

# EXPLORATION OF LANGUAGE DEPENDENCY FOR JAPANESE SELF-SUPERVISED SPEECH REPRESENTATION MODELS

Takanori Ashihara, Takafumi Moriya, Kohei Matsuura, Tomohiro Tanaka

NTT Corporation, Japan

## ABSTRACT

Self-supervised learning (SSL) has been dramatically successful not only in monolingual but also in cross-lingual settings. However, since the two settings have been studied individually in general, there has been little research focusing on how effective a cross-lingual model is in comparison with a monolingual model. In this paper, we investigate this fundamental question empirically with Japanese automatic speech recognition (ASR) tasks. First, we begin by comparing the ASR performance of cross-lingual and monolingual models for two different language tasks while keeping the acoustic domain as identical as possible. Then, we examine how much unlabeled data collected in Japanese is needed to achieve performance comparable to a cross-lingual model pre-trained with tens of thousands of hours of English and/or multilingual data. Finally, we extensively investigate the effectiveness of SSL in Japanese and demonstrate state-of-the-art performance on multiple ASR tasks. Since there is no comprehensive SSL study for Japanese, we hope this study will guide Japanese SSL research.

**Index Terms**— self-supervised learning, speech representation, language dependency, automatic speech recognition, low-resource

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, self-supervised learning (SSL) has attracted much attention in the speech community [1]. Since SSL is unsupervised representation learning, pre-trained models can capture speech information contained in unlabeled data. A variety of SSL methods have been proposed and feature impressive performance, especially in the automatic speech recognition (ASR) task in English [2–7]. Subsequent studies have also shown task generalizability with better performance than hand-crafted features (e.g., log mel filterbank output) for a variety of downstream tasks such as speaker verification and emotion recognition [8, 9].

In addition to task generalizability, SSL models have demonstrated language generalizability to alleviate the problem of data scarcity. For example, some studies have built a multilingual or English pre-trained model for improving performance not only for English but also for low-resource languages [10–13]. This universal representation democratizes speech tasks in a low-resource language, and thereby, various models in desired languages are publicly available from open-access platforms such as the Hugging Face model hub<sup>1</sup>. In the above studies and released models, to evaluate transferability to other languages, the downstream non-English models are typically constructed in the context of transfer learning, in which a multilingual or English model is fine-tuned with a small amount of target language data (model (a) shown in Figure 1).

However, despite the success of cross-lingual models, there has been little understanding of how effective the language transferabil-




Fig. 1. SSL-based models for target languages.

ity of multilingual models is in comparison with monolingual models pre-trained and fine-tuned in a monolingual setting (model (b) in Figure 1). In other words, how strongly does the SSL model depend on the language? More concretely, we can ask if training data can be collected for the target language sufficiently, can a monolingual model achieve higher accuracy than a cross-lingual model? And if so, how much unlabeled data in the target language is required for pre-training to achieve higher accuracy than a multilingual/English model that is pre-trained with tens of thousands of hours? Due to the substantial computing and energy costs of attempting SSL many times, this fundamental question is critical to determining whether pre-training is expected to achieve sufficient performance. For example, some low-resource domains cannot reap the benefits of generalizability [14], and hence, this implication would help to identify possible applications of SSL. Furthermore, in practical scenarios, it is often possible to collect hundreds of hours of non-English unlabeled data for languages that have a certain number of daily speakers, such as Asian or Indian languages.

In this paper, we focus on Japanese SSL with open-access corpora. First, we compare the ASR performance of models (a) and (b) illustrated in Figure 1 to identify the language dependency of SSL on the JNAS dataset [15]. Since the JNAS is a low-resource corpus containing a set of newspaper readings in Japanese, the acoustical domain is similar to CommonVoice [16], LibriSpeech [17], Multilingual LibriSpeech [18], and Libri-Light [19] except for the language. Second, we analyze the relationship between the amount of Japanese unlabeled data and the performance to find out how much data is needed to rank with the multilingual SSL model on the JNAS task. The results of the above exploration demonstrate that language dependency is crucial rather than acoustical dependency, and furthermore, a monolingual model pre-trained on 200 hours shows comparable performance to a multilingual model. Finally, to the best of our knowledge, since there are no articles on Japanese SSL unlike other non-English languages [20–22], we extensively investigate an SSL-based ASR model and achieve state-of-the-art error rates on multiple Japanese ASR tasks.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Some pre-trained models in Japanese will be released to accelerate Japanese SSL research at the following URL: <https://huggingface.co/ashi-ta/japanese-pretrained-ckpt>

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/models>

## 2. RELATED WORK

Previous studies have reported on the impact of dataset domains for SSL. For example, [23] investigated how the in-domain and out-of-domain datasets used for pre-training affect the downstream ASR performance and demonstrated that an in-domain dataset is effective in any situation. [24] also explored the effect of dataset bias such as the gender or speed of speech. These works mainly focused on how much the dataset domain of unlabeled data affects the performance of downstream tasks in English, whereas not much was elucidated about language transferability/dependency. Because SSL representations have been suggested to be partly correlated phonemic structures that have a certain relationship to language [2], this paper investigates how much language dependency affects the performance in a downstream ASR system.

## 3. METHOD

### 3.1. Self-supervised learning

#### 3.1.1. wav2vec 2.0

In this paper, we focus on wav2vec 2.0 [3] among the various SSL methods. In general, the architecture of a pre-trained model consists of two main components:

$$\mathbf{H}^0 = \text{Convolution}(\mathbf{X}), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{H}^l = \text{Encoder}(\mathbf{H}^{l-1}), \quad (2)$$

where  $\text{Convolution}(\cdot)$  is a multilayer convolutional network (CNN) that maps input audio  $\mathbf{X}$  to latent feature  $\mathbf{Z} = \{\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_T\}$  with downsampling. After the first components, the representation is fed into an  $\text{Encoder}(\cdot)$  model such as Transformer to output hidden speech representation  $\mathbf{H}^l = \{\mathbf{h}_1^l, \dots, \mathbf{h}_T^l\}$ . Here,  $l$  and  $T$  are the block index of  $\text{Encoder}(\cdot)$  and output sequence length, respectively. We define the final output of  $\text{Encoder} \mathbf{H}^l$  as context representations  $\mathbf{C} = \{\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_T\}$ .

For training objectives, wav2vec 2.0 utilize the quantized representation  $\mathbf{Q} = \{\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_T\}$  calculated from  $\mathbf{Z}$  as a training target. When pre-training, the input to  $\text{Encoder}(\cdot)$  is masked at a certain proportion of time steps, and the contrastive loss is computed from  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

#### 3.1.2. Input audio feature

Although the input to  $\text{Convolution}(\cdot)$  generally uses a raw waveform (WAV), deep CNNs may not be able to acquire an adequate feature representation from a small amount of WAVs. Therefore, we investigate not only a WAV but also log mel-filterbank output (FBANK) for inputting to SSL models [25]. Specifically, we extract 80-dimensional FBANK features with a 25 ms window width and 10 ms shift extracted from raw audio. To normalize the features, we subject the data set to pre-estimated global cepstral mean and variance normalization (CMVN). With the application of FBANK, the composition of  $\text{Convolution}(\cdot)$  is also modified from the 7-L 1-D CNNs used in the original wav2vec 2.0 model to the 2-L 2-D convolutional layers. Each 2-D convolution layer has 32 channels with a kernel size of 3 and stride of 2, and hence the output temporal resolution is reduced by a factor of 4 against the FBANK sequence, resulting in the reduction of GPU memory consumption.

#### 3.1.3. Encoder architecture

In addition to the type of audio input, we compare the Conformer [26] encoder with the Transformer encoder for the  $\text{Encoder}(\cdot)$  component. Recent studies have reported the effectiveness of the Conformer encoder for SSL in English [25, 27], but there is no

**Table 1.** Domain and amount of Japanese datasets in hours after pre-processing by using ESPnet recipes. Each column shows amount of data for training, development, and multiple evaluation sets. Considering amount of training data, four tasks can be divided into top two (high-resource) and bottom two (low-resource) rows.

Dataset	Domain	Train	Dev	Test
CSJ	Spontaneous speech	515.6	6.5	dev / eval1 / eval2 / eval3 6.5 / 1.8 / 1.9 / 1.3
LTVS	Broadcast speech	2031.2	5.0	dev / dev-4k / tedx-jp-10k 5.0 / 13.7 / 8.9
JNAS	Newspaper readings	47.8	2.5	dev / testset-100 / testset-500 2.5 / 1.6 / 1.9
JSUT	Text readings	9.7	0.3	dev / eval1 0.3 / 0.3

comparative study in Japanese. In this paper, we adopt a Conformer block comprised of a multi-head self-attention module with relative position encoding, a convolution module, and a feed-forward module.

### 3.2. ASR system

After SSL, the pre-trained model is optimized using a Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) [28] criterion. When fine-tuning, we investigate where to apply feature masking similar to SpecAugment [29]. In the original wav2vec 2.0 paper, this operation is applied after  $\text{Convolution}(\cdot)$  (post-CNN) as temporal/channel masking. However, when inputting FBANK, the same transformation can be applied before the  $\text{Convolution}(\cdot)$  (pre-CNN) as temporal/spectral masking which is more similar to the original SpecAugment. Because the convolutional module can also be regularized in addition to  $\text{Encoder}(\cdot)$ , the ASR performance can be further improved for the FBANK-based model.

## 4. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### 4.1. Dataset

For Japanese speech data, we utilized four publicly available corpora: the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese (CSJ) [30], Laboro TVSpeech (LTVS) [31], Japanese Newspaper Article Sentences (JNAS) [15], and the Japanese speech corpus of Saruwatari Laboratory, the University of Tokyo (JSUT) [32]. Table 1 summarizes the domain and the amount of datasets after preparation with each recipe in ESPnet [33]. Since JNAS is recorded from speakers reading newspaper articles, the acoustical domain is close to LibriSpeech (LS) [17], CommonVoice [16], Multilingual LibriSpeech [18] and Libri-Light [19], which are derived from audiobooks or reading sentences. On the other hand, CSJ contains a collection of academic presentation speeches and simulated public speeches, which is analogous to the TED-LIUM-v2 (TED2) corpus [34] collected from TED talks.

For SSL, as unlabeled data, we utilized only high-resource corpora, specifically CSJ, LTVS, and LS. For fine-tuning, we defined six ASR tasks with full labeled data and categorized them into two resource-based situations; CSJ, LTVS, and LS belong to the high-resource situation, and JNAS, JSUT, and TED50h belong to the low-resource one. Here, TED50h is an English dataset randomly extracted from the TED2 corpus for only 50 hours to make the amount of data roughly equivalent to JNAS. We utilized all data contained in each corpus unless otherwise stated.

## 4.2. Training and evaluation

### 4.2.1. Pre-training

The model architecture explored in this paper is based on [3] and we used the same setting as the wav2vec 2.0 BASE model for the Transformer encoder. As the Conformer encoder, we used 12 blocks containing a multi-head self-attention with 768-dim embeddings and 12 heads, a convolution module with a kernel size of 31, and a 3072-dim feed-forward module. We basically operated with 16-bit floating point (FP16) arithmetic but with FP32 only when we encountered the gradient overflow issue. Note that the hyperparameters related to input length were converted from sample units to frame units when pre-training and fine-tuning with FBANK as input. For example, if the maximum batch size per GPU is 87.5 seconds for WAV input, then there are 8750 frames for FBANK input.

In our experiment, we also compared with released pre-trained models available from fairseq.<sup>3</sup>

### 4.2.2. Fine-tuning

We fine-tuned the SSL model with two types of configurations in relation to the resource-based situations described in Section 4.1. For the high-resource situation, we used the same setup as in the case where the wav2vec 2.0 BASE model was fine-tuned with LS 960h [3] except for the parameters for masking as described below. The other type is for the low-resource situation, with the maximum number of training steps reduced to 80 k and the peak of the learning rate reduced to  $3 \times 10^{-5}$ . As stated in Section 3.2, during fine-tuning, we adopt two positions and hyperparameters for masking: temporal (channel) masking with a length of 10 (64) and probability of 0.5 (0.1) for the post-CNN, and temporal (spectral) masking with a length of 20 (30) and probability of 0.65 (0.1) for the pre-CNN. In addition, we freeze the feature encoder Convolution(·) only when applying post-CNN masking. The output vocabulary was characters in all tasks, and the vocabulary number was 3259, 3949, 2272, 2739, 28 and 31 for the CSJ, LTVS, JNAS, JSUT, LS and TED50h tasks, respectively.

### 4.2.3. Decoding

We performed Viterbi decoding using a CTC model that averaged the weights of multiple checkpoints. During fine-tuning, we evaluated the model every 6400 steps for high-resource tasks and 1600 steps for low-resource tasks and stored the top-5 checkpoints for averaging. Here, the evaluation measure was the character error rate (CER) for Japanese tasks and word error rate (WER) for English tasks.

All the above training and decoding processes were implemented with fairseq<sup>4</sup> [35].

## 5. RESULTS


Here, we first offer the analysis results from Section 5.1 to Section 5.3 and then provide the performances of our SSL-based ASR models for various Japanese tasks. For the sake of simplicity, we used a Transformer-based SSL model fine-tuned with post-CNN masking except in Section 5.4,

### 5.1. WAV vs. FBANK

First of all, to verify the impact of the input audio type used in our experiment, we compared the performance of the models inputting WAV and FBANK. Table 2 shows the results for the LS and CSJ models, which were pre-trained and fine-tuned with the same

**Table 2.** Effect of input type on LS and CSJ when pre-training and fine-tuning on same data. Note that WAV input model of LS is publicly available wav2vec 2.0 BASE.

(Un)labeled data	Input type	WER			
		dev-clean	dev-other	test-clean	test-other
LS	WAV	3.2	8.9	3.4	8.4
	FBANK	3.2	9.0	3.4	8.7
(Un)labeled data	Input type	CER			
		dev	eval1	eval2	eval3
CSJ	WAV	4.0	4.7	3.5	3.8
	FBANK	3.4	4.6	3.2	3.7



**Fig. 2.** Evaluation result for different SSL models on JNAS (left-bar) and TED50h (right-bar) tasks. LL-LARGE is taken from released wav2vec 2.0 LARGE model pre-trained on Libri-Light [19].

dataset. There was no severe degradation for LS but rather a performance improvement for CSJ. This is possible because the amount of data in CSJ is approximately half the volume of LS, leading to the difficulty of optimizing deep CNNs that encode WAV to latent features. On the basis of these results, subsequent analyses basically use the FBANK input model for Japanese SSL.

### 5.2. Language dependency

For this section, we analyze the language dependency with four SSL models: the Japanese model pre-trained on CSJ, a publicly available wav2vec 2.0 LARGE model pre-trained on Libri-Light [19], XLSR-53 [12], and XLS-R-128<sup>5</sup> [13]. Figure 2 illustrates the performances of two low-resource ASR tasks in Japanese (JNAS; left-bar) and in English (TED50h; right-bar). Note that each error rate is averaged over all test sets within each task. The result shows that the multilingual models showed clear language generalizability (7.1%/7.9% for XLSR-53 and 6.9%/8.3% for XLS-R-128), but each monolingual model had lower error rates in the corresponding language task; the CSJ model achieved 6.5%/25.5%, and the LL-LARGE model achieved 8.1%/7.2% on the JNAS/TED50h task. Because the dataset domain of the CSJ and LL-LARGE SSL models is similar to TED50h and JNAS, respectively, this indicates that it is critical to pre-train and fine-tune in the same language rather than in the same acoustical domain.

### 5.3. Amount of unlabeled data


Section 5.2 shows results emphasizing the language dependency of SSL rather than the acoustical dependency and obvious language generalizability of the multilingual model. However the above results are only possible when a sufficient amount of unlabeled data

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq/tree/main/examples/wav2vec>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq>

<sup>5</sup>We used XLS-R (0.3B) pre-trained on 128 languages with the same architecture as XLSR-53 from the following link:

<https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq/tree/main/examples/wav2vec/xlsr>



**Fig. 3.** Evaluation result with different amounts of unlabeled data on JNAS, which is out-of-domain setting for all models.

in the target language has been collected such as CSJ. Therefore, we assume several conditions with different amounts of unlabeled data in Japanese and investigate how much collected unlabeled data would reverse the performance of the multilingual model. Specifically, in this analysis, we built Japanese SSL models on five different data volumes for comparison with the multilingual models and performed the same experiment with LTVS as well as CSJ for confirmation. Figure 3 presents the relationship between the number of Japanese unlabeled data and the CERs averaged over three evaluation sets on the JNAS task. The results indicated that the models pre-trained in approximately 200 hours achieved comparable performance to the multilingual models, and this trend is seemingly almost the same for both CSJ and LTVS.

#### 5.4. Comparison on Japanese ASR tasks

In Section 5.3, the performance of the multilingual model caught up to the monolingual models with nearly 200 hours of unlabeled data which is much smaller than the amount for only the open-access corpora in Japanese. Therefore, we built SSL models with a combination of high-resource data (i.e., CSJ and LTVS) and compared various models fine-tuned with the training techniques introduced in Section 3. Table 3 shows the CERs of two baselines (B1–B2), monolingual SSL-based models (M1–M6) in Japanese, cross-lingual models (C1, C2), and the existing models (E) in the four Japanese tasks. Since the performance trend is similar between the tasks except for the masking position configuration, we report the full results only for the CSJ task and the best performances for other tasks due to space limitations. Note that we exhibit only the performance of the model fine-tuned with a post-CNN for low-resource tasks because it performed better than the pre-CNN unlike for the high-resource tasks. From the CSJ results, we can see that the SSL-based models (C1, C2, M1–M6) were better than the baseline models (B1–B2), of which the Japanese SSL models (M1–M6) were particularly efficient. To verify whether other language data improves the accuracy of the target language task, we also experimented with model (M6) pre-trained with a combination of CSJ, LTVS, and LS, but we could not realize any additional improvement in any of the tasks. To the best of our knowledge, the CERs of our models advance the state-of-the-art performance of the existing reports (E) in most test sets.

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/espnet/espnet/blob/master/egs2/laborotv/asr1/README.md>

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/espnet/espnet/blob/master/egs/jnas/asr1/RESULTS>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/espnet/espnet/blob/master/egs2/jsut/asr1/README.md>

**Table 3.** Evaluation results with different unlabeled data, encoder, and masking strategy for CSJ, LTVS, JNAS, and JSUT. Note that only labeled data within each task is used for fine-tuning in each task (e.g., 515.6 hours of labeled data in CSJ task). T and C in fourth column mean Transformer and Conformer encoder, and pre and post in third column mean pre-CNN and post-CNN masking.

CSJ							
ID	Unlabeled data	Enc.	Mask	CER			
				dev	eval1	eval2	eval3
B1	-	T	pre	4.2	5.3	3.8	4.1
B2	-	C	pre	4.1	5.0	3.8	3.9
M1	CSJ	T	post	3.4	4.6	3.2	3.7
M2	CSJ+LTVS	T	post	3.5	4.5	3.2	3.7
M3	CSJ+LTVS	T	pre	3.5	4.2	3.3	3.7
M4	CSJ+LTVS	C	post	3.3	4.2	3.0	3.5
M5	CSJ+LTVS	C	pre	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.2</b>
M6	CSJ+LTVS+LS	C	pre	3.4	4.3	3.1	3.4
C1	XLSR-53 [12]		post	3.8	4.7	3.6	3.8
C2	XLS-R-128 [13]		post	3.7	4.7	3.5	3.8
E	Karita et al. [36]			<b>3.1</b>	4.1	3.2	3.5

LTVS						
ID	Unlabeled data	Enc.	Mask	CER		
				dev	dev-4k	tedx-jp-10k
B1	-	T	pre	10.0	8.0	13.4
B2	-	C	pre	9.4	7.7	13.1
M5	CSJ+LTVS	C	pre	<b>8.7</b>	7.4	<b>12.6</b>
E	ESPnet <sup>6</sup>			9.7	<b>7.0</b>	13.0

JNAS						
ID	Unlabeled data	Enc.	Mask	CER		
				dev	testset-100	testset-500
B1	-	T	pre	12.0	8.9	12.4
B2	-	C	pre	14.7	11.1	14.4
M4	CSJ+LTVS	C	post	<b>5.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>5.5</b>
E	ESPnet <sup>7</sup>			11.0	8.9	11.3

JSUT					
ID	Unlabeled data	Enc.	Mask	CER	
				dev	eval1
B1	-	T	pre	30.0	31.5
B2	-	C	pre	33.4	34.9
M4	CSJ+LTVS	C	post	<b>11.7</b>	<b>12.6</b>
E	ESPnet <sup>8</sup>			12.0	13.9

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we empirically investigated and analyzed language dependency by comparing monolingual and cross-lingual models in Japanese ASR tasks. Our findings indicate that the performance of the SSL-based model was more affected by the language aspect rather than the acoustic aspect during pre-training and fine-tuning, and the monolingual model pre-trained with 200 hours was comparable in accuracy to the cross-lingual models. With this observation in mind, we built various models with modifications to the original wav2vec 2.0 model, and our models achieved state-of-the-art performance on multiple Japanese ASR tasks.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] A. Mohamed, H.-y. Lee, L. Borgholt, J. D. Havtorn, J. Edin, C. Igel, K. Kirchhoff, S.-W. Li, K. Livescu, L. Maaløe, T. N. Sainath, and S. Watanabe, “Self-supervised speech representation learning: A review,” *JSTSP*, 2022.
- [2] A. v. d. Oord, Y. Li, and O. Vinyals, “Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.
- [3] A. Baevski, Y. Zhou, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” in *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [4] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhotia, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, “HuBERT: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *TASLP*, 2021.
- [5] S. Chen, C. Wang, Z. Chen, Y. Wu, S. Liu, Z. Chen, J. Li, N. Kanda, T. Yoshioka, X. Xiao, J. Wu, L. Zhou, S. Ren, Y. Qian, Y. Qian, J. Wu, M. Zeng, X. Yu, and F. Wei, “WavLM: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing,” *JSTSP*, 2022.
- [6] A. Baevski, W.-N. Hsu, Q. Xu, A. Babu, J. Gu, and M. Auli, “data2vec: A general framework for self-supervised learning in speech, vision and language,” *ICML*, 2022.
- [7] Y.-A. Chung, Y. Zhang, W. Han, C.-C. Chiu, J. Qin, R. Pang, and Y. Wu, “w2v-BERT: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pre-training,” in *ASRU*, 2021.
- [8] S. w. Yang, P.-H. Chi, Y.-S. Chuang, C.-I. J. Lai, K. Lakhotia, Y. Y. Lin, A. T. Liu, J. Shi, X. Chang, G.-T. Lin, T.-H. Huang, W.-C. Tseng, K. t. Lee, D.-R. Liu, Z. Huang, S. Dong, S.-W. Li, S. Watanabe, A. Mohamed, and H. y. Lee, “SUPERB: Speech Processing Universal PERformance Benchmark,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [9] T. Ashihara, T. Moriya, K. Matsuura, and T. Tanaka, “Deep versus wide: An analysis of student architectures for task-agnostic knowledge distillation of self-supervised speech models,” in *Interspeech*, 2022.
- [10] M. Rivière, A. Joulin, P.-E. Mazaré, and E. Dupoux, “Unsupervised pretraining transfers well across languages,” in *ICASSP*, 2020.
- [11] K. Kawakami, L. Wang, C. Dyer, P. Blunsom, and A. v. d. Oord, “Learning robust and multilingual speech representations,” in *EMNLP*, 2020.
- [12] A. Conneau, A. Baevski, R. Collobert, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli, “Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning for speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [13] A. Babu, C. Wang, A. Tjandra, K. Lakhotia, Q. Xu, N. Goyal, K. Singh, P. von Platen, Y. Saraf, J. Pino, A. Baevski, A. Conneau, and M. Auli, “XLS-R: Self-supervised cross-lingual speech representation learning at scale,” in *Interspeech*, 2022.
- [14] L. P. Violeta, W. C. Huang, and T. Toda, “Investigating self-supervised pretraining frameworks for pathological speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2022.
- [15] K. Itou, M. Yamamoto, K. Takeda, T. Takezawa, T. Matsuoka, T. Kobayashi, K. Shikano, and S. Itahashi, “JNAS: Japanese speech corpus for large vocabulary continuous speech recognition research,” *JASJ*, 1999.
- [16] R. Ardila, M. Branson, K. Davis, M. Kohler, J. Meyer, M. Henretty, R. Morais, L. Saunders, F. Tyers, and G. Weber, “Common Voice: A massively-multilingual speech corpus,” in *LREC*, 2020.
- [17] V. Panayotov, G. Chen, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, “LibriSpeech: An ASR corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *ICASSP*, 2015.
- [18] V. Pratap, Q. Xu, A. Sriram, G. Synnaeve, and R. Collobert, “MLS: A large-scale multilingual dataset for speech research,” in *Interspeech*, 2020.
- [19] J. Kahn, M. Rivière, W. Zheng, E. Kharitonov, Q. Xu, P. E. Mazaré, J. Karadayi, V. Liptchinsky, R. Collobert, C. Fuegen, T. Likhomanenko, G. Synnaeve, A. Joulin, A. Mohamed, and E. Dupoux, “Libri-Light: A benchmark for ASR with limited or no supervision,” in *ICASSP*, 2020.
- [20] K. Deng, Z. Yang, S. Watanabe, Y. Higuchi, G. Cheng, and P. Zhang, “Improving non-autoregressive end-to-end speech recognition with pre-trained acoustic and language models,” in *ICASSP*, 2022.
- [21] R. Al-Ghezi, Y. Getman, A. Rouhe, R. Hildén, and M. Kurimo, “Self-supervised end-to-end ASR for low resource L2 Swedish,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [22] K. D. N, P. Wang, and B. Bozza, “Using large self-supervised models for low-resource speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [23] W.-N. Hsu, A. Sriram, A. Baevski, T. Likhomanenko, Q. Xu, V. Pratap, J. Kahn, A. Lee, R. Collobert, G. Synnaeve, and M. Auli, “Robust wav2vec 2.0: Analyzing domain shift in self-supervised pre-training,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.
- [24] Y. Meng, Y.-H. Chou, A. T. Liu, and H.-y. Lee, “Don’t speak too fast: The impact of data bias on self-supervised speech models,” in *ICASSP*, 2022.
- [25] Y. Zhang, J. Qin, D. S. Park, W. Han, C.-C. Chiu, R. Pang, Q. V. Le, and Y. Wu, “Pushing the limits of semi-supervised learning for automatic speech recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10504*, 2020.
- [26] A. Gulati, J. Qin, C.-C. Chiu, N. Parmar, Y. Zhang, J. Yu, W. Han, S. Wang, Z. Zhang, Y. Wu, and R. Pang, “Conformer: Convolution-augmented Transformer for speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2020.
- [27] A. Sriram, M. Auli, and A. Baevski, “Wav2Vec-Aug: Improved self-supervised training with limited data,” in *Interspeech*, 2022.
- [28] A. Graves, S. Fernandez, F. Gomez, and J. Schmidhuber, “Connectionist temporal classification: Labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural nets,” in *ICML*, 2006.
- [29] D. S. Park, W. Chan, Y. Zhang, C.-C. Chiu, B. Zoph, E. D. Cubuk, and Q. V. Le, “SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2019.
- [30] K. Maekawa, “Corpus of spontaneous Japanese: Its design and evaluation,” in *SSPR*, 2003.
- [31] S. Ando and H. Fujihara, “Construction of a large-scale Japanese ASR corpus on TV recordings,” in *ICASSP*, 2021.
- [32] R. Sonobe, S. Takamichi, and H. Saruwatari, “JSUT corpus: Free large-scale Japanese speech corpus for end-to-end speech synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00354*, 2017.
- [33] S. Watanabe, T. Hori, S. Karita, T. Hayashi, J. Nishitoba, Y. Unno, N. Enrique Yalta Soplin, J. Heymann, M. Wiesner, N. Chen, A. Renduchintala, and T. Ochiai, “ESPnet: End-to-end speech processing toolkit,” in *Interspeech*, 2018.
- [34] A. Rousseau, P. Deléglise, and Y. Estève, “Enhancing the TED-LIUM corpus with selected data for language modeling and more TED talks,” in *LREC*, 2014.
- [35] M. Ott, S. Edunov, A. Baevski, A. Fan, S. Gross, N. Ng, D. Grangier, and M. Auli, “fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling,” in *NAACL-HLT*, 2019.
- [36] S. Karita, Y. Kubo, M. A. U. Bacchiani, and L. Jones, “A comparative study on neural architectures and training methods for Japanese speech recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2021.