Gender \rightarrow Subs Error, Gender \rightarrow Del Error, Gender \rightarrow Subs Error in our causal graph shown in Figure 3.

Furthermore, to understand the impact of pronunciation variability, we include the GoP [53] as a measure of the pronunciation ability of children which directly impacts the substitution, deletion, and insertion errors { GoP \rightarrow Subs Error, GoP \rightarrow Del Error, GoP \rightarrow Subs Error }. In addition, pronunciation ability is also impacted by age and vocabulary difficulty. Therefore, we also consider the causal relation between Age \rightarrow GoP, and Vocab Diff \rightarrow GoP in our proposed causal graph in Figure 3. Hence, GoP acts as a confounder in our proposed causal graph.




Figure 2: Depiction of factors affecting children’s speech production, based on findings reported in [18]

Finally, we include *signal-to-noise ratio* (SNR) for understanding the impact of background noise on SFMs accuracy { $SNR \rightarrow$ Subs Error, $SNR \rightarrow$ Del Error, $SNR \rightarrow$ Subs Error}. We also note that all four SFMs are trained using attention layers [70] which includes the contextual information in model prediction. Hence, the length of the context also impacts the prediction ability of SFMs. Encoder-Decoder based SFMs, such as *Whisper* [24] and *MMS* [25], also consider the previously predicted tokens in predicting the next tokens (i.e. the number of words in audio also impacts the prediction ability of SFMs). Hence, we consider including the number of words in audio as a factor impacting ASR errors { $\#Words \rightarrow$ Subs Error, $\#Words \rightarrow$ Del Error, $\#Words \rightarrow$ Subs Error}.

Following the proposed Causal DAG in Fig.3, the joint probability distribution of physiology, cognitive response, extrinsic factors, and ASR errors, which forms the basis for CI [62] can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_{\text{child}} &= p(\text{Cognition, Physiology, Extrinsic Factors, Ins Error, Del Error, Sub Error}) \\
 &= p(\text{Age, Gender, GoP, SNR, Vocab Difficulty, No. Words,} \\
 &\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{Ins Error, Del Error, Sub Error}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(\text{joint}) &= p(\text{Age}) \cdot p(\text{Gender}) \cdot p(\text{SNR}) \cdot p(\text{Vocab Difficulty}) \cdot p(\text{No. Words}) \\
 &\quad \cdot p(\text{GoP} \mid \text{Age}) \cdot p(\text{GoP} \mid \text{Vocab Difficulty}) \\
 &\quad \cdot p(\text{Ins Error} \mid \text{Age, Gender, SNR, GoP, No. Words}) \\
 &\quad \cdot p(\text{Del Error} \mid \text{Age, Gender, SNR, GoP, No. Words}) \\
 &\quad \cdot p(\text{Sub Error} \mid \text{Age, Gender, SNR, GoP, No. Words}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

4. Experimental Setup

4.1. Dataset

We consider two standard children speech corpora in our experiments: CSLU Kids [3] and My Science Tutor (MyST) [4]. The former comprises both spontaneous and scripted recordings from approximately 1100 children. It includes a gender-balanced group of roughly 100 children per grade, spanning from kindergarten (age 5-6 years old) to grade 10 (age 15-16 years old). Gender-wise speaker distribution per age group is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 3: **Proposed Analysis Approach Using Causal Inference (CI)**: Unlike previous studies that examine the impact of factors such as age [10], gender, pronunciation ability [16], number of words in context [10], and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) on deletion (Del), insertion (Ins), and substitution (Subs) errors independently, our approach employs CI to analyze their effects collectively in a joint framework.

Split	Boys			Girls		
	# Spk	# Utt	# Hours	# Spk	# Utt	# Hours
Original Dataset	605	39184	38.0	513	32815	31.8
Cleaned	602	39167	37.9	511	32811	31.8
With good tag	602	25454	22.6	511	22071	19.7
Test-good	542	22960	20.4	451	19561	17.6
Dev-good	30	1290	1.1	30	1260	1.1
Train-good	30	1204	1.1	30	1250	1.1

Table 2: CSLU kids Corpus (scripted): # speakers and # of utterances from different genders in the scripted set of the CSLU kids corpus. We remove speakers with less than two utterances in the dataset to ensure at least one enrollment and one test audio per speaker, resulting in *Cleaned* version as indicated in this table.




Figure 4: Gender-wise speaker distribution per grade (age in years) group in the CSLU Kids corpus.

Following [8], we focus exclusively on scripted subset. The CSLU Kids Corpus scripted recordings include isolated words and sentences from 605 boys and 513 girls, categorized as "Good" (only target word), "Maybe" (target word with extra content), "Bad" (no target word), and "Puff" (target word with inhaling noise). For our experiments, we use only "Good" recordings, creating customized, speaker-disjoint train, development, and test sets for fine-tuning and benchmarking Speech Foundation Models (SFMs) on the CSLU Kids corpus, as shown in Table 2. The age and

gender metadata in the corpus enables SFM performance evaluation across age and gender groups.

The second and more recent corpus, My Science Tutor (MyST) [4], consists of 470 hours of English speech from 1371 students in grades 3 to 5 engaged in conversations with the tutor. The corpus includes speaker-disjoint subsets for training (1052 speakers), development (153 speakers), and testing (156 speakers). Some of the MyST recordings are longer than 30 seconds, where self-supervised models such as Hubert and Wav2Vec2.0 may fail as they are trained on audio lengths of 0.5 seconds to 30 seconds. Hence, we removed recordings that were longer than 30 seconds. Different from CSLU Kids, age and gender metadata are not available for the MyST dataset, which prohibits us from presenting age- and gender-specific results on MyST.

4.2. Automatic Speech Recognition Systems

As summarized in Table 3, we consider four ASR systems in our experiments: Wav2Vec 2.0, Hubert, Whisper, and MMS. The first one, Wav2Vec2.0 [22], is a self-supervised model, which leverages contrastive [71] training to learn contextually informed speech representations from unlabeled audio data. The model comprises a pre-trained transformer encoder and a quantized feature encoder, enabling efficient and effective representation learning from raw audio. The second model, Hubert [23], is also self-supervised, based on a similar architecture to Wav2Vec2.0. Different from Wav2Vec2.0, however, Hubert applies a classification task, forcing the model to classify hidden sequences into pre-defined categories. Finally, the two last models, Whisper [24] and MMS [25], are *weakly supervised* models that rely on limited labeled data for training. While Whisper utilizes a semi-supervised approach to learn from both labeled and unlabeled data, MMS adopts a multi-task learning framework to jointly optimize for various speech processing tasks.

In the first part of the analysis, we utilize these open-source SFMs to analyze their sensitivity to children’s physiology (characterized by age and gender [18]), cognition (characterized by pronunciation ability [17]), and extrinsic factors. The last consists of common factors that are external to the particular individual, but can be expected to influence ASR performance. In specific, we consider the level of background noise, vocabulary difficulty, and the number of spoken words in utterance that provide the context to the attention layers in SFMs. In the second part, we fine-tune the best-performing open-source *self-supervised* and *weakly-supervised* models on children’s speech data from the MyST Train dataset to evaluate how fine-tuning impacts the models’ sensitivity to children’s physiological and cognitive traits, as well as extrinsic factors.

While, physiological factors, such as age and gender, along with extrinsic factors like SNR and number of words in sentences, can be directly obtained from audio and metadata. However, pronunciation ability and vocabulary difficulty are less commonly addressed in ASR literature. Therefore, we provide a brief explanation of these factors in Section ?? and Section ??, respectively.

4.3. Goodness of Pronunciation Score

Various types of confidence measures have been proposed for automatic pronunciation quality assessment, including likelihood ratio [57] and posterior probability [58] of target phonemes and most probable phonemes in the forced alignment of ASR. The so-called *goodness of pronunciation* (GOP) score [53], a variation of posterior probability, has recently been used for pronunciation assessment [59]. The GOP score utilizes forced alignment techniques, normalizing the posterior probability of the target phoneme by dividing it by the maximum posterior probability across all possible phonemes, and is formally defined as follows:

$$GOP(p) \approx \log \frac{P(p|o_t; t_s, t_e)}{\max_{q \in Q} P(q|o_t; t_s, t_e)},$$

where p represents the target phone, $q \in Q$ indicates the set of all possible phones in vocabulary. The log posterior of phone p is computed as,

$$\log P(p|o_t; t_s, t_e) \approx \frac{1}{t_e - t_s} \sum_{t_s}^{t_e} \log \sum_{s \in p} P(s|o_t),$$

where t_s and t_e are the start and end indices of the phone (obtained using forced alignment); $s \in p$ is the set of context-dependent phones; o_t is the input feature at frame t ; and $P(s|o_t)$ is the frame-level posterior score, which can

be obtained by aligning the utterance with the corresponding target phone sequence. In practice, we use the *Montreal Forced Aligner* (MFA) [60] tool to obtain the forced alignment between children’s audio and the corresponding text.

The average phoneme GOP score is used as the utterance level pronunciation quality score. For causal inference, we further discretize the utterance-level score into three ordinal categories, *Good*, *Average*, and *Bad*. This allows us to stratify the data into meaningful groups, which helps in identifying cause-effect relationships more precisely. By analyzing each category separately, we can understand how different levels of pronunciation quality influence the model’s performance, and identify specific factors that contribute to degraded outcomes. The categorization of the GoP-based pronunciation score in the CSLU Kids corpus is depicted in Fig.5a.

4.4. Vocabulary Difficulty

Certain words can be considered *a priori* more complex to produce, whether due to simply being rare, or otherwise expected to involve a complex sequence of articulatory gestures. Since *vocabulary difficulty* measures—computed solely from text (prompts)—are dependent neither on the individual child, nor the acoustic realization, it is of great interest to consider their role in the analysis of ASR errors. To determine word difficulty, we employ a combined approach using both **rarity** and **readability** scores, following [54]. Rarity is measured by the inverse of the word’s frequency across various text corpora, including *movie-reviews* (movie sentiments), *Reuters* (news articles), *brown* (American English texts), *Gutenberg* (classic literature), *webtext* (informal web content), and *nps-chat* (online chat conversations). Words that appear less frequently across these corpora are assigned higher rarity scores, reflecting their infrequency and thus, their potential difficulty for users [55]. Readability, in turn, is evaluated based on the ratio of vowels to the total length of the word. A higher ratio indicates a word is easier to read [56], which results in a lower difficulty rating. By focusing on the vowel-to-length ratio, this metric quantifies how accessible a word is to read or pronounce.

The final difficulty score of a word is the sum of the rarity and the readability scores. We obtain a sentence-level difficulty score by averaging the difficulty scores of the individual words. Similar to GOP, for causal inference we discretize the score to define three difficulty categories: *Easy*, *Moderate*, and *Difficult*. The categorization of vocabulary difficulty scores is based on finding local minima in the kernel density estimates, on the CSLU Kids corpus, as visualized in Fig. 5b.




Figure 5: (a) The distribution of the Goodness of Pronunciation (GoP) scores in the CSLU Kids corpus, categorized into three levels: Bad, Average, and Good. The categorization is based on the GoP score’s distance from the mean, where scores within $\pm\sigma$ (standard deviation) are classified as “Average,” while scores beyond this range are labeled as “Bad” or “Good.”; (b) Distribution of word difficulty scores in the CSLU Kids corpus, categorized as easy, moderate, and difficult. The categorization of vocabulary difficulty scores is based on local minima in the kernel density estimates of the CSLU Kids corpus.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1. Comparison of Different Speech Foundation Models

We present the overall WER, substitution, deletion, and insertion errors for the open-source models and their fine-tuned variants in Table 4. Whisper [24] outperforms the other three models, indicating its generalizability, which

Model	Architecture	Type	Pretraining	Training Data	# Params
Wav2Vec2.0-large	Encoder only	Self-supervised	Libri-light	Libri-960	317M (large)
HuBERT-large	Encoder only	Self-supervised loss	Libri-light	Libri-960	317M million (base)
Whisper-base	Transformer	Weakly-supervised	-	Unknown 680K Hours	244M (small)
MMS-1.1B	Transformer	Weakly-supervised	-	Unknown	300M

Table 3: Comparison of speech foundation models (SFMs) in terms of architecture, loss, training data, and the number of parameters.

Table 4: Updated performance comparison across different models.

Model	Error	Open Source			Fine-Tuned		
		myST Dev	myST Test	CSLU Read	myST Dev	myST Test	CSLU Read
Wav2Vec	WER	21.6	25.2	54.0	13.2	15.6	32.4
	Subs	9.0	10.8	21.6	6.0	7.2	14.4
	Del	5.4	5.4	10.8	3.6	3.6	7.2
	Ins	7.2	9.0	21.6	4.8	6.0	14.4
HuBERT	WER	19.8	23.4	48.6	-	-	-
	Subs	7.2	9.0	16.2	-	-	-
	Del	3.6	5.4	10.8	-	-	-
	Ins	9.0	10.8	27.0	-	-	-
Whisper	WER	18.0	21.6	26.28	10.8	13.2	25.2
	Subs	5.4	7.2	16.95	3.6	4.8	10.8
	Del	3.6	3.6	3.64	2.4	2.4	3.6
	Ins	7.2	9.0	6.39	4.8	6.0	14.4
MMS	WER	23.4	27.0	59.4	-	-	-
	Subs	10.8	12.6	27.0	-	-	-
	Del	7.2	7.2	16.2	-	-	-
	Ins	9.0	10.8	27.0	-	-	-

might be due to the inclusion of diverse datasets in its training. Furthermore, we note that the substitution error is consistently higher compared to the other errors across the models and test sets. A further breakdown of the results according to age and gender is provided in Table 5. Again, *Whisper* outperforms the other models, while *MMS* [25] yields the highest WERs. We observe an overall decreasing trends in all the metrics with increasing grade (a proxy for age), as one might expect. The apparent ‘jump’ between grades 5 and 6 can be attributed to the use of different sentences in grades K to 5 and 6 to 10. The latter consists primarily of single-word utterances, which results in notably high WERs. It is known that models trained with attention-based architectures [70] benefit from the larger context size, which is a rare case in the upper classes. Additionally, the two self-supervised models *Wav2Vec2.0* [22] and *HuBERT* [23] exhibit a relatively larger increase in errors between grades 5 and 6, indicating increased sensitivity to shorter context. This might be attributed to the use of *contrastive loss* [71], which requires large context to predict the masked input representation. Finally, as for gender, we observe no notable change in WER trends between boys and girls.

Overall, the performance of all four ASR models is far from perfect, with notably high error rates for younger age groups, and for single-word utterances. It is therefore interesting to consider the combined potential of the four models under an oracle selection strategy. In this ‘hypothesis selection’ strategy, summarized in the last group of results for the two genders in Table 5, we output the transcript from whichever model yields the lowest WER, on the specific utterance. As one may expect, this reduces WERs substantially, suggesting that the four models produce different transcripts for the same utterance in the CSLU Kids corpus. Since this analysis does not reveal *which* groups of models are more/less complementary to each other, we further analyze correlation coefficient between each model pair on the utterance-wise WER data. The results summarized in Fig. 6 indicate that *Wav2Vec* and *HuBERT* are most strongly correlated. This might be due to the similarity in architecture and training dataset of these models; both models are trained in a self-supervised manner on LibriSpeech [73]. Interestingly, the *Whisper* shows the lowest correlation with the rest of the speech foundation models.

Up to this point, we have focused on generic open-source models whose checkpoints (neural network weights) are publicly available. None of the four models are particularly optimized for children ASR. While the above *zero-shot* evaluation of ASR on an unseen target domain (here, childrens’ speech) is justified from a practical deployment point of view, whenever speech data *is* available from the target domain, it is beneficial to employ model fine-tuning. For this experiment, based on the above zero-shot results, we select *Wav2Vec2.0* and *Whisper* to represent self- and weakly-supervised model families, respectively. The two models are then fine-tuned on the MyST train split. We do

Table 5: Detailed Oracle WER analysis across gender and age groups on CSLU Test set using open-source speech foundation models.

		Grades												
Model	(%)	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
B	wav2vec	WER	66.8	42.4	36.1	30.4	23.8	22.3	64.6	56.8	55.0	56.9	55.6	
		Subs	46.8	30.3	26.4	21.3	17.2	15.8	46.2	40.3	39.1	39.9	38.1	
		Del	7.6	3.3	2.5	1.3	0.9	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	HuBert	Ins	12.4	8.8	7.2	7.9	5.7	5.2	18.4	16.5	15.9	17.0	17.5	
		WER	71.6	42.5	34.6	29.5	21.0	20.8	53.3	45.8	44.1	49.2	45.5	
		Subs	46.9	28.9	23.6	19.0	14.8	14.5	37.9	33.6	32.0	34.6	31.1	
	whisper	Del	4.9	2.6	1.8	1.0	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		Ins	19.9	11.0	9.1	9.5	5.6	5.2	15.3	12.2	12.1	14.6	14.4	
		WER	84.6	37.5	28.0	23.1	17.5	18.7	30.3	26.3	22.0	23.1	22.4	
	MMS	Subs	34.8	22.4	18.0	14.1	10.4	11.3	21.3	18.5	16.9	16.5	16.1	
		Del	2.4	4.9	4.0	4.2	4.7	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		Ins	47.4	10.2	6.1	4.8	2.4	2.7	9.0	7.8	5.2	6.6	6.3	
	Hypo. Selection	WER	122.4	85.8	87.6	68.4	60.0	57.3	193.3	168.3	131.5	166.6	150.9	
		Subs	62.0	46.2	43.5	36.7	32.5	31.4	78.3	73.2	70.5	76.4	71.1	
		Del	7.6	4.4	4.0	2.1	1.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	G	wav2vec	Ins	52.7	35.2	40.2	29.5	25.8	23.8	115.0	95.0	61.0	90.1	79.8
			WER	42.47	27.34	21.33	18.26	14.18	15.47	23.63	20.13	17.83	17.62	17.60
			Subs	30.18	18.47	14.41	11.59	8.57	9.62	17.46	15.28	13.81	13.19	13.09
		HuBert	Del	2.19	4.00	2.90	3.23	4.16	3.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
			Ins	10.09	4.87	4.02	3.44	1.45	1.86	6.17	4.85	4.02	4.43	4.51
WER			64.4	42.9	34.4	30.7	22.1	22.7	63.8	58.1	53.8	58.7	52.9	
whisper		Subs	45.0	31.1	25.6	22.2	15.8	16.3	44.7	41.9	39.9	39.7	36.6	
		Del	7.5	2.6	1.7	1.1	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		Ins	11.9	9.2	7.0	7.4	5.7	5.5	19.1	16.3	13.9	19.0	16.4	
MMS		WER	68.4	43.6	32.6	29.8	19.9	20.8	52.4	48.3	44.4	48.9	42.8	
		Subs	45.7	29.1	23.4	20.0	13.8	14.8	36.1	34.7	32.6	32.5	28.9	
		Del	3.9	1.5	1.4	0.9	0.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Hypo. Selection		Ins	18.7	13.0	7.7	8.9	5.5	5.0	16.3	13.6	11.8	16.5	13.9	
		WER	49.0	30.6	25.2	22.7	17.5	19.5	31.6	25.9	22.3	25.3	16.9	
		Subs	30.8	20.7	15.9	13.9	10.5	12.4	21.1	18.4	16.5	16.5	11.9	
wav2vec		Del	2.8	3.1	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		Ins	15.4	6.9	4.9	4.6	2.4	2.9	10.4	7.5	5.7	8.8	5.0	
		WER	126.1	87.7	78.2	62.9	52.8	61.7	200.1	178.5	156.5	161.5	131.1	
HuBert		Subs	60.3	47.8	41.2	36.7	30.4	30.3	78.1	74.3	71.7	74.1	68.5	
		Del	5.9	4.9	2.7	2.3	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Ins	59.9	35.0	34.3	23.9	20.9	30.0	122.1	104.3	84.8	87.4	62.6		
whisper	WER	38.30	23.66	19.32	17.61	14.38	15.76	23.73	19.99	17.36	20.31	13.65		
	Subs	27.00	17.15	13.13	11.50	8.66	10.03	16.83	14.63	12.79	13.88	9.96		
	Del	2.31	2.58	3.10	3.19	4.19	3.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
MMS	Ins	8.99	3.93	3.08	2.92	1.54	2.17	6.90	5.35	4.58	6.43	3.69		
	WER	64.4	42.9	34.4	30.7	22.1	22.7	63.8	58.1	53.8	58.7	52.9		
	Subs	45.0	31.1	25.6	22.2	15.8	16.3	44.7	41.9	39.9	39.7	36.6		
Hypo. Selection	Del	7.5	2.6	1.7	1.1	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	Ins	11.9	9.2	7.0	7.4	5.7	5.5	19.1	16.3	13.9	19.0	16.4		
	WER	68.4	43.6	32.6	29.8	19.9	20.8	52.4	48.3	44.4	48.9	42.8		
wav2vec	Subs	45.7	29.1	23.4	20.0	13.8	14.8	36.1	34.7	32.6	32.5	28.9		
	Del	3.9	1.5	1.4	0.9	0.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	Ins	18.7	13.0	7.7	8.9	5.5	5.0	16.3	13.6	11.8	16.5	13.9		
HuBert	WER	49.0	30.6	25.2	22.7	17.5	19.5	31.6	25.9	22.3	25.3	16.9		
	Subs	30.8	20.7	15.9	13.9	10.5	12.4	21.1	18.4	16.5	16.5	11.9		
	Del	2.8	3.1	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
whisper	Ins	15.4	6.9	4.9	4.6	2.4	2.9	10.4	7.5	5.7	8.8	5.0		
	WER	126.1	87.7	78.2	62.9	52.8	61.7	200.1	178.5	156.5	161.5	131.1		
	Subs	60.3	47.8	41.2	36.7	30.4	30.3	78.1	74.3	71.7	74.1	68.5		
MMS	Del	5.9	4.9	2.7	2.3	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	Ins	59.9	35.0	34.3	23.9	20.9	30.0	122.1	104.3	84.8	87.4	62.6		
	WER	38.30	23.66	19.32	17.61	14.38	15.76	23.73	19.99	17.36	20.31	13.65		
Hypo. Selection	Subs	27.00	17.15	13.13	11.50	8.66	10.03	16.83	14.63	12.79	13.88	9.96		
	Del	2.31	2.58	3.10	3.19	4.19	3.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	Ins	8.99	3.93	3.08	2.92	1.54	2.17	6.90	5.35	4.58	6.43	3.69		

not use CSLU Train-good (defined in 2) as it is too small for training (compared to MyST train split). The overall results are presented in Table 4, and the breakdown by age and gender in Table 6.

While the fine-tuned models show a reduced WER for on both MyST Test and CSLU Test-good, the relative reduction in the former is greater. This might be due to the diverse age groups in the CSLU Kids corpus, whereas the age distribution in the MyST training and test sets is limited to grades 5 to 8. Furthermore, the age-wise results of the fine-tuned models in Table 6 are better than those of the open-source models in Table 5, but they show a similar trend of WER reduction as the grade level increases. Similar to Table 5, we see the 'jump' between grades 5 and 6, indicating that fine-tuning did not reduce the sensitivity to shorter contexts.

5.2. Causal and Effect Analysis

While the analysis of raw results on WER, substitution, deletion, and insertion errors presented in Table 4 to 6 gives the understating of overall WER across different test sets, and variation across gender and age groups, but fails to consider the impact of other factors such signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), variation of pronunciation within age group, and exact impact of the number of words in context on WER. Hence, we utilize the *Causal analysis* approach, proposed in Section 3, to understand the relative impact of different causes such as **age**, **gender**, **pronunciation ability**,




Figure 6: Correlation heat maps between different speech foundation models across various age groups of children in the CSLU Kids corpus.

vocabulary difficulty, the severity of **background noise**, **the number of spoken words in audio** on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors.

5.2.1. Open-source SFMs

We analyze the relative impact of the above causes on open-source speech foundation models through *average causal effect*(ACE) presented in Table 7 and *conditional mutual information* (CMI) shown on the edges of causal *directed acyclic graphs* (DAGs) in Fig.7. A higher ACE of a particular cause indicates a higher impact of that cause on a particular error. Similarly, a higher CMI value on the edge of DAG indicates more impact of the parent on the child.

As per the ACE presented in Table 7, *number of words in audio* (*i.e. context*) and the *Age* have the highest impact on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors for all models. The negative value of ACE for these two causes indicates that the errors decrease as the age or number of words increases. We also note that the impact of context and age are highest on substitution error, while lowest on deletion error. Further, the *Whisper* model has the lowest ACE for Age and number of words, making it the most suitable open-source model for children’s ASR. Apart from the number of words and age, the *goodness of pronunciation* (GoP) and *signal-to-noise-ratio* (SNR) are other major causes impacting errors in children’s ASR. While gender has the lowest effect across the models.

Additionally, we also present the causal DAG for different models in Fig. 7. Unlike ACE, which captures the linear association between the cause and effect, CMI captures the non-linear degree of association between cause and effect [62]. Confirming to the findings of ACE, CMI also indicates the highest sensitivity of substitution, and insertion errors towards the number of words and age, GoP and SNR being the other major factor. Similarly, the *Whisper* model shows the lowest CMI between age/number-of-words and ASR errors. This part of the analysis answers the first question in Section 1.

- **Q-1: What is the extent of sensitivity in open-source SFMs to children’s physiology, cognitive ability, and extrinsic factors?**
- *Answer: Our cause-effect analysis indicates that the SFMs have the highest sensitivity towards a particular extrinsic factor, the number of words in context. Second-highest sensitivity is towards the physiological factor*

Table 6: Detailed WER Analysis across gender and age groups on CSLU Test set using fine-tuned speech foundation models.

		Grades											
Model	(%)	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
B	wav2vec	WER	32.4	21.3	19.1	18.4	23.8	22.3	64.6	56.8	55.0	56.9	55.6
		Subs	46.8	30.3	26.4	21.3	17.2	15.8	46.2	40.3	39.1	39.9	38.1
		Del	7.6	3.3	2.5	1.3	0.9	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	whisper	Ins	12.4	8.8	7.2	7.9	5.7	5.2	18.4	16.5	15.9	17.0	17.5
		WER	58.9	40.4	34.5	30.2	23.9	24.7	38.0	35.3	31.8	32.0	32.1
		Subs	37.8	23.5	19.9	16.0	12.5	12.9	25.6	23.7	22.1	22.2	21.7
	Hypo. Selection	Del	2.9	6.6	6.0	5.9	6.5	6.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Ins	18.2	10.3	8.6	8.3	4.9	5.3	12.4	11.6	9.7	9.8	10.4
		WER	42.47	27.34	21.33	18.26	14.18	15.47	23.63	20.13	17.83	17.62	17.60
		Subs	30.18	18.47	14.41	11.59	8.57	9.62	17.46	15.28	13.81	13.19	13.09
		Del	2.19	4.00	2.90	3.23	4.16	3.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Ins	10.09	4.87	4.02	3.44	1.45	1.86	6.17	4.85	4.02	4.43	4.51
G	wav2vec	WER	64.4	42.9	34.4	30.7	22.1	22.7	63.8	58.1	53.8	58.7	52.9
		Subs	45.0	31.1	25.6	22.2	15.8	16.3	44.7	41.9	39.9	39.7	36.6
		Del	7.5	2.6	1.7	1.1	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	whisper	Ins	11.9	9.2	7.0	7.4	5.7	5.5	19.1	16.3	13.9	19.0	16.4
		WER	53.9	37.8	32.5	29.9	24.6	26.2	39.3	35.0	32.8	34.9	25.9
		Subs	34.4	22.8	19.0	16.5	13.4	14.2	26.3	24.0	22.6	22.6	18.2
	Hypo. Selection	Del	2.3	5.8	5.6	5.7	5.6	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Ins	17.2	9.1	7.9	7.7	5.6	5.9	13.1	11.0	10.2	12.3	7.7
		WER	38.30	23.66	19.32	17.61	14.38	15.76	23.73	19.99	17.36	20.31	13.65
		Subs	27.00	17.15	13.13	11.50	8.66	10.03	16.83	14.63	12.79	13.88	9.96
		Del	2.31	2.58	3.10	3.19	4.19	3.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Ins	8.99	3.93	3.08	2.92	1.54	2.17	6.90	5.35	4.58	6.43	3.69

Age, while the other physiological factor Gender has negligible sensitivity. The cognitive factor has the least sensitivity among the physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors.

Finally, we also present CMI between $Age \rightarrow GoP$, and $Vocab Diff \rightarrow GoP$ Fig. 7 and Fig. 8. These two edges in our Causal DAGs help us to understand the factor affecting the pronunciation ability in children. We observe that the CMI between $Vocab Diff \rightarrow GoP$ is higher than that of $Age \rightarrow GoP$, indicating vocabulary difficulty affects the pronunciation ability more than the Age. This part of the analysis answers the third question in Section 1.

- **Q-2: To what degree does the cognitive ability of children characterized by pronunciation ability impacted by physiology characterized by age vs extrinsic factor characterized by linguistic complexity (e.g., vocabulary difficulty)?**
- *Answer: While both physiology and vocabulary difficulty affect pronunciation ability, vocabulary difficulty has a higher impact than that of physiology.*

5.2.2. Fine-tuned SFMs

Average causal effect(ACE) of fine-tuned Wav2Vec2.0 and Whisper models are presented in Table 7 and conditional mutual information (CMI) shown on the edges of causal directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) in Fig.8.

As per the ACE presented in Table 7 and Fig.8, fine-tuning gives the largest reduction in ACE for the Age, which indicates that fine-tuning reduces the sensitivity of SFM towards children’s physiology. While a moderate reduction in ACE and CMI for cognitive factor GoP is observed. This might be due to the mismatch in vocabulary between MyST train and the CSLU Test corpus, as GoP depends on vocabulary. On the other hand, the sensitivity of fine-tuned Wav2Vec2.0 and Whisper remains high for a particular extrinsic factor, the number of words in context. This indicates the limitation of SFMs towards transcribing shorter contexts. This part of the analysis addresses the third question Section ??.

- **Q-3: Does fine-tuning speech foundation models on child-specific speech datasets reduce the model’s sensitivity to children’s physiology, cognitive ability, and extrinsic factors? Which aspect benefits the most from fine-tuning, and which remains largely unaffected?**

Table 7: Average causal effect analysis of different interventions on substitution, deletion, and insertion errors

Model	Interventions	Open-source			Finetuned		
		Subs	Del	Ins	Subs	Del	Ins
Wav2Vec	Age	-4.36	-0.10	-1.60	-2.12	-0.04	-2.81
	Gender	0.80	0.17	0.87	0.25	0.06	0.22
	GoP	-1.07	-0.25	-0.88	-	-	-
	SNR	-1.08	0.09	0.28	-0.58	0.11	0.09
	# Words in Audio	-9.20	0.30	-4.23	-7.14	0.36	-3.12
HuBERT	Age	-4.10	-0.06	-2.99	-	-	-
	Gender	0.86	0.02	1.04	-	-	-
	GoP	-1.51	-0.20	-1.45	-	-	-
	SNR	-0.99	0.091	1.42	-	-	-
	# Words in Audio	-7.96	0.27	-5.31	-	-	-
Whisper	Age	-3.25	-0.20	-2.16	-3.0	0.32	-2.22
	Gender	0.62	0.37	1.15	1.90	0.10	1.33
	GoP	-1.25	-0.18	0.35	-1.10	-0.49	-0.05
	SNR	-1.21	0.14	-0.21	-1.02	0.15	-0.36
	# Words in Audio	-5.10	1.02	-3.45	-5.53	1.20	-3.59
MMS	Age	-3.60	-0.06	-5.89	-	-	-
	Gender	0.66	-0.17	1.96	-	-	-
	GoP	-1.51	-0.33	3.78	-	-	-
	SNR	-2.19	0.06	-7.86	-	-	-
	# Words in Audio	-12.54	0.52	-13.22	-	-	-

- *Answer: Our findings indicate the fine-tuning largely reduces the sensitivity of SFMs towards the physiological factor characterized by age. While the sensitivity towards extrinsic factor, shorter context, remains.*

6. Conclusion

In this study, we propose a causal inference (CI)-based approach to quantify the sensitivity of speech foundation models (SFMs) to children’s physiological, cognitive, and extrinsic factors. Our findings reveal that SFMs exhibit the highest sensitivity to physiological factors, particularly age, while gender has a negligible impact. Additionally, SFMs are sensitive to an extrinsic factor related to shorter context lengths.

Cause-effect analysis on fine-tuned models shows that fine-tuning improves SFMs’ generalization to physiological variability, but the sensitivity to architectural limitations, such as shorter context, persists. On the other hand, fine-tuning has a moderate effect on sensitivity towards cognitive factors characterized by the goodness of pronunciation (GoP).

Importantly, although we apply this CI-based approach to children’s speech, it can be easily extended to other speech-processing tasks, such as assessing the sensitivity of speech systems to different speech attributes in spoofed speech detection, paving the way for explainable speech AI.

Appendix A. Causal Inference

Causal inference aims to establish cause-and-effect relationships rather than mere statistical associations. The causal relation is represented through Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs). Given a joint distribution over n variables, a DAG encodes all information about how interventions on one variable affect the others. Formally, let G be a causal DAG with nodes X_1, \dots, X_n . An edge $X_i \rightarrow X_j$ implies that X_i directly influences X_j .

As shown in Figure A.9, X_1 has no parents, X_2 has X_1 as its parent ($PA_2 = \{X_1\}$), X_3 has X_2, X_1 as its parent ($PA_3 = \{X_2, X_1\}$), and X_2 and X_3 are descendants of X_1 .

According to the factorization rule, the joint probability distribution $P(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ can be written as:

$$P(X_1, X_2, X_3) = P(X_1) \cdot P(X_2 | X_1) \cdot P(X_3 | X_2)$$

. This factorization reflects the structure of the DAG, where $P(X_1)$ is the marginal probability of X_1 since X_1 has no parents. $P(X_2 | X_1)$ is the conditional probability of X_2 given X_1 . $P(X_3 | X_2)$ is the conditional probability of X_3 given X_2 .

According to the Causal Markov Condition (CMC) [61, 62], every node X_j is conditionally independent of its nondescendants, given its parents with respect to the causal DAG G .

In practice, CMC is important for simplifying the analysis of complex systems. By identifying a Markov sufficient set, one can reduce the dimensionality of the problem and focus on a subset of variables that captures all the necessary dependency information.

Given the CMC sufficiency, the joint probability distribution $P(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ factorizes according to the DAG structure as:

$$P(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n P(X_j | \text{PA}_j), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where PA_j denotes the set of parent variables of X_j in G .

Interventions in a causal system are represented using Pearl's *do*-calculus. The intervention $do(X_i = x_i)$ modifies the distribution by setting X_i to x_i and propagating the effect through the DAG. The resulting distribution of a variable Y given an intervention on X is denoted by $P(Y|do(X = x))$.

Some common approaches to measuring the strength of causal relation in DAG include: (1.) Average Causal Effect (ACE), (2.) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and (3.) Mutual Information.

Appendix A.1. Average Causal Effect (ACE)

The Average Causal Effect (ACE) measures the average outcome difference between treated and untreated individuals. It is particularly useful in randomized experiments where treatment is assigned randomly. For a binary treatment variable T , ACE is defined as:

$$\text{ACE}(X_i \rightarrow X_j) = P(X_j = 1 | do(X_i = 1)) - P(X_j = 1 | do(X_i = 0)) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $Y(1)$ and $Y(0)$ are the potential outcomes if the individual receives or does not receive the treatment, respectively.

In the context of observational studies, ACE can be estimated using the propensity score, which is the probability of receiving the treatment given covariates X :

$$e(X) = \Pr(T = 1 | X). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By matching individuals with similar propensity scores from the treatment and control groups, we can estimate the ACE more accurately:

$$\hat{\text{ACE}} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i:T_i=1} Y_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i:T_i=0} Y_i, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where n_1 and n_0 are the number of treated and control individuals, respectively.

Appendix A.2. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a statistical method used to compare the means of three or more groups to see if at least one of them is significantly different. ANOVA decomposes the total variance observed in the data into variance between groups and variance within groups.

The total variance (SS_{Total}) is given by:

$$\text{SS}_{\text{Total}} = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where \bar{Y} is the overall mean of the data.

The between-group variance (SS_{Between}) is:

$$SS_{\text{Between}} = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j (\bar{Y}_j - \bar{Y})^2, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where \bar{Y}_j is the mean of group j and n_j is the number of observations in group j .

The within-group variance (SS_{Within}) is:

$$SS_{\text{Within}} = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_j)^2, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

ANOVA tests the null hypothesis that all group means are equal against the alternative hypothesis that at least one group mean is different. The F-statistic is used to determine the significance:

$$F = \frac{MS_{\text{Between}}}{MS_{\text{Within}}}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $MS_{\text{Between}} = \frac{SS_{\text{Between}}}{k-1}$ and $MS_{\text{Within}} = \frac{SS_{\text{Within}}}{n-k}$.

Appendix A.3. Mutual Information

Mutual information is a measure of the amount of information that one random variable contains about another random variable. It quantifies the reduction in uncertainty about one variable given knowledge of the other.

For two discrete random variables X and Y , mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is defined as:

$$I(X; Y) = \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} P(x, y) \log \left(\frac{P(x, y)}{P(x)P(y)} \right), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where $P(x, y)$ is the joint probability distribution of X and Y , and $P(x)$ and $P(y)$ are the marginal probability distributions.

Mutual information can also be expressed in terms of entropy:

$$I(X; Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $H(X)$ is the entropy of X , and $H(X|Y)$ is the conditional entropy of X given Y .

Entropy $H(X)$ is defined as:

$$H(X) = - \sum_{x \in X} P(x) \log P(x). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Conditional entropy $H(X|Y)$ is:

$$H(X|Y) = - \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} P(x, y) \log P(x|y). \quad (\text{A.12})$$


Mutual information is always non-negative and is zero if and only if X and Y are independent.

References


- [1] Graafland, J. H. (2018). "New technologies and 21st century children," Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (179), www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/paper/e071a505-en.
- [2] Bittman, M., Rutherford, L., Brown, J., and Unsworth, L. (2011). "Digital natives? new and old media and children's outcomes," Australian Journal of Education 55, 161–175.
- [3] Shobaki, K., Hosom, J.-P., and Cole, R. (2000). "The OGI kids' speech corpus and recognizers," in *Proc. Interspeech*.
- [4] Pradhan, S. S., Cole, R. A., and Ward, W. H. (2023). "My science tutor (MyST)—a large corpus of children's conversational speech," arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13347.

- [5] Yu, F., et al. (2020). "The SLT 2021 Children Speech Recognition Challenge: Open Datasets, Rules and Baselines," 2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT), 1117–1123.
- [6] Singh, V. P., Sailor, H., Bhattacharya, S., and Pandey, A. (2022). "Spectral Modification Based Data Augmentation For Improving End-to-End ASR For Children's Speech," Proc. Interspeech.
- [7] Patel, T. and Scharenborg, O. (2024). "Improving End-to-End Models for Children's Speech Recognition," Applied Sciences **14**(6), 2353.
- [8] Fan, R., Shankar, N., and Alwan, A. (2024). "Benchmarking Children's ASR with Supervised and Self-supervised Speech Foundation Models," Interspeech.
- [9] Jain, R., Barcovschi, A., Yiwere, M. Y., Bigioi, D., Corcoran, P., and Cucu, H. (2023). "A Wav2Vec2-Based Experimental Study on Self-Supervised Learning Methods to Improve Child Speech Recognition," IEEE Access **11**, 46938–46948.
- [10] Gurunath Shivakumar, P. and Narayanan, S. (2022). "End-to-end neural systems for automatic children speech recognition: An empirical study," Computer Speech & Language **72**, 101289.
- [11] Yang, Shu-wen, et al.. (2024). "A Large-Scale Evaluation of Speech Foundation Models," IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, **32**, 2884–2899.
- [12] Hu, Shujie, et al.. (2024). "Self-Supervised ASR Models and Features for Dysarthric and Elderly Speech Recognition," IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, **32**, 3561–3575.
- [13] Cao, Jie, et al.. (2023). "A Comparative Analysis of Automatic Speech Recognition Errors in Small Group Classroom Discourse," Proceedings of the 31st ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization, pp. 250–262.
- [14] Bent, T., et al.. (2021). "How pronunciation distance impacts word recognition in children and adults," J Acoust Soc Am **150**, 6, 4103.
- [15] Southwell, R., et al.. (2024). "Automatic Speech Recognition Tuned for Child Speech in the Classroom," IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pp. 12291-12295.
- [16] Li, Qun, and Martin Russell. (2002). "An analysis of the causes of increased error rates in children's speech recognition," Proceedings of the International Conference on Spoken Language Processing (ICSLP), 09, doi: 10.21437/ICSLP.2002-221.
- [17] Zhang, Min, and Jennifer A. Hudson. (2018). "The Development of Temporal Concepts: Linguistic Factors and Cognitive Processes," Frontiers in Psychology, **9**, 12, 2451, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02451. PMID: 30568621; PMCID: PMC6290033.
- [18] Committee on the Science of Children Birth to Age 8: Deepening and Broadening the Foundation for Success, Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Institute of Medicine, National Research Council, Allen, L., Kelly, B.B. (2015). "Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation," National Academies Press (US), Washington (DC). PMID: 26269871.
- [19] Attia, Ahmed Adel, et al.. (2023). "Kid-Whisper: Towards Bridging the Performance Gap in Automatic Speech Recognition for Children VS. Adults," ArXiv, abs/2309.07927.
- [20] Jain, Rishabh, et al.. (2023). "Adaptation of Whisper models to child speech recognition," ArXiv, abs/2307.13008.
- [21] Mikolov, Tomas, Kai Chen, G.s Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. (2013). "Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space," Proceedings of Workshop at ICLR, 2013, 01.
- [22] Baevski, Alexei, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. (2020). "wav2vec 2.0: A Framework for Self-Supervised Learning of Speech Representations," Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [23] Hsu, Wei-Ning, et al.. (2021). "HuBERT: Self-Supervised Speech Representation Learning by Masked Prediction of Hidden Units," IEEE/ACM Trans. Audio, Speech and Lang. Proc. **29**, 3451–3460.
- [24] Radford, Alec, et al.. (2023). "Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision," Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning.
- [25] Pratap, Vineel, et al.. (2024). "Scaling Speech Technology to 1,000+ Languages," Journal of Machine Learning Research **25**, 97, 1–52.
- [26] Fan, Ruchao, Yunzheng Zhu, Jinhan Wang, and Abeer Alwan. (2022). "Towards Better Domain Adaptation for Self-Supervised Models: A Case Study of Child ASR," IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing **16**, 6, 1242-1252.
- [27] Miller, T. (2017). "Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences,," In CoRR, abs/1706.07269.
- [28] Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). "Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning,," In arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608.
- [29] Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., & Bengio, Y. (2014). "Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate,," In arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473.
- [30] Kim, B., Khanna, R., & Koyejo, O. O. (2016). "Examples are not enough, learn to criticize! criticism for interpretability,," In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, **2280–2288**.
- [31] Renkl, A. (2014). "Toward an instructionally oriented theory of example-based learning,," In Cognitive science, **38**(1), 1–37.
- [32] Erhan, D., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., & Vincent, P. (2009). "Visualizing higher-layer features of a deep network,," In University of Montreal, **1341**(3), 1.
- [33] Simonyan, K., Vedaldi, A., & Zisserman, A. (2013). "Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps,," In Proceedings of the ICLR 2014 Workshop.
- [34] Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). "Why should i trust you?: Explaining the predictions of any classifier,," In Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, 1135–1144. ACM.
- [35] Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). "Attention is all you need,," In Advances in neural information processing systems, 5998–6008.
- [36] Wu, Y., Zhang, L., Wu, X., & Tong, H. (2019). "Pc-fairness: A unified framework for measuring causality-based fairness,," In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 3399–3409.
- [37] Yang, Z., Yang, D., Dyer, C., He, X., Smola, A., & Hovy, E. (2016). "Hierarchical attention networks for document classification,," In Proceedings of the 2016 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, 1480–1489.
- [38] Yang, F., Du, M., & Hu, X. (2019). "Evaluating explanation without ground truth in interpretable machine learning,,"
- [39] Moraffah, R., Karami, M., Guo, R., Raglin, A., & Liu, H. (2020). "Causal Interpretability for Machine Learning - Problems, Methods and Evaluation,," In SIGKDD Explor. Newsl., **22**, 1, 18–33. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400051.3400058>.


- [40] Gendron, G., Witbrock, M., & Dobbie, G. (2023). "A Survey of Methods, Challenges and Perspectives in Causality.," CoRR, **abs/2302.00293**. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.00293>.
- [41] Colombo, D., Maathuis, M. H., Kalisch, M., & Richardson, T. S. (2012). "Learning high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with latent and selection variables.," *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 294–321.
- [42] Zhou, J., Lin, Y., Chen, Q., Zhang, Q., Huang, X., & He, L. (2024). "CausalABSC: Causal Inference for Aspect Debiasing in Aspect-Based Sentiment Classification.," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, **32**, 830-840.
- [43] Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2006). "Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models.," Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [44] Zecevic, M., Dhimi, D. S., Velickovic, P., & Kersting, K. (2021). "Relating Graph Neural Networks to Structural Causal Models.," CoRR, **abs/2109.04173**.
- [45] Pearl, J. (2009). "Causality (2 ed.).," Cambridge University Press.
- [46] Xia, K., Lee, K. Z., Bengio, Y., & Bareinboim, E. (2021). "The Causal-Neural Connection: Expressiveness, Learnability, and Inference.," In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, NeurIPS 2021.
- [47] Spirtes, P., & Glymour, C. (1991). "An Algorithm for Fast Recovery of Sparse Causal Graphs.," *Social Science Computer Review*, **9**, 1, 62–72.
- [48] Spirtes, P., Glymour, C. N., & Scheines, R. (2000). "Causation, Prediction, and Search.," MIT Press.
- [49] Nakatsu, R.T. (2024). "Explainable AI in Machine Learning Regression: Creating Transparency of a Regression Model.," In: Nah, F.F.H., and Siau, K.L., (eds) HCI in Business, Government and Organizations. HCII 2024. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 14720. Springer, Cham.
- [50] Gonzalez Hautamäki, R., Hautamäki, V., Kinnunen, T. (2019). "On the limits of automatic speaker verification: Explaining degraded recognizer scores through acoustic changes resulting from voice disguise," *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*, **146**, 1, 693.
- [51] Singh, V. P., Sahidullah, M., Kinnunen, T. (2023). "Speaker Verification Across Ages: Investigating Deep Speaker Embedding Sensitivity to Age Mismatch in Enrollment and Test Speech," *Proc. Interspeech 2023*, 1948–1952.
- [52] Walker, E. A., Redfern, A., Oleson, J. J. (2019). "Linear Mixed-Model Analysis to Examine Longitudinal Trajectories in Vocabulary Depth and Breadth in Children Who Are Hard of Hearing," *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.* **62**, 3, 525–542.
- [53] Wei, Author. (2022). "Automatic Speech Recognition and Pronunciation Error Detection of Dutch Non-native Speech: cumulating speech resources in a pluricentric language," *Speech Communication*, **144**, 1–9.
- [54] Duskin, Omer. (2023). "Estimating Word Difficulty In English Using Python: A Practical Guide," Available online: <https://medium.com/@omerduskin/estimating-word-difficulty-in-english-using-python-a-practical-guide-8f6812de5122>.
- [55] Shi, R., Werker, J., & Cutler, A. (2003). "Function words in early speech perception.," In *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, **3009–3012**.
- [56] Hornung, C., Martin, R., & Fayol, M. (2017). "The power of vowels: Contributions of vowel, consonant, and digit RAN to clinical approaches in reading development.," *Learning and Individual Differences*, **57**, 85–102.
- [57] Franco, Horacio, Lee Neumeier, Mari Ostendorf, and Howard Bratt. (1999). "Automatic detection of phone-level mispronunciation for language learning," In *Sixth European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*.
- [58] Zhang, Fan, Chao Huang, Frank K. Soong, Min Chu, and Ren-Hua Wang. (2008). "Automatic mispronunciation detection for Mandarin," *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, 5077–5080.
- [59] Mathad, Vikram C., Tristram J. Mahr, Nancy Scherer, Kathy Chapman, Katherine C. Hustad, Julie Liss, and Visar Berisha. (2021). "The Impact of Forced-Alignment Errors on Automatic Pronunciation Evaluation," *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, 1922–1926. doi:10.21437/Interspeech.2021-1403.
- [60] McAuliffe, Michael, Michaela Socolof, Sarah Mihuc, Michael Wagner, and Morgan Sonderegger. (2017). "Montreal Forced Aligner: Trainable Text-Speech Alignment Using Kaldi," *Proc. Interspeech 2017*, 498–502. doi:10.21437/Interspeech.2017-1386.
- [61] Yao, Liuyi, Zhixuan Chu, Sheng Li, Yaliang Li, Jing Gao, and Aidong Zhang. (2021). "A Survey on Causal Inference," *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* **15**(5).
- [62] Janzing, Dominik, et al. (2013). "QUANTIFYING CAUSAL INFLUENCES.," *The Annals of Statistics* **41**(5), 2324–58.
- [63] Moraffah, Raha, Mansooreh Karami, Ruocheng Guo, Adrienne Raglin, and Huan Liu. (2020). "Causal Interpretability for Machine Learning - Problems, Methods and Evaluation," *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.* **22**(1), 18–33.
- [64] Schölkopf, B., F. Locatello, S. Bauer, N. R. Ke, N. Kalchbrenner, A. Goyal, and Y. Bengio. (2021). ".,," *Proceedings of the IEEE* **109**(5), 612–634.
- [65] Castro, D.C., Walker, I., and Glocker, B. (2020). "Causality matters in medical imaging," *Nat Commun*, **11**, 3673.
- [66] Termine, A., A. Antonucci, and A. Facchini. (2023). "Machine Learning Explanations by Surrogate Causal Models (MaLESCaMo)," xAI (Late-breaking Work, Demos, Doctoral Consortium).
- [67] Liu, Xiaoyu, et al. (2024). "Large language models and causal inference in collaboration: A comprehensive survey," arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09606.
- [68] Feder, Amir, et al. (2022). "Causal Inference in Natural Language Processing: Estimation, Prediction, Interpretation and Beyond," *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- [69] Graves, Alex, Santiago Fernández, Faustino Gomez, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. (2006). "Connectionist temporal classification: Labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks," *Proc. ICML*.
- [70] Vaswani, Ashish, et al. (2017). "Attention is All You Need," *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [71] Chen, Ting, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. (2020). "A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations," *Pro. ICML*.
- [72] Park, Daniel S., William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, and Quoc V. Le. (2019). "SpecAugment: A Simple Data Augmentation Method for Automatic Speech Recognition," *Proc. Interspeech*.
- [73] Panayotov, Vassil, Guoguo Chen, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. (2015). "LibriSpeech: An ASR corpus based on public domain audio books," *Proc. ICASSP*.




(a) Wav2Vec2.0.



(b) HuBERT.




(c) Whisper.




(d) MMS.

Figure 7: Mutual Information based cause and effect analysis for different open-source models.



(a) Wav2Vec2.0.



(b) Whisper.

Figure 8: Mutual Information based cause and effect analysis for different fine-tuned models.




Figure A.9: Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) illustrating the causal relationships where X_2 is a parent of X_3 , X_1 is a parent of both X_2 and X_3 , making X_1 a confounder. X_2 and X_3 are descendants of x_1 .