

---

# On the Cross-lingual Transferability of Pre-trained wav2vec2-based Models

---

**Jonatas Grosman**

Department of Informatics  
Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro  
Rio de Janeiro - Brazil  
jgrosman@inf.puc-rio.br

**Cassio Almeida**

National School of Statistical Sciences  
Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics  
Rio de Janeiro - Brazil  
cassio.almeida@ibge.gov.br

**Guilherme Schardong**

Institute of Systems and Robotics  
University of Coimbra  
Coimbra - Portugal  
guilherme.schardong@isr.uc.pt

**Hélio Lopes**

Department of Informatics  
Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro  
Rio de Janeiro - Brazil  
lopes@inf.puc-rio.br

## Abstract

Using representations provided by a large pre-trained model has become the primary strategy for achieving state-of-the-art results in a wide range of tasks. A recently proposed large pre-trained model, wav2vec 2.0, was seminal for several other works on pre-training large models on speech data. Many models are being pre-trained using the same architecture as wav2vec 2.0 and are getting state-of-the-art in various speech-related tasks. Previous work has demonstrated that the data used during the pre-training of these wav2vec2-based models can impact the model's performance in downstream tasks, and this should be taken into consideration before utilizing these models. However, few works have proposed investigating further how the transfer knowledge of these pre-trained models behaves in different languages, even when the target language differs from the one used during the model's pre-training. Our work aims to investigate the cross-lingual transferability of these wav2vec2-based models. We performed several fine-tuning experiments on the speech recognition task in 18 languages using 15 large pre-trained models. The results of our experiments showed us that the size of data used during the pre-training of these models is not as important to the final performance as the diversity. We noticed that the performance of Indo-European languages is superior to non-Indo-European languages in the evaluated models. We have observed a positive cross-lingual transfer of knowledge using monolingual models, which was evident in all the languages we used, but more pronounced when the language used during pre-training was more similar to the downstream task language. With these findings, we aim to assist the scientific community in utilizing existing wav2vec2-based pre-trained models, as well as facilitate the pre-training of new ones.

# 1 Introduction

The pre-training of large models to produce speech representations, which are then used for posterior fine-tuning on speech-related downstream tasks, has recently received considerable attention. Currently, most of these models are trained on a massive amount of unlabeled data using a self-supervised learning approach. A recently proposed large pre-trained model, wav2vec 2.0 (Baevski et al., 2020), was trained using a self-supervised approach and has obtained the state-of-the-art in several speech-related tasks. Several large pre-trained models have been built using the architecture proposed in the wav2vec 2.0 work, modifying only the training technique or the data used in pre-training (Conneau et al., 2021; Hsu et al., 2021b; Chen et al., 2021b; Babu et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021b). These models are usually pre-trained in thousands of hours of data from different languages (multilingual models) or just one (monolingual models), achieving good results on downstream tasks even when only a small amount of data is available during fine-tuning. In the speech recognition downstream task, it is possible to obtain good results by fine-tuning these models on only 10 minutes of audio (Baevski et al., 2020). This is a critical capability when dealing with languages with very few resources available.

Most of the available wav2vec2-based models are pre-trained using only English speech data. However, there are some pre-trained multilingual models, and in some cases, they present even better results on speech recognition tasks than monolinguals that have been trained in the same language (Conneau et al., 2021; Babu et al., 2021), so the use of multilingual models seems to be a good alternative even though a monolingual model is available. The languages used during pre-training of these multilingual models generally range from a few (Wang et al., 2021b) to hundreds (Babu et al., 2021). So, most of the languages spoken in the world, about 7000 (Lewis et al., 2016), are missing from these models' training data.

As we currently do not have pre-trained models available in all languages spoken worldwide, we must investigate the cross-lingual transferability of existing wav2vec2-based models. We believe that the variability of languages makes a difference in the final result of the multilingual models. However, in a study where the authors used 128 languages in a wav2vec2-based model pre-training (Babu et al., 2021), they found no significant difference in the model's performance when comparing the results with another multilingual model that used only 53 languages in its pre-training (Conneau et al., 2021). The pre-trained model with more languages was significantly better only when it increased the network's size. Perhaps the variability caused by the interference between languages during the pre-training of multilingual models is enough for a model to perform well regardless of the number of languages used. **Do multilingual wav2vec2-based models of the same size perform similarly during fine-tuning?** Another point that we must take into account regarding the transferability of these multilingual models is that the imbalance in the data of different languages used during pre-training can harm the final performance of the models. For example, in the case of the XLSR-53 model (Conneau et al., 2021), out of the 56 thousand hours of audio used during pre-training, 44 thousand were English. Some pre-trained multilingual models attempt to mitigate this problem by introducing a factor to balance the contribution of languages during pre-training (Babu et al., 2021). Still, even with this balancing factor, languages with more diverse and larger datasets are generally Indo-European. We think these pre-trained models can perform better in this language family on downstream tasks. **Do Indo-European languages perform better compared to non-Indo-European ones on fine-tuning?** In the absence of monolingual models for a given language, some studies have achieved good results by continuing the pre-training of English monolingual models (Gupta et al., 2021; Kim and Kang, 2021). **But even when not continuing the pre-training of a monolingual model in cross-lingual scenarios, is it possible to obtain good results?** In this work, we provide evidence to help solve these doubts by evaluating the results of several fine-tuning experiments in the speech recognition task using 15 models and 18 languages. Our results showed that the performance of Indo-European languages is generally superior to that of non-Indo-European languages in the evaluated models. We have seen different performances using different multilingual models, and we realized that the size of data used during the pre-training of these models is not as crucial to the final performance as the diversity. We observed a positive cross-lingual transfer of knowledge in all the evaluated monolingual models and languages, but this effect was more pronounced when the languages shared a similar language family.

The rest of the paper presents works related to ours (Section 2), details the models, data, and methods used in our experiments (Section 3), and then provides the results and discussions of these experiments (Section 4). Then we present the conclusions of our work in Section 5.

## 2 Related Work

The work that proposed the wav2vec 2.0 architecture (Baevski et al., 2020) was seminal for several other works on pre-training large models on speech data using self-supervised techniques. Most of these works investigate the **transferability on large models pre-trained from scratch**. The XLSR-53 (Conneau et al., 2021) was the first version of a multilingual wav2vec2-based model. During its pre-training, this model utilized data from 53 languages, in 56k hours of audio from various domains. One of the most significant findings of this work is that the performance of fine-tuned multilingual models consistently outperforms that of monolingual ones in most cases. To evaluate how these multilingual models behave at even larger scales, considering the size of the network and the amount and variety of training data, a new model called XLS-R was proposed (Babu et al., 2021). Its pre-training data contained about 436k hours of audio and supported 128 languages, with network sizes ranging from 300M to 2B parameters. In another work (Wang et al., 2021b), the authors modified the training approach of the original wav2vec 2.0. They utilized labeled data in their pre-training within a hybrid training regime that combined self-supervised learning and supervised learning techniques, based on the phonetic markers of the transcripts. Several configurations were tested in the experiments conducted in this work, resulting in a monolingual model in English and a multilingual model containing four languages in the pre-training data (en, fr, es, it). In general, the multilingual version performed better on the speech recognition task for languages not seen during its pre-training when compared to the pre-trained English version. Further studies investigated alternative methods for pre-training a model using the wav2vec2 architecture. For example, HuBERT (Hsu et al., 2021b), which employs a BERT-like prediction loss approach using labels defined for the sound units of each sample during pre-training, utilizing offline clustering techniques. Other works investigated using a speaker-aware approach (Chen et al., 2021c,b). Their approach modified the pre-training data by adding speaker overlays, achieving state-of-the-art performance in several tasks of SUPERB (Yang et al., 2021), particularly those focused on speaker identification. In another work, the authors investigated how wav2vec2-based models behave in domain shift situations (Hsu et al., 2021a). The authors reported that the similarity between domains improves the final fine-tuning performance. Still, pre-training data from multiple domains favors the model’s generalization to domains not seen during pre-training.

Some works investigate the **cross-lingual transferability on large models already pre-trained**. Most of these works focus on assessing the transferability of English monolingual pre-trained models. A model called CLSRIL-23 (Gupta et al., 2021) was pre-trained using data from 23 Indic languages, utilizing the weights of the wav2vec 2.0 model at initialization. This model obtained excellent results in speech recognition tasks in several Indic languages. The authors also pre-trained some monolingual models of some Indic languages, but these models could not outperform the results of the multilingual version. Another work obtained excellent results in several benchmarks for the speech recognition task in Korean using a similar approach (Kim and Kang, 2021). With a focus on the Flemish-Dutch language (Poncelet and Van Hamme, 2021), another work conducted several fine-tuning experiments on pre-trained models. The authors used five pre-trained models in this work. Two of them were wav2vec2-based, one was monolingual (wav2vec 2.0), and another was multilingual (XLSR-53). Having these two obtained the best performance among the other pre-trained models. In another study, the authors investigated the ability of an English pre-trained wav2vec-based model to transfer knowledge to other languages using limited data, comparing its results with those of a fully supervised approach (Yi et al., 2021). Some works propose adjustments in the fine-tuning strategy to improve transfer knowledge, such as a study that investigated the use of English audio transliterations using characters from the target language in the fine-tuning of low-resource languages (Khare et al., 2021). Similarly, with the aim of modifying the training data, another work (Xu et al., 2021) constructed a training dataset comprising only the phonetic transcription of multilingual audio files. Then, they built a phoneme recognizer by fine-tuning the XLSR-53 model, surpassing the results of several previous works in zero-shot learning situations in several languages. Other authors have proposed more sophisticated fine-tuning techniques for adapting monolingual models. For example, a work proposed a technique that enables monolingual models to achieve similar performance to multilingual models in certain languages (Khurana et al., 2022).

Most of these works only investigated the cross-lingual transferability of monolingual models in English to a small number of languages. In our work, we conducted experiments with a greater quantity and diversity than those found in previous works, as well as investigating a phenomenon that has not been observed in previous works: cross-lingual transferability between language families.

### 3 Methodology

We performed several fine-tuning experiments on wav2vec2-based pre-trained large models. The wav2vec2 architecture can be summarized in a convolutional encoder feature that maps raw audio  $X$  to the set of latent speech representations  $Z$ , which serve as input to a Transformer network (Vaswani et al., 2017) that maps  $Z$  to contextual representations  $C$ .

The difference between the pre-trained models we selected mainly resides in the training strategy and data used during training. We can divide these models into monolingual and multilingual. The first approach uses only data from a single language during pre-training, while the second approach utilizes data from multiple languages. We selected 15 pre-trained models for our experiments. There are different versions of the selected pre-trained models, each with varying parameter sizes. In our experiments, we used the LARGE model from each of them, which has approximately 300 million parameters. During our experiments, we selected data from 18 languages from the Common Voice dataset (Ardila et al., 2019) (release 7.0). The Common Voice is a crowdsourced dataset covering dozens of languages and is one of the most extensive multilingual datasets for the speech recognition task. As previous works demonstrated that with a few hours of data, it is possible to obtain results similar to state-of-the-art in several benchmarks in the speech recognition task (Baevski et al., 2020; Conneau et al., 2021; Babu et al., 2021), we selected the 18 languages for our experiments among those that contained at least five hours of training data in the Common Voice. We used the Common Voice train split during the fine-tuning. The validation and test splits were only used during the evaluation stage. In Appendix A we provide more details about the models and languages used in our experiments.

We followed an approach similar to that adopted in (Baevski et al., 2020) for the fine-tuning of the pre-trained models. Which consists of using the Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) (Graves et al., 2006) loss during the fine-tuning of the models for the speech recognition task, adding a linear projection of size  $|V|$  randomly initialized on top of the pre-trained network, where  $V$  is a set containing all the different characters in the target language (including special characters and whitespace) plus one special character called a blank token, used to control the repetition of characters during decoding the network output. We adopted an automated strategy to generate this  $V$  set during our experiments. We selected only non-numeric characters with a frequency greater than or equal to 0.001% in the training dataset for each language.

We fine-tuned each of the 18 languages on all 15 pre-trained models we selected. To reduce the effects of randomness in our analyses, we repeated this fine-tuning process three times with different seeds. As the data available in Common Voice can vary significantly from one language to another, we randomly selected only five hours of data for each language in each fine-tuning round. To establish a baseline for our analyses, in addition to the 15 selected models, we fine-tuned a wav2vec2 network with randomly initialized weights.

In all fine-tuning and evaluation experiments, we used the HuggingSound tool (Grosman, 2022). We fine-tuned the network using Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) for 4k steps with a learning rate equal to  $6e-5$ . We employ a tri-stage learning rate strategy, where the training learning rate increases linearly during the first 10% of optimization steps, remains constant for the next 40%, and decays linearly thereafter. The training batch size consisted of 32 samples, where samples with a duration longer than 12 seconds were discarded during training to prevent memory overflow issues, resulting in a maximum batch size of 384 seconds.

As done in (Baevski et al., 2020), to leverage the features already learned during the network’s pre-training process, we froze the encoder feature block during our fine-tuning experiments. However, we updated the entire network during the training process for baseline models, which were not previously pre-trained.

We used the Character Error Rate (CER) as the evaluation metric for all fine-tuned models. This metric is similar to the Word Error Rate (WER) metric (Morris et al., 2004), but operates on the

character level, computing the minimum number of operations required to transform the predicted transcription into the expected one and extracts the ratio between this value and the total number of characters in the reference transcription, as you can see in the equation 1.

$$CER = \frac{S + D + I}{S + D + C} \quad (1)$$

where  $S$ ,  $D$ , and  $I$  are respectively the number of substitutions, deletions, and insertions needed to transform the predicted transcription into the reference one. And  $C$  is the number of correct characters in the predicted transcription. We adopted the CER metric as it is generic enough to handle transcripts from any of the experiment’s selected languages. For example, the WER metric is incompatible for evaluating Chinese transcriptions, as a group of characters with a white space between them forming a word is not a feature present in Chinese language transcriptions.

We performed statistical analyses for comparisons between models and languages in two stages in our evaluation experiments. First, a statistical test was applied to detect a significant difference between any two groups. Then, if any significant effect was detected, we applied a multiple comparison test to determine the significance between the groups. The statistical test we used for the first stage was the Kruskal–Wallis test (Kruskal and Wallis, 1952). For the second stage, we used the Conover-Iman test (Conover and Iman, 1979). We used a significance level of 0.05 to reject or not the null hypothesis in our tests.

## 4 Results and Discussion

In the following sections, we summarize the results found during our experiments and discuss them. You can find more details about the results of our experiments in appendices B, C, D, and E.

### 4.1 Multilingual models performance in different languages

To test whether the multilingual models perform similarly, we trained each multilingual model three times for each language in the Common Voice dataset. We calculated the CER for each model/language pair for the validation and test splits. Then we performed Kruskal-Wallis tests to assess whether one model performs quite differently from the others in each split. The results show that at least one model has a significant performance difference from the others ( $p < 0.05$ ) in most languages. The only languages and splits where the trained models exhibit statistically similar performance are Dutch in the validation dataset ( $p = 0.086$ ) and Japanese in the test dataset ( $p = 0.057$ ). Details regarding the performance for all the languages can be seen in Appendix C, Table 7.

Table 1 shows the frequency with which a multilingual model appears at each ranking position per language based on their average CER. From this, we notice that models XLS-R and XLS-53 never rank last for both splits, with XLS-R obtaining the overall best results (8 times as the best-ranked model). Additionally, Unispeech-ML appears as the second-best-performing model, ranking as a top performer for 6 languages considered. However, upon inspecting the languages for which it ranked best, we see that they are either used during pre-training (en, es, fr, it) or have the worst overall performance for all models (ja, zh). Unispeech-ML ranks as the second-to-last model, with 4th place in 8 languages, behind only VoxPopuli-100k, which ranks 4th in 10 languages. A detailed ranking view is presented in Appendix C, Table 8.

By performing a Conover-Iman test for each pair of models on a language basis, we observe that models XLS-53 and XLS-R present no significant performance difference in the same six languages for both splits. These languages are Arabic (ar), Persian (fa), French (fr), Dutch (nl), Japanese (ja), and Chinese (zh). Other model pairs perform similarly on at most 3 of the languages considered. As for the languages themselves, Dutch, Japanese, and Arabic exhibit the highest statistical similarity between models for both splits. The Table 2 shows the frequency with which the models had no statistical difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) for each split. A detailed view for all model pairs and languages is shown in Appendix C, Table 9.

Given the results presented above, we can infer that some multilingual models performed better than others. Regarding the data used during the pre-training of these multilingual models, it seems that the

Table 1: The frequency with which a multilingual fine-tuned model appears in a particular place in each of the 18 languages’ ranking.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
<b>Validation</b>				
XLS-R	8	5	5	0
UniSpeech-ML	6	0	4	8
XLSR-53	2	10	6	0
VP-100k	2	3	3	10
<b>Test</b>				
XLS-R	8	7	3	0
UniSpeech-ML	6	0	4	8
XLSR-53	3	8	7	0
VP-100k	1	3	4	10

Table 2: The frequency with which a multilingual fine-tuned model pair showed no statistical difference (p-value above 0.05) in one of the 18 languages.

<b>Validation</b>		
XLS-R	XLSR-53	6
UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k	3
UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	3
VP-100k	XLS-R	2
VP-100k	XLSR-53	2
UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	1
<b>Test</b>		
XLS-R	XLSR-53	6
UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k	3
UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	3
VP-100k	XLS-R	3
UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	2
VP-100k	XLSR-53	2

diversity of the data is more important than quantity. The XLSR-53 presented much better results than the VoxPopuli-100k. The XLSR-53 was pre-trained on 56k hours of audio from diverse sources, while VoxPopuli-100k used 100k hours of speeches from the European Parliament. These findings align with the results reported in the literature (Hsu et al., 2021a). From our results, we also notice that if we want to use a pre-trained model for a specific domain, we can achieve good results with less data for pre-training than most available pre-trained models. The Unispeech-ML has been pre-trained using only the Common Voice (shown in Table 5), the same dataset of our experiments, and presents exceptional results for the languages used during pre-training (en, es, fr, it) with considerably less training data being used (2k hours, compared to 436k hours for XLS-R).

## 4.2 Multilingual models performance in different language families

When we grouped the results between Indo-European and non-Indo-European families, we noticed an apparent difference in performance between these two groups over all the multilingual models, as you can observe in Figures 1 and 2. The non-Indo-European group presents a large dispersion of the CER. That overdispersion suggests a heterogeneous performance in each model depending on the language contained in the non-Indo-European group. We investigated the performances by language families to analyze this heterogeneity. The Uralic and Austronesian families present the best performances with an average CER similar to that obtained in the Indo-European family. The Japonic and Sino-Tibetan families have the highest average errors. The best performance for these families was an average CER of 0.382 for the Japonic and 0.357 for the Sino-Tibetan. The other families, Afro-Asian and Kra-Dai, present average values of intermediate CER. These results suggest that the great dispersion of the average values of CER in this group is due to the characteristics of the language families. Details can be seen in Appendix D.




Figure 1: Multilingual pre-trained models performance over **grouped** language families on the **validation** set




Figure 2: Multilingual pre-trained models performance over **grouped** language families on the **test** set

We performed Kruskal-Wallis tests to assess whether one group of languages performed differently from the other. The results indicated strong evidence ( $p \approx 0$ ) of a significant difference in all the evaluated models in both validation and test splits. However, Japanese and Chinese have a much larger number of possible characters in their writing systems than the other languages we evaluated. This difference can make the speech recognition task more complex in these two languages. We then ran statistical tests comparing the performance of Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages, excluding Chinese and Japanese languages, to assess whether the differences between the family groups persisted even after removing these languages from our analysis. This test revealed that, even when excluding Chinese and Japanese, there is a statistically significant difference between Indo-European and non-Indo-European families in all evaluated models. Details of these tests can be found in Appendix D, in Tables 10 and 11. Considering the evidence from the statistical test, and given that the CER averages for all models in the Indo-European group were consistently lower than those in the non-Indo-European group, we can conclude that all models performed better for the Indo-European family. To reinforce these results, we proceeded with another test using the models as factors instead of the group of languages. The test results showed that only the Indo-European group has at least one model with a different performance from the others. The non-Indo-European group has no significant differences in the performance between models. For detailed results see in Appendix D in Table 12.

Our results showed that the Indo-European language group performed consistently better than the non-Indo-European language group. Except for Estonian and Indonesian, all other non-Indo-European languages performed much worse than the Indo-European ones. This divergent performance between the groups may be related to the fact that the data used during the pre-training of all the multilingual models we used in our experiments were more diverse and abundant for the Indo-European languages. This imbalance may have made languages in this family have a more significant influence on the weights of the pre-trained network. And what we observe in our experiments is just a reflection of that. This pre-training data effect aligns with the findings in (Conneau et al., 2021), which argue that the similarity of languages used in pre-training plays a crucial role in the model’s final performance.

### 4.3 Monolingual models’ performance in different languages

For our investigation regarding cross-lingual transferability in monolingual models, we selected 11 models. The vast majority of publicly available monolingual models are in English. Our monolingual model selection reflects the dominance of the English model, as 6 out of 11 selected models were English. Our analysis was then segmented between English and non-English models. The non-English models were pre-trained using the VoxPopuli dataset in Spanish, French, Italian, Dutch, and Swedish. In addition to the selected monolingual models, we have included a model without pre-training in our tests to establish a performance baseline.

The statistical tests we conducted using the performance of all pre-trained English models showed that, for all languages, at least one model had significantly different performance in both the validation and test splits. We performed a Conover-Iman test to see which model(s) had different behavior. Comparing the number of times each model pair presented statistically similar results, surprisingly, UniSpeech-SAT produced similar results with models without pre-training in 14 cases for the validation dataset and 15 for the test dataset. A more detailed view is shown in Table 19, Appendix E. A similar result for the VoxPopuli pre-trained models is shown for the model pre-trained in Dutch, where this model and models without pre-training presented  $p > 0.05$  for 10 languages in both splits (Appendix E, Table 23).

Tables 3 and 4 show the ranking frequency of the models tested. We have included the best multilingual models for each language for comparison. Unsurprisingly, the multilingual models rank better for most languages, except for English, where UniSpeech presents superior results.

The VoxPopuli results show an interesting fact: when pre-training and fine-tuning take the language family and subgroup into consideration, the resulting model yields better results, at least for Indo-European languages. Let us focus on two languages, Portuguese (pt) and German (de). Portuguese and German belong to the same family (Indo-European) but different subgroups (Italic and Germanic). For Portuguese, the monolingual models ranking excluding the multilingual models is VP-es, VP-it, VP-fr, VP-nl, and VP-sv. The first 3 models are pre-trained in languages of the same subgroup as Portuguese. Making the same comparison for German, the model ranking is composed of VP-nl,



Table 3: The frequency with which an English monolingual fine-tuned model appears in a particular place in each of the 18 languages’ ranking. Multilingual models are presented in bold-face.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
<b>Validation</b>								
<b>XLS-R</b>	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>UniSpeech-ML</b>	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>XLSR-53</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>VP-100k</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UniSpeech	1	2	1	3	4	6	1	0
WavLM	0	9	4	2	1	1	1	0
R-wav2vec2	0	5	7	3	1	1	1	0
HuBERT	0	1	1	3	7	5	1	0
wav2vec2	0	0	4	6	4	4	0	0
UniSpeech-SAT	0	0	1	1	1	1	14	0
no-pretraining	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
<b>Test</b>								
<b>XLS-R</b>	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>UniSpeech-ML</b>	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>XLSR-53</b>	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>VP-100k</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UniSpeech	1	3	1	2	3	7	1	0
WavLM	0	8	6	1	1	1	1	0
R-wav2vec2	0	5	9	1	1	1	1	0
HuBERT	0	1	1	3	8	4	1	0
UniSpeech-SAT	0	0	1	1	0	2	14	0
wav2vec2	0	0	0	10	5	3	0	0
no-pretraining	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

Table 4: The frequency with which a VoxPopuli monolingual fine-tuned model appears in a particular place in each of the 18 languages’ ranking. Multilingual models are presented in bold-face.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
<b>Validation</b>							
<b>XLS-R</b>	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>UniSpeech-ML</b>	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>XLSR-53</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>VP-100k</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
VP-es	0	5	2	3	4	4	0
VP-sv	0	5	3	2	2	6	0
VP-fr	0	4	5	7	2	0	0
VP-nl	0	3	2	2	7	4	0
VP-it	0	1	6	4	3	4	0
no-pretraining	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
<b>Test</b>							
<b>XLS-R</b>	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>UniSpeech-ML</b>	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>XLSR-53</b>	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>VP-100k</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
VP-sv	0	5	2	3	3	5	0
VP-fr	0	4	4	7	2	1	0
VP-es	0	4	3	3	4	4	0
VP-nl	0	3	4	0	7	4	0
VP-it	0	2	5	5	2	4	0
no-pretraining	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

VP-sv, VP-fr, VP-es, and VP-it. The first 2 models are pre-trained in languages of the same subgroup as German. The same pattern also occurs in other Germanic and Italic languages.

The results of our experiments demonstrated a positive transfer of knowledge in nearly all the scenarios we evaluated, where all the monolingual models outperformed the models without pre-training. Furthermore, it appears that we can enhance knowledge transfer by using models pre-trained in a language similar to the fine-tuning language. A final interesting finding is about the performance of UniSpeech pre-trained in English and fine-tuned in both Japanese (Figure 12 in Appendix E) and Chinese (Figure 20, Appendix E). In both cases, the performance of UniSpeech surpassed that of some multilingual models pre-trained using Japanese and Chinese speech data. Perhaps this behavior is associated with the low representation of these languages in the pre-training of these multilingual models. The more detailed results can be seen in Appendix E.

## 5 Conclusion

To evaluate the cross-lingual transferability of pre-trained wav2vec2-based models, we conducted fine-tuning experiments for the speech recognition task in large pre-trained models. To the best of our knowledge, we employ a combination of models and languages on a scale that has not been seen in other works. More precisely, we used 15 models and 18 languages during our experiments.

The results obtained from our experiments showed that Indo-European languages generally performed superiorly compared to other language families. It may be related to the fact that the amount and diversity of data used during the pre-training of the models were greater for Indo-European languages than for other language families. Another point we noticed during our experiments was that the amount of data used during models’ pre-training does not seem to have as much influence on the final performance of the model as the diversity. Multilingual models with more varied data generally performed better than other models with more data but less diversity. When investigating the effect of cross-lingual transferability in monolingual models, we found a positive transfer of knowledge in all evaluated scenarios. We observed that knowledge transfer appears stronger when the language used during fine-tuning belongs to the same subgroup as the language used during the model’s pre-training. We observed that multilingual models perform better than monolingual models, even when the data used for pre-training and fine-tuning were from the same language. With our findings, we aim to contribute to the pre-training of new models, as well as the effective use of existing ones.

In future work, we would like to investigate more in-depth why Indo-European languages generally performed better than other language families in our experiments. For this, we can adopt approaches similar to those in previous works, which have continued the pre-training of already pre-trained models (Gupta et al., 2021; Kim and Kang, 2021). We could continue pre-training using different combinations of language families in the pre-training data and evaluating the effects this has on the final results of the model on different languages. We would also like to investigate other potential effects resulting from the imbalanced data used during pre-training. For instance, most of the data used during the pre-training of these models typically comes from male voices; this gender imbalance may affect the final performance of the pre-trained model.

## Limitations

All our findings are limited to the behavior we observed in publicly available pre-trained models. We could obtain more robust results by pre-training large wav2vec2-based models from scratch using different language combinations in the training data. However, the high cost of pre-training those models makes this kind of analysis extremely expensive, and we did not have enough resources. Even the fine-tuning of these large models has a high cost, which meant that we had to run a limited number of fine-tuning rounds using the same hyperparameter configuration defined in the initial stage of our work, varying only the seed during the training. So we could not test whether our findings still held up using different combinations of hyperparameters during the fine-tuning experiments.

Since we only use the Common Voice dataset in our experiments, we cannot determine whether our findings would remain valid in a different domain. The decision not to run our experiments on multiple datasets is due to the high cost of fine-tuning, as mentioned above. Therefore, due to our limited resources, we had to choose between a more significant variability of datasets or languages. We preferred to opt for the second option. Therefore, we chose to use the Common Voice dataset,

the only publicly available dataset for the Speech Recognition task with a sufficiently diverse set of languages to perform the experiments we had imagined. But even though the distribution of speech hours by language is quite unbalanced. There are many more hours in Indo-European languages than in other language families. Few non-Indo-European languages were able to provide the five hours of training data required for our experiments, as reflected in the final selection of languages we used. Those limitations make our findings for Indo-European families more robust than those related to other language families.

## Acknowledgements

The first author wish to acknowledge the financial support from the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq; grant 141763/2018-3).

## References

- Rosana Ardila, Megan Branson, Kelly Davis, Michael Henretty, Michael Kohler, Josh Meyer, Reuben Morais, Lindsay Saunders, Francis M Tyers, and Gregor Weber. 2019. Common voice: A massively-multilingual speech corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06670*.
- Arun Babu, Changan Wang, Andros Tjandra, Kushal Lakhotia, Qiantong Xu, Naman Goyal, Kritika Singh, Patrick von Platen, Yatharth Saraf, Juan Pino, et al. 2021. Xls-r: Self-supervised cross-lingual speech representation learning at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09296*.
- Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. 2020. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12449–12460.
- Guoguo Chen, Shuzhou Chai, Guanbo Wang, Jiayu Du, Wei-Qiang Zhang, Chao Weng, Dan Su, Daniel Povey, Jan Trmal, Junbo Zhang, et al. 2021a. Gigaspeech: An evolving, multi-domain asr corpus with 10,000 hours of transcribed audio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.06909*.
- Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Jinyu Li, Naoyuki Kanda, Takuya Yoshioka, Xiong Xiao, et al. 2021b. Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13900*.
- Sanyuan Chen, Yu Wu, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Zhuo Chen, Shujie Liu, Jian Wu, Yao Qian, Furu Wei, Jinyu Li, et al. 2021c. Unispeech-sat: Universal speech representation learning with speaker aware pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05752*.
- Christopher Cieri, David Miller, and Kevin Walker. 2004. The fisher corpus: A resource for the next generations of speech-to-text. In *LREC*, volume 4, pages 69–71.
- A. Conneau, A. Baevski, R. Collobert, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli. 2021. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning for speech recognition. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, page 346–350.
- W Jay Conover and Ronald L Iman. 1979. Multiple-comparisons procedures. informal report. Technical report, Los Alamos National Lab.(LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States).
- Mark JF Gales, Kate M Knill, Anton Ragni, and Shakti P Rath. 2014. Speech recognition and keyword spotting for low-resource languages: Babel project research at cued. In *Fourth International workshop on spoken language technologies for under-resourced languages (SLTU-2014)*, pages 16–23. International Speech Communication Association (ISCA).
- John Godfrey and Edward Holliman. 1993. Switchboard-1 release 2 ldc97s62. *Linguistic Data Consortium*.
- Alex Graves, Santiago Fernández, Faustino Gomez, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2006. Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 369–376.

- Jonatas Grosman. 2022. HuggingSound: A toolkit for speech-related tasks based on Hugging Face’s tools. <https://github.com/jonatasgrosman/huggingsound>.
- Anirudh Gupta, Harveen Singh Chadha, Priyanshi Shah, Neeraj Chhimwal, Ankur Dhuriya, Rishabh Gaur, and Vivek Raghavan. 2021. Clsrl-23: Cross lingual speech representations for indic languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07402*.
- W.-N. Hsu, A. Sriram, A. Baevski, T. Likhomanenko, Q. Xu, V. Pratap, J. Kahn, A. Lee, R. Collobert, G. Synnaeve, and M. Auli. 2021a. Robust wav2vec 2.0: Analyzing domain shift in self-supervised pre-training. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, page 2123–2127.
- Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Kushal Lakhotia, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman Mohamed. 2021b. Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:3451–3460.
- 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. 2020. Libri-light: A benchmark for asr with limited or no supervision. In *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7669–7673. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/libri-light>.
- S. Khare, A. Mittal, A. Diwan, S. Sarawagi, P. Jyothi, and S. Bharadwaj. 2021. Low resource asr: The surprising effectiveness of high resource transliteration. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, page 1051–1055.
- Sameer Khurana, Antoine Laurent, and James Glass. 2022. Magic dust for cross-lingual adaptation of monolingual wav2vec-2.0. In *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, page 6647–6651. IEEE.
- Jounghee Kim and Pilsung Kang. 2021. K-wav2vec 2.0: Automatic speech recognition based on joint decoding of graphemes and syllables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05172*.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- William H Kruskal and W Allen Wallis. 1952. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 47(260):583–621.
- M. P. Lewis, G. F. Simon, and C. D. Fennig. 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, nineteenth edition. SIL International.
- Andrew Cameron Morris, Viktoria Maier, and Phil Green. 2004. From wer and ril to mer and wil: improved evaluation measures for connected speech recognition. In *Eighth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*.
- J. Poncelet and H. Van Hamme. 2021. Comparison of self-supervised speech pre-training methods on flemish dutch. In *2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop, ASRU 2021 - Proceedings*, page 169–176.
- Vineel Pratap, Qiantong Xu, Anuroop Sriram, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Ronan Collobert. 2020. Mls: A large-scale multilingual dataset for speech research. *ArXiv*, abs/2012.03411.
- Jörgen Valk and Tanel Alumäe. 2021. Voxlingua107: a dataset for spoken language recognition. In *2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 652–658. IEEE.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Changhan Wang, Morgane Riviere, Ann Lee, Anne Wu, Chaitanya Talnikar, Daniel Haziza, Mary Williamson, Juan Pino, and Emmanuel Dupoux. 2021a. Voxpopuli: A large-scale multilingual speech corpus for representation learning, semi-supervised learning and interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00390*.

- Chengyi Wang, Yu Wu, Yao Qian, Kenichi Kumatani, Shujie Liu, Furu Wei, Michael Zeng, and Xuedong Huang. 2021b. Unispeech: Unified speech representation learning with labeled and unlabeled data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10937–10947. PMLR.
- Qiantong Xu, Alexei Baevski, and Michael Auli. 2021. Simple and effective zero-shot cross-lingual phoneme recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.11680*.
- Shu-wen Yang, Po-Han Chi, Yung-Sung Chuang, Cheng-I Jeff Lai, Kushal Lakhotia, Yist Y Lin, Andy T Liu, Jiatong Shi, Xuankai Chang, Guan-Ting Lin, et al. 2021. Superb: Speech processing universal performance benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01051*.
- Cheng Yi, Jianzong Wang, Ning Cheng, Shiyu Zhou, and Bo Xu. 2021. Transfer ability of monolingual wav2vec2.0 for low-resource speech recognition. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, page 1–6. IEEE.

Table 5: Pre-trained models used during our experiments

Pre-trained model	Languages	Pre-training data
wav2vec 2.0 (2020)	en	60k hours (Libri-Light (2020))
XLSR-53 (2021)	53 languages	56k hours (MLS (2020), Common Voice (2019), BABEL (2014))
HuBERT (2021b)	en	60k hours (Libri-Light (2020))
UniSpeech (2021b)	en	1350 hours (Common Voice (2019))
UniSpeech-ML (2021b)	en, fr, es, it	1961 hours (Common Voice (2019))
VP-100k (2021a)	en, de, fr, es, pl, it, ro, hu, cs, nl, fi, hr, sk, sl, et, lt, pt, bg, el, lv, mt, sv, da	100k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a))
VP-sv (2021a)	sv	16k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a))
VP-nl (2021a)	nl	19k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a))
VP-it (2021a)	it	21k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a))
VP-es (2021a)	es	21k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a))
VP-fr (2021a)	fr	22k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a))
Robust wav2vec 2.0 (2021a)	en	63k hours (Libri-Light (2020), Common Voice (2019), Switchboard (1993), Fisher (2004))
UniSpeech-SAT (2021c)	en	94k hours (Libri-Light (2020), GigaSpeech (2021a), VoxPopuli (2021a))
WavLM (2021b)	en	94k hours (Libri-Light (2020), GigaSpeech (2021a), VoxPopuli (2021a))
XLS-R (2021)	128 languages	436k hours (VoxPopuli (2021a), MLS (2020), Common Voice (2019), VoxLingua107 (2021), BABEL (2014))

Table 6: Summary of the languages used in our experiments and the Common Voice (Ardila et al., 2019) dataset size in hours for each of these languages. The language families are described according to the Ethnologue (Lewis et al., 2016) catalog.

Language	ISO code	Family	Sub-grouping	Train	Val.	Test
Arabic	ar	Afro-Asiatic	Semitic	30h	12h	12h
Chinese	zh	Sino-Tibetan	Chinese	31h	14h	15h
Dutch	nl	Indo-European	Germanic	31h	13h	13h
English	en	Indo-European	Germanic	1209h	27h	26h
Estonian	et	Uralic	Coastal Finnic	5h	4h	4h
French	fr	Indo-European	Italic	545h	25h	25h
German	de	Indo-European	Germanic	572h	26h	26h
Indonesian	id	Austronesian	Malayo-Polynesian	5h	1h	0.5h
Italian	it	Indo-European	Italic	190h	24h	25h
Japanese	ja	Japonic		8h	2h	5h
Persian	fa	Indo-European	Indo-Iranian	13h	8h	10h
Polish	pl	Indo-European	Balto-Slavic	16h	8h	9h
Portuguese	pt	Indo-European	Italic	14h	8h	9h
Russian	ru	Indo-European	Balto-Slavic	25h	13h	13h
Spanish	es	Indo-European	Italic	291h	25h	26h
Swedish	sv	Indo-European	Germanic	7h	4h	5h
Thai	th	Kra-Dai	Kam-Tai	27h	12h	0.3h
Ukrainian	uk	Indo-European	Balto-Slavic	7h	6h	6h

## A Models and data details

This section presents the details about the models and data used in our experiments. You can see the details about the pre-trained models used in Table 5 and a summary of the languages and data in Table 6




Figure 3: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Arabic** language




Figure 4: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **German** language

## B Overall results

This section presents the overall results of our tests in all languages considered.

## C Multilingual models performance (languages)

This section contains tables and charts of the multilingual models' performance over the languages. The average CER for the multilingual models and the p-values of the statistical tests may be found




Figure 5: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **English** language




Figure 6: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Spanish** language






Figure 7: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Estonian** language




Figure 8: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Persian** language




Figure 9: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **French** language




Figure 10: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Indonesian** language




Figure 11: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Italian** language




Figure 12: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Japanese** language




Figure 13: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Dutch** language




Figure 14: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Polish** language




Figure 15: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Portuguese** language




Figure 16: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Russian** language




Figure 17: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Swedish** language




Figure 18: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Thai** language




Figure 19: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Ukrainian** language




Figure 20: Overall performance over the pre-trained models for **Chinese** language

Table 7: Average CER on multilingual fine-tuned models and the p-value of the hypothesis test on models’ performance. Values of  $p > 0.05$  are marked in bold-face.

	US-ML	VP-100k	XLS-R	XLSR-53	p-value
<b>Validation</b>					
ar	0.221 ± 0.005	0.254 ± 0.016	0.193 ± 0.005	0.206 ± 0.011	0.023
de	0.109 ± 0.004	0.069 ± 0.002	0.049 ± 0.001	0.048 ± 0.000	0.016
en	0.077 ± 0.001	0.164 ± 0.005	0.113 ± 0.002	0.107 ± 0.000	0.016
es	0.027 ± 0.004	0.057 ± 0.001	0.041 ± 0.001	0.043 ± 0.000	0.016
et	0.135 ± 0.004	0.063 ± 0.000	0.069 ± 0.002	0.098 ± 0.001	0.016
fa	0.140 ± 0.002	0.151 ± 0.010	0.097 ± 0.010	0.092 ± 0.000	0.024
fr	0.070 ± 0.010	0.107 ± 0.001	0.083 ± 0.001	0.082 ± 0.000	0.019
id	0.102 ± 0.004	0.133 ± 0.007	0.081 ± 0.001	0.088 ± 0.002	0.016
it	0.024 ± 0.001	0.051 ± 0.000	0.039 ± 0.001	0.042 ± 0.000	0.016
ja	0.382 ± 0.003	0.548 ± 0.016	0.533 ± 0.016	0.525 ± 0.007	0.044
nl	0.112 ± 0.007	0.041 ± 0.001	0.045 ± 0.010	0.041 ± 0.000	<b>0.086</b>
pl	0.109 ± 0.004	0.047 ± 0.001	0.034 ± 0.001	0.041 ± 0.001	0.016
pt	0.077 ± 0.001	0.068 ± 0.002	0.048 ± 0.000	0.049 ± 0.001	0.016
ru	0.118 ± 0.003	0.057 ± 0.001	0.046 ± 0.000	0.067 ± 0.001	0.016
sv	0.159 ± 0.005	0.106 ± 0.005	0.083 ± 0.003	0.118 ± 0.003	0.016
th	0.301 ± 0.005	0.324 ± 0.001	0.276 ± 0.004	0.285 ± 0.001	0.016
uk	0.116 ± 0.004	0.068 ± 0.002	0.054 ± 0.001	0.073 ± 0.001	0.016
zh	0.346 ± 0.001	0.725 ± 0.026	0.601 ± 0.061	0.540 ± 0.025	0.019
<b>Test</b>					
ar	0.221 ± 0.008	0.258 ± 0.016	0.195 ± 0.007	0.211 ± 0.018	0.038
de	0.119 ± 0.004	0.078 ± 0.002	0.056 ± 0.002	0.054 ± 0.000	0.016
en	0.089 ± 0.001	0.204 ± 0.006	0.143 ± 0.002	0.136 ± 0.001	0.016
es	0.029 ± 0.004	0.065 ± 0.001	0.047 ± 0.001	0.050 ± 0.000	0.016
et	0.123 ± 0.004	0.058 ± 0.001	0.059 ± 0.002	0.086 ± 0.001	0.025
fa	0.167 ± 0.003	0.178 ± 0.007	0.119 ± 0.007	0.115 ± 0.001	0.025
fr	0.075 ± 0.010	0.120 ± 0.000	0.093 ± 0.001	0.093 ± 0.000	0.024
id	0.109 ± 0.004	0.128 ± 0.006	0.092 ± 0.001	0.097 ± 0.002	0.016
it	0.025 ± 0.001	0.055 ± 0.000	0.043 ± 0.001	0.045 ± 0.000	0.015
ja	0.432 ± 0.006	0.601 ± 0.013	0.589 ± 0.026	0.582 ± 0.017	<b>0.057</b>
nl	0.135 ± 0.008	0.067 ± 0.001	0.063 ± 0.010	0.057 ± 0.001	0.031
pl	0.118 ± 0.004	0.061 ± 0.001	0.041 ± 0.001	0.048 ± 0.001	0.016
pt	0.079 ± 0.001	0.074 ± 0.002	0.051 ± 0.000	0.053 ± 0.000	0.016
ru	0.130 ± 0.003	0.071 ± 0.000	0.057 ± 0.001	0.079 ± 0.001	0.016
sv	0.157 ± 0.004	0.109 ± 0.006	0.084 ± 0.003	0.120 ± 0.003	0.016
th	0.304 ± 0.004	0.325 ± 0.001	0.278 ± 0.004	0.288 ± 0.001	0.016
uk	0.131 ± 0.005	0.082 ± 0.002	0.064 ± 0.001	0.086 ± 0.001	0.016
zh	0.357 ± 0.002	0.730 ± 0.026	0.607 ± 0.060	0.547 ± 0.024	0.019

in Table 7. The ranking of the models for each language is presented in Table 8. Table 9 shows the p-values obtained by the post-hoc tests of each pair of models.

## D Multilingual models performance (language families)

This section contains tables and charts of the multilingual models performance over the language families. The average CER for the multilingual models and the p-values of the statistical tests may be found in Tables 10 and 12. The ranking of the models for each language family group is presented in Table 13. Table 14 shows the p-values obtained by the post-hoc tests of each pair of models. To explore the diversity of language families in the non-Indo-European group, we describe the basic statistics of language families in Table 15, Figure 21 and Figure 22






Figure 21: Multilingual pre-trained models performance(CER) over language families on the **validation** set




Figure 22: Multilingual pre-trained models performance(CER) over language families on the **test** set

Table 8: Multilingual fine-tuned models ranking based on the average CER

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
<b>Validation</b>				
ar	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
de	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
en	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
es	UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k
et	VP-100k	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
fa	XLSR-53	XLS-R	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
fr	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
id	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
it	UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k
ja	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
nl	VP-100k	XLSR-53	XLS-R	UniSpeech-ML
pl	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
pt	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
ru	XLS-R	VP-100k	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
sv	XLS-R	VP-100k	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
th	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
uk	XLS-R	VP-100k	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
zh	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
<b>Test</b>				
ar	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
de	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
en	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
es	UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k
et	VP-100k	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
fa	XLSR-53	XLS-R	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
fr	UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k
id	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
it	UniSpeech-ML	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k
ja	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
nl	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
pl	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
pt	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k	UniSpeech-ML
ru	XLS-R	VP-100k	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
sv	XLS-R	VP-100k	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
th	XLS-R	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML	VP-100k
uk	XLS-R	VP-100k	XLSR-53	UniSpeech-ML
zh	UniSpeech-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k

## E Monolingual models performance

This section contains tables and charts to support our findings for RQ3. We divided these results into two parts: English pre-trained monolingual models, and VoxPopuli pre-trained monolingual models. All tables also present the non-pre-trained models (NP) as a performance baseline. Table 16 presents the average CER of English pre-trained monolingual models as well as Kruskal-Wallis p-values. A model ranking per language is presented in Table 17, with the addition of multilingual models for comparison. The results of Conover-Imam tests between pairs of models are shown in Table 18, and a count of  $p > 0.05$  per model-pair and language is presented in Table 19.

As for the VoxPopuli data, Table 20 presents the average CER for each model/language, with Kruskal-Wallis p-values as well. A frequency of model rankings is shown in Table 4. The Conover-Imam p-value test results for each model pair and language is shown in Table 22, while the count of  $p > 0.05$  for each model pair/language is shown in Table 23.

Table 9: The p-value of post-hoc hypothesis test on multilingual models’ performance. Values of  $p > 0.05$  are marked in bold-face.

	US-ML VP-100k	US-ML XLS-R	US-ML XLSR-53	VP-100k XLS-R	VP-100k XLSR-53	XLS-R XLSR-53
<b>Validation</b>						
ar	<b>0.091</b>	0.012	<b>0.138</b>	0.001	0.007	<b>0.138</b>
de	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.019
en	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.000	0.019
es	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
et	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.000	0.019
fa	<b>0.097</b>	0.019	0.044	0.002	0.003	<b>0.461</b>
fr	0.000	0.003	0.040	0.040	0.003	<b>0.058</b>
id	0.019	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019
it	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
ja	0.012	0.049	<b>0.219</b>	<b>0.587</b>	<b>0.219</b>	<b>0.587</b>
nl	<b>0.160</b>	<b>0.075</b>	<b>0.162</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>
pl	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
pt	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
ru	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.000
sv	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.000
th	0.019	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019
uk	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.000
zh	0.000	0.003	0.040	0.040	0.003	<b>0.058</b>
<b>Test</b>						
ar	<b>0.130</b>	<b>0.126</b>	<b>0.347</b>	0.006	0.047	<b>0.297</b>
de	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.019
en	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.000	0.019
es	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
et	0.003	0.003	<b>0.109</b>	<b>0.809</b>	0.032	0.035
fa	<b>0.109</b>	0.035	0.032	0.003	0.003	<b>0.809</b>
fr	0.001	0.044	0.024	0.024	0.044	<b>0.461</b>
id	0.019	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019
it	0.000	0.016	0.000	0.000	0.016	0.016
ja	0.026	<b>0.075</b>	<b>0.225</b>	<b>0.832</b>	<b>0.374</b>	<b>0.832</b>
nl	<b>0.088</b>	0.038	0.003	<b>0.403</b>	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.116</b>
pl	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
pt	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019
ru	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.000
sv	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.000
th	0.019	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.019
uk	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.000
zh	0.000	0.003	0.040	0.040	0.003	<b>0.058</b>

Table 10: Average CER plus or minus the standard deviation on multilingual fine-tuned models and the p-value of hypothesis test on models’ performance on Indo-European and non-Indo-European language family

	Indo-European	non-Indo-European	p-value
<b>Validation</b>			
UniSpeech-ML	0.095 ± 0.040	0.248 ± 0.107	0.000
VP-100k	0.082 ± 0.040	0.341 ± 0.237	0.000
XLS-R	0.061 ± 0.025	0.292 ± 0.214	0.000
XLSR-53	0.067 ± 0.027	0.290 ± 0.189	0.000
<b>Test</b>			
UniSpeech-ML	0.105 ± 0.045	0.258 ± 0.122	0.000
VP-100k	0.097 ± 0.047	0.350 ± 0.249	0.000
XLS-R	0.072 ± 0.031	0.303 ± 0.228	0.000
XLSR-53	0.078 ± 0.031	0.302 ± 0.205	0.000

Table 11: Average CER plus or minus the standard deviation on multilingual fine-tuned models and the p-value of hypothesis test on models’ performance on Indo-European and non-Indo-European language family (**without Chinese and Japanese languages**)

	Indo-European	non-Indo-European	p-value
<b>Validation</b>			
UniSpeech-ML	0.095 ± 0.040	0.190 ± 0.081	0.001
VP-100k	0.082 ± 0.040	0.194 ± 0.106	0.001
XLS-R	0.061 ± 0.025	0.155 ± 0.089	0.001
XLSR-53	0.067 ± 0.027	0.169 ± 0.085	0.000
<b>Test</b>			
UniSpeech-ML	0.105 ± 0.045	0.189 ± 0.083	0.012
VP-100k	0.097 ± 0.047	0.192 ± 0.110	0.018
XLS-R	0.072 ± 0.031	0.156 ± 0.091	0.001
XLSR-53	0.078 ± 0.031	0.170 ± 0.088	0.001

Table 12: Average CER plus or minus the standard deviation on multilingual fine-tuned models and the p-value of hypothesis test on performance between models on Indo-European and non-Indo-European language family groups. Values of  $p > 0.05$  are marked in bold-face.

	US-ML	VP-100k	XLS-R	XLSR-53	p-value
<b>Validation</b>					
Indo-European	0.095 ± 0.040	0.082 ± 0.040	0.061 ± 0.025	0.067 ± 0.027	0.001
non-Indo-European	0.248 ± 0.107	0.341 ± 0.237	0.292 ± 0.214	0.290 ± 0.189	<b>0.861</b>
<b>Test</b>					
Indo-European	0.105 ± 0.045	0.097 ± 0.047	0.072 ± 0.031	0.078 ± 0.031	0.001
non-Indo-European	0.258 ± 0.122	0.350 ± 0.249	0.303 ± 0.228	0.302 ± 0.205	<b>0.807</b>

Table 13: Multilingual fine-tuned models ranking based on the average CER on Indo-European and non-Indo-European language family groups

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
<b>Validation</b>				
Indo-European	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k	US-ML
non-Indo-European	US-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k
<b>Test</b>				
Indo-European	XLS-R	XLSR-53	VP-100k	US-ML
non-Indo-European	US-ML	XLSR-53	XLS-R	VP-100k

Table 14: The p-value of post-hoc Conover-Iman hypothesis test on models’ performance on Indo-European languages. Values of  $p > 0.05$  are marked in bold-face.

Split	US-ML VP-100k	US-ML XLS-R	US-ML XLSR-53	VP-100k XLS-R	VP-100k XLSR-53	XLS-R XLSR-53
Validation	<b>0.335</b>	0.000	0.010	0.044	<b>0.335</b>	<b>0.335</b>
Test	<b>0.569</b>	0.001	0.013	0.025	<b>0.145</b>	<b>0.569</b>

Table 15: Average CER plus or minus the standard deviation on multilingual fine-tuned models performance grouped by language family

	US-ML	VP-100k	XLS-R	XLSR-53
<b>Validation</b>				
Afro-Asiatic	$0.221 \pm 0.005$	$0.254 \pm 0.016$	$0.193 \pm 0.005$	$0.206 \pm 0.011$
Austronesian	$0.102 \pm 0.004$	$0.133 \pm 0.007$	$0.081 \pm 0.001$	$0.088 \pm 0.002$
Indo-European	$0.095 \pm 0.040$	$0.082 \pm 0.040$	$0.061 \pm 0.025$	$0.067 \pm 0.027$
Japonic	$0.382 \pm 0.003$	$0.548 \pm 0.016$	$0.533 \pm 0.016$	$0.525 \pm 0.007$
Kra-Dai	$0.301 \pm 0.005$	$0.324 \pm 0.001$	$0.276 \pm 0.004$	$0.285 \pm 0.001$
Sino-Tibetan	$0.346 \pm 0.001$	$0.725 \pm 0.026$	$0.601 \pm 0.061$	$0.540 \pm 0.025$
Uralic	$0.135 \pm 0.004$	$0.063 \pm 0.000$	$0.069 \pm 0.002$	$0.098 \pm 0.001$
<b>Test</b>				
Afro-Asiatic	$0.221 \pm 0.008$	$0.258 \pm 0.016$	$0.195 \pm 0.007$	$0.211 \pm 0.018$
Austronesian	$0.109 \pm 0.004$	$0.128 \pm 0.006$	$0.092 \pm 0.001$	$0.097 \pm 0.002$
Indo-European	$0.105 \pm 0.045$	$0.097 \pm 0.047$	$0.072 \pm 0.031$	$0.078 \pm 0.031$
Japonic	$0.432 \pm 0.006$	$0.601 \pm 0.013$	$0.589 \pm 0.026$	$0.582 \pm 0.017$
Kra-Dai	$0.304 \pm 0.004$	$0.325 \pm 0.001$	$0.278 \pm 0.004$	$0.288 \pm 0.001$
Sino-Tibetan	$0.357 \pm 0.002$	$0.730 \pm 0.026$	$0.607 \pm 0.060$	$0.547 \pm 0.024$
Uralic	$0.123 \pm 0.004$	$0.058 \pm 0.001$	$0.059 \pm 0.002$	$0.086 \pm 0.001$

Table 16: Average CER on **English monolingual** and no pre-trained fine-tuned models and the p-value of the hypothesis test on models' performance.

	<b>HuBERT</b>	<b>R-wav2vec2</b>	<b>UniSpeech</b>	<b>US-SAT</b>	<b>wav2vec2</b>	<b>WavLM</b>	<b>NP</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Validation</b>								
ar	0.249 ± 0.008	0.242 ± 0.006	0.243 ± 0.006	0.257 ± 0.006	0.239 ± 0.002	0.238 ± 0.010	0.782 ± 0.058	0.024
de	0.125 ± 0.003	0.112 ± 0.001	0.127 ± 0.002	0.148 ± 0.003	0.118 ± 0.004	0.116 ± 0.003	0.749 ± 0.058	0.005
en	0.114 ± 0.016	0.086 ± 0.001	0.066 ± 0.003	0.116 ± 0.015	0.098 ± 0.005	0.081 ± 0.001	0.762 ± 0.009	0.004
es	0.118 ± 0.002	0.103 ± 0.001	0.109 ± 0.003	0.127 ± 0.008	0.104 ± 0.000	0.100 ± 0.007	0.762 ± 0.039	0.006
et	0.143 ± 0.004	0.133 ± 0.005	0.155 ± 0.002	0.161 ± 0.008	0.136 ± 0.003	0.138 ± 0.002	0.725 ± 0.015	0.007
fa	0.153 ± 0.002	0.147 ± 0.001	0.150 ± 0.006	0.173 ± 0.006	0.160 ± 0.010	0.142 ± 0.002	0.770 ± 0.046	0.006
fr	0.188 ± 0.009	0.175 ± 0.002	0.219 ± 0.046	0.216 ± 0.005	0.183 ± 0.012	0.168 ± 0.006	0.716 ± 0.010	0.008
id	0.139 ± 0.004	0.121 ± 0.002	0.121 ± 0.002	0.134 ± 0.002	0.137 ± 0.004	0.122 ± 0.002	0.807 ± 0.085	0.008
it	0.105 ± 0.002	0.092 ± 0.001	0.102 ± 0.003	0.122 ± 0.007	0.094 ± 0.001	0.090 ± 0.004	0.728 ± 0.034	0.005
ja	0.457 ± 0.001	0.612 ± 0.035	0.414 ± 0.029	0.465 ± 0.022	0.540 ± 0.022	0.576 ± 0.110	0.948 ± 0.006	0.005
nl	0.129 ± 0.001	0.108 ± 0.005	0.114 ± 0.007	0.142 ± 0.000	0.110 ± 0.006	0.117 ± 0.000	0.723 ± 0.020	0.007
pl	0.114 ± 0.002	0.111 ± 0.002	0.124 ± 0.001	0.134 ± 0.005	0.110 ± 0.001	0.106 ± 0.001	0.798 ± 0.012	0.004
pt	0.139 ± 0.003	0.132 ± 0.001	0.148 ± 0.010	0.153 ± 0.001	0.132 ± 0.002	0.123 ± 0.005	0.771 ± 0.009	0.004
ru	0.137 ± 0.002	0.130 ± 0.001	0.146 ± 0.005	0.157 ± 0.012	0.131 ± 0.001	0.131 ± 0.004	0.754 ± 0.025	0.006
sv	0.172 ± 0.001	0.165 ± 0.004	0.174 ± 0.001	0.192 ± 0.010	0.177 ± 0.019	0.164 ± 0.001	0.767 ± 0.015	0.012
th	0.301 ± 0.003	0.310 ± 0.002	0.306 ± 0.002	0.323 ± 0.007	0.313 ± 0.007	0.305 ± 0.007	0.876 ± 0.098	0.010
uk	0.120 ± 0.002	0.119 ± 0.000	0.135 ± 0.002	0.141 ± 0.005	0.120 ± 0.003	0.118 ± 0.004	0.770 ± 0.003	0.012
zh	0.514 ± 0.008	0.783 ± 0.116	0.358 ± 0.002	0.503 ± 0.009	0.728 ± 0.035	0.908 ± 0.066	0.989 ± 0.007	0.004
<b>Test</b>								
ar	0.247 ± 0.003	0.238 ± 0.010	0.247 ± 0.006	0.259 ± 0.006	0.244 ± 0.005	0.239 ± 0.008	0.792 ± 0.050	0.022
de	0.137 ± 0.002	0.124 ± 0.001	0.137 ± 0.002	0.158 ± 0.003	0.130 ± 0.005	0.126 ± 0.003	0.751 ± 0.056	0.006
en	0.143 ± 0.019	0.114 ± 0.001	0.075 ± 0.004	0.141 ± 0.016	0.129 ± 0.007	0.103 ± 0.001	0.773 ± 0.001	0.005
es	0.129 ± 0.002	0.113 ± 0.001	0.119 ± 0.003	0.136 ± 0.008	0.115 ± 0.001	0.110 ± 0.008	0.767 ± 0.034	0.007
et	0.129 ± 0.003	0.120 ± 0.005	0.142 ± 0.002	0.148 ± 0.007	0.124 ± 0.002	0.123 ± 0.002	0.741 ± 0.019	0.007
fa	0.178 ± 0.001	0.174 ± 0.002	0.177 ± 0.006	0.197 ± 0.006	0.186 ± 0.008	0.167 ± 0.003	0.769 ± 0.041	0.006
fr	0.203 ± 0.009	0.189 ± 0.002	0.232 ± 0.046	0.228 ± 0.005	0.198 ± 0.011	0.181 ± 0.006	0.718 ± 0.010	0.007
id	0.143 ± 0.004	0.126 ± 0.001	0.125 ± 0.001	0.149 ± 0.003	0.140 ± 0.003	0.133 ± 0.003	0.814 ± 0.093	0.004
it	0.110 ± 0.002	0.097 ± 0.001	0.108 ± 0.003	0.127 ± 0.006	0.100 ± 0.002	0.094 ± 0.004	0.730 ± 0.034	0.004
ja	0.512 ± 0.004	0.639 ± 0.015	0.463 ± 0.022	0.536 ± 0.027	0.583 ± 0.021	0.596 ± 0.075	0.956 ± 0.006	0.007
nl	0.151 ± 0.001	0.133 ± 0.005	0.136 ± 0.006	0.166 ± 0.002	0.136 ± 0.007	0.138 ± 0.000	0.745 ± 0.025	0.011
pl	0.124 ± 0.002	0.122 ± 0.002	0.133 ± 0.001	0.145 ± 0.005	0.123 ± 0.000	0.113 ± 0.001	0.806 ± 0.017	0.005
pt	0.145 ± 0.003	0.136 ± 0.002	0.152 ± 0.011	0.157 ± 0.000	0.139 ± 0.002	0.127 ± 0.006	0.767 ± 0.008	0.004
ru	0.152 ± 0.003	0.144 ± 0.001	0.159 ± 0.005	0.172 ± 0.013	0.147 ± 0.001	0.144 ± 0.003	0.761 ± 0.026	0.005
sv	0.168 ± 0.002	0.164 ± 0.005	0.169 ± 0.001	0.190 ± 0.010	0.176 ± 0.017	0.160 ± 0.001	0.754 ± 0.013	0.012
th	0.304 ± 0.002	0.314 ± 0.002	0.308 ± 0.002	0.322 ± 0.006	0.316 ± 0.007	0.307 ± 0.007	0.878 ± 0.097	0.007
uk	0.137 ± 0.002	0.136 ± 0.001	0.151 ± 0.002	0.156 ± 0.004	0.138 ± 0.001	0.134 ± 0.005	0.776 ± 0.009	0.010
zh	0.523 ± 0.008	0.785 ± 0.113	0.370 ± 0.002	0.514 ± 0.010	0.731 ± 0.033	0.908 ± 0.064	0.989 ± 0.007	0.004

Table 17: **English monolingual** fine-tuned models ranking based on the average CER. For comparison purposes, the best multilingual and the fine-tuned model without pre-training are included in the ranking, both in bold-face font. Where, HB = HuBERT, RW = R-wav2vec2, US = UniSpeech, USS = UniSpeech-SAT, W = wav2vec2, WL = WavLM, XR = XLS-R, X53 = XLSR-53, USM = UniSpeech-ML, NP = no-pretraining, and VP = VP-100k. Multilingual and no-pretrained models are marked in bold-face.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
Validation								
ar	<b>XR</b>	WL	W	RW	US	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
de	<b>X53</b>	RW	WL	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
en	US	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
es	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	US	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
et	<b>VP</b>	RW	W	WL	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
fa	<b>X53</b>	WL	RW	US	HB	W	USS	<b>NP</b>
fr	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	HB	USS	US	<b>NP</b>
id	<b>XR</b>	RW	US	WL	USS	W	HB	<b>NP</b>
it	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	US	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
ja	<b>USM</b>	US	HB	USS	W	WL	RW	<b>NP</b>
nl	<b>VP</b>	RW	W	US	WL	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
pl	<b>XR</b>	WL	W	RW	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
pt	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
ru	<b>XR</b>	RW	WL	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
sv	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	HB	US	W	USS	<b>NP</b>
th	<b>XR</b>	HB	WL	US	RW	W	USS	<b>NP</b>
uk	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	HB	W	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
zh	<b>USM</b>	US	USS	HB	W	RW	WL	<b>NP</b>
Test								
ar	<b>XR</b>	RW	WL	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
de	<b>X53</b>	RW	WL	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
en	US	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	USS	HB	<b>NP</b>
es	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	US	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
et	<b>VP</b>	RW	WL	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
fa	<b>X53</b>	WL	RW	US	HB	W	USS	<b>NP</b>
fr	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	HB	USS	US	<b>NP</b>
id	<b>XR</b>	US	RW	WL	W	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
it	<b>USM</b>	WL	RW	W	US	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
ja	<b>USM</b>	US	HB	USS	W	WL	RW	<b>NP</b>
nl	<b>X53</b>	RW	US	W	WL	HB	USS	<b>NP</b>
pl	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
pt	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
ru	<b>XR</b>	RW	WL	W	HB	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
sv	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	HB	US	W	USS	<b>NP</b>
th	<b>XR</b>	HB	WL	US	RW	W	USS	<b>NP</b>
uk	<b>XR</b>	WL	RW	HB	W	US	USS	<b>NP</b>
zh	<b>USM</b>	US	USS	HB	W	RW	WL	<b>NP</b>

Table 18: The p-value of post-hoc hypothesis test on **English monolingual** models’ performance. Where, HB=HuBERT, RW=R-wav2vec2, US=UniSpeech, USS=UniSpeech-SAT, W=wav2vec2, and WL=WavLM. Values with  $p > 0.05$  are shown in bold-face font.

	HB RW	HB US	HB USS	HB W	HB WL	HB NP	RW US	RW USS	RW W	RW WL	RW NP	US USS	US W	US WL	US NP	USS W	USS WL	USS NP	W WL	W NP	WL NP
Validation																					
ar	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	<b>0.47</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.05	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	0.01
de	0.00	<b>0.61</b>	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.30</b>	0.00	<b>0.17</b>	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.61</b>	0.00	0.00
en	0.00	0.00	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.14</b>	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.17</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.17</b>	0.00	<b>0.14</b>	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
es	0.00	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.77</b>	0.01	0.00	<b>0.10</b>	0.03	0.00	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.86</b>	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.41</b>	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.52</b>	0.00	0.00
et	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.34</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.01	<b>0.21</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.34</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.00
fa	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.49</b>	0.01	0.00	<b>0.47</b>	0.00	0.02	<b>0.47</b>	0.00	0.02	<b>0.40</b>	0.03	0.00	<b>0.47</b>	0.00	<b>0.47</b>	0.00	0.03	0.00
fr	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.72</b>	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.00	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.60</b>	0.00	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.60</b>	0.00	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.09</b>	0.00	<b>0.60</b>	0.05	0.00	0.00
id	0.00	0.00	<b>0.66</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	<b>0.44</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.03	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.13</b>	0.03	0.02	<b>0.15</b>	0.00
it	0.00	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.32</b>	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.81</b>	0.00	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.53</b>	0.00	0.00
ja	0.00	<b>0.21</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	0.01
nl	0.00	0.05	<b>0.96</b>	0.01	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.96</b>	0.00	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.96</b>	0.00	0.00	0.05	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.22</b>	0.00	0.00
pl	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.12</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.10</b>	0.05	0.00	0.00
pt	0.01	<b>0.10</b>	0.04	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.09</b>	0.00	<b>0.52</b>	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	0.02	0.00	0.00
ru	0.01	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.83</b>	0.00	<b>0.83</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.06</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.48</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.00
sv	<b>0.44</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.29</b>	0.02	<b>0.08</b>	0.01	<b>0.62</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.21</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.39</b>	0.02	0.00
th	0.04	<b>0.73</b>	0.00	0.02	<b>0.57</b>	0.00	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.49</b>	0.05	0.01	<b>0.27</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>0.54</b>	0.02	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.00
uk	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.24</b>	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>0.13</b>	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.18</b>	0.04	<b>0.31</b>	0.02	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.00
zh	0.01	0.01	<b>0.23</b>	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	<b>0.12</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	<b>0.12</b>
Test																					
ar	<b>0.79</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	<b>0.79</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.17</b>	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.03	0.01
de	0.00	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.24</b>	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.76</b>	0.00	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.20</b>	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.37</b>	0.00	0.00
en	0.01	0.00	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.56</b>	0.00	<b>0.07</b>	0.03	0.02	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.48</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.48</b>	0.00	<b>0.68</b>	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.00
es	0.00	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.84</b>	0.04	0.00	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.87</b>	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.12</b>	0.00	0.01	0.00	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.54</b>	0.00	0.00
et	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	0.00	<b>0.21</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.34</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.00
fa	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.48</b>	0.03	<b>0.34</b>	0.01	0.00	<b>0.38</b>	0.00	0.01	<b>0.34</b>	0.00	0.01	<b>0.14</b>	0.03	0.00	<b>0.38</b>	0.00	<b>0.37</b>	0.00	0.04	0.00
fr	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.74</b>	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.48</b>	0.00	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.40</b>	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	<b>0.40</b>	0.02	0.00	0.00
id	0.00	0.00	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.76</b>	0.02	0.00	<b>0.76</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.05	0.00	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	0.00
it	0.00	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.06</b>	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.41</b>	0.00	0.01	<b>0.06</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.09</b>	0.01	0.00	0.00
ja	0.00	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.51</b>	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.03	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.51</b>	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.51</b>	0.00	<b>0.87</b>	0.03	0.02
nl	0.03	<b>0.19</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.03	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.00
pl	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	<b>0.70</b>	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.09</b>	0.00	<b>0.48</b>	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	<b>0.48</b>	0.02	0.00	0.00
pt	0.01	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.15</b>	0.00	<b>0.27</b>	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	<b>0.10</b>	0.01	0.00	0.00
ru	0.00	<b>0.23</b>	0.02	<b>0.21</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.83</b>	0.00	<b>0.30</b>	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.23</b>	0.00	0.00
sv	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.28</b>	0.02	<b>0.20</b>	0.01	<b>0.46</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.41</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.14</b>	0.04	0.00
th	0.01	<b>0.67</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.67</b>	0.00	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.03	0.00	<b>0.07</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>0.67</b>	0.00	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.06</b>	0.00
uk	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	0.04	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.50</b>	0.02	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.09</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.74</b>	0.01	0.00
zh	0.01	0.02	<b>0.54</b>	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.12</b>	0.00	<b>0.12</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.06</b>	0.00	<b>0.12</b>



Table 19: The frequency with which a **English monolingual** fine-tuned model pair showed no statistical difference (p-value above 0.05), no-pretraining in bold-face font.

Validation		
R-wav2vec2	WavLM	17
R-wav2vec2	wav2vec2	16
HuBERT	UniSpeech	14
UniSpeech-SAT	<b>no-pretraining</b>	14
UniSpeech	UniSpeech-SAT	13
HuBERT	UniSpeech-SAT	13
wav2vec2	WavLM	11
HuBERT	wav2vec2	10
UniSpeech	wav2vec2	9
HuBERT	R-wav2vec2	7
HuBERT	WavLM	7
R-wav2vec2	UniSpeech	7
UniSpeech-SAT	wav2vec2	7
UniSpeech	WavLM	5
UniSpeech	<b>no-pretraining</b>	5
HuBERT	<b>no-pretraining</b>	4
R-wav2vec2	UniSpeech-SAT	2
UniSpeech-SAT	WavLM	2
wav2vec2	<b>no-pretraining</b>	2
R-wav2vec2	<b>no-pretraining</b>	1
WavLM	<b>no-pretraining</b>	1
Test		
R-wav2vec2	WavLM	18
R-wav2vec2	wav2vec2	16
UniSpeech-SAT	<b>no-pretraining</b>	15
HuBERT	UniSpeech	14
HuBERT	UniSpeech-SAT	13
HuBERT	wav2vec2	13
wav2vec2	WavLM	12
UniSpeech	UniSpeech-SAT	11
UniSpeech	wav2vec2	10
UniSpeech-SAT	wav2vec2	8
HuBERT	R-wav2vec2	7
R-wav2vec2	UniSpeech	7
HuBERT	WavLM	6
UniSpeech	WavLM	5
UniSpeech	<b>no-pretraining</b>	5
HuBERT	<b>no-pretraining</b>	4
R-wav2vec2	UniSpeech-SAT	1
R-wav2vec2	<b>no-pretraining</b>	1
UniSpeech-SAT	WavLM	1
wav2vec2	<b>no-pretraining</b>	1
WavLM	<b>no-pretraining</b>	1

Table 20: Average CER on **VoxPopuli monolingual** and no pre-trained fine-tuned models and the p-value of hypothesis test on models’ performance. Values in bold-face correspond to  $p > 0.05$ .

	VP-es	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-nl	VP-sv	NP	p-value
<b>Validation</b>							
ar	0.301 ± 0.004	0.291 ± 0.007	0.283 ± 0.006	0.283 ± 0.006	0.280 ± 0.002	0.782 ± 0.058	0.021
de	0.188 ± 0.009	0.175 ± 0.002	0.190 ± 0.007	0.138 ± 0.002	0.164 ± 0.006	0.749 ± 0.058	0.006
en	0.311 ± 0.005	0.293 ± 0.002	0.308 ± 0.009	0.283 ± 0.003	0.298 ± 0.007	0.762 ± 0.009	0.010
es	0.063 ± 0.002	0.134 ± 0.002	0.111 ± 0.002	0.142 ± 0.005	0.145 ± 0.008	0.762 ± 0.039	0.007
et	0.172 ± 0.005	0.177 ± 0.003	0.180 ± 0.008	0.192 ± 0.004	0.172 ± 0.005	0.725 ± 0.015	0.019
fa	0.197 ± 0.007	0.193 ± 0.003	0.302 ± 0.179	0.246 ± 0.005	0.188 ± 0.001	0.770 ± 0.046	0.027
fr	0.211 ± 0.002	0.172 ± 0.106	0.209 ± 0.004	0.229 ± 0.004	0.241 ± 0.006	0.716 ± 0.010	0.036
id	0.191 ± 0.009	0.204 ± 0.012	0.209 ± 0.003	0.208 ± 0.010	0.213 ± 0.007	0.807 ± 0.085	0.043
it	0.098 ± 0.000	0.114 ± 0.004	0.054 ± 0.001	0.133 ± 0.002	0.133 ± 0.004	0.728 ± 0.034	0.007
ja	0.564 ± 0.023	0.603 ± 0.011	0.565 ± 0.007	0.604 ± 0.012	0.595 ± 0.009	0.948 ± 0.006	0.014
nl	0.180 ± 0.001	0.173 ± 0.004	0.194 ± 0.002	0.043 ± 0.010	0.161 ± 0.003	0.723 ± 0.020	0.005
pl	0.153 ± 0.003	0.149 ± 0.006	0.151 ± 0.005	0.150 ± 0.003	0.151 ± 0.002	0.798 ± 0.012	<b>0.144</b>
pt	0.122 ± 0.008	0.165 ± 0.003	0.144 ± 0.004	0.179 ± 0.003	0.208 ± 0.018	0.771 ± 0.009	0.005
ru	0.166 ± 0.003	0.161 ± 0.008	0.172 ± 0.009	0.176 ± 0.007	0.174 ± 0.003	0.754 ± 0.025	0.039
sv	0.252 ± 0.017	0.228 ± 0.002	0.252 ± 0.003	0.220 ± 0.010	0.092 ± 0.010	0.767 ± 0.015	0.008
th	0.353 ± 0.006	0.348 ± 0.002	0.349 ± 0.006	0.354 ± 0.008	0.346 ± 0.004	0.876 ± 0.098	<b>0.104</b>
uk	0.153 ± 0.002	0.148 ± 0.006	0.148 ± 0.003	0.153 ± 0.007	0.159 ± 0.004	0.770 ± 0.003	<b>0.054</b>
zh	0.707 ± 0.058	0.627 ± 0.002	0.632 ± 0.038	0.643 ± 0.027	0.614 ± 0.027	0.989 ± 0.007	0.048
<b>Test</b>							
ar	0.298 ± 0.008	0.294 ± 0.008	0.286 ± 0.003	0.286 ± 0.008	0.287 ± 0.003	0.792 ± 0.050	0.041
de	0.202 ± 0.010	0.189 ± 0.002	0.204 ± 0.007	0.151 ± 0.002	0.178 ± 0.005	0.751 ± 0.056	0.007
en	0.353 ± 0.006	0.336 ± 0.003	0.353 ± 0.010	0.328 ± 0.004	0.342 ± 0.007	0.773 ± 0.001	0.011
es	0.073 ± 0.002	0.146 ± 0.003	0.123 ± 0.001	0.155 ± 0.005	0.158 ± 0.008	0.767 ± 0.034	0.006
et	0.164 ± 0.006	0.167 ± 0.004	0.170 ± 0.010	0.179 ± 0.006	0.162 ± 0.005	0.741 ± 0.019	0.032
fa	0.228 ± 0.006	0.225 ± 0.002	0.337 ± 0.189	0.264 ± 0.005	0.220 ± 0.002	0.769 ± 0.041	0.028
fr	0.227 ± 0.003	0.184 ± 0.106	0.225 ± 0.004	0.246 ± 0.004	0.257 ± 0.007	0.718 ± 0.010	0.036
id	0.183 ± 0.011	0.201 ± 0.016	0.199 ± 0.003	0.197 ± 0.013	0.201 ± 0.004	0.814 ± 0.093	<b>0.051</b>
it	0.105 ± 0.001	0.120 ± 0.004	0.058 ± 0.001	0.140 ± 0.002	0.139 ± 0.004	0.730 ± 0.034	0.007
ja	0.627 ± 0.015	0.658 ± 0.013	0.632 ± 0.016	0.657 ± 0.017	0.635 ± 0.009	0.956 ± 0.006	0.024
nl	0.213 ± 0.003	0.207 ± 0.006	0.230 ± 0.003	0.069 ± 0.011	0.196 ± 0.004	0.745 ± 0.025	0.006
pl	0.174 ± 0.004	0.169 ± 0.008	0.170 ± 0.005	0.169 ± 0.002	0.173 ± 0.002	0.806 ± 0.017	<b>0.084</b>
pt	0.129 ± 0.008	0.171 ± 0.003	0.150 ± 0.004	0.187 ± 0.003	0.214 ± 0.017	0.767 ± 0.008	0.005
ru	0.185 ± 0.002	0.180 ± 0.008	0.190 ± 0.009	0.195 ± 0.007	0.192 ± 0.002	0.761 ± 0.026	0.037
sv	0.249 ± 0.017	0.226 ± 0.002	0.246 ± 0.002	0.219 ± 0.006	0.095 ± 0.010	0.754 ± 0.013	0.007
th	0.357 ± 0.005	0.350 ± 0.001	0.354 ± 0.008	0.357 ± 0.008	0.349 ± 0.003	0.878 ± 0.097	<b>0.059</b>
uk	0.176 ± 0.002	0.171 ± 0.007	0.173 ± 0.003	0.177 ± 0.008	0.180 ± 0.003	0.776 ± 0.009	<b>0.059</b>
zh	0.716 ± 0.056	0.635 ± 0.001	0.643 ± 0.038	0.653 ± 0.027	0.627 ± 0.027	0.989 ± 0.007	0.050

Table 21: **VoxPopuli monolingual** fine-tuned models ranking based on the average CER. For comparison purposes, the best multilingual and the fine-tuned model without pre-training are included in the ranking in bold-face font. Where, US-ML = UniSpeech-ML, and NP = no-pretraining. Multilingual and no-pretrained models are marked in bold-face.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
<b>Validation</b>							
ar	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-sv	VP-it	VP-nl	VP-fr	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
de	<b>XLSR-53</b>	VP-nl	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
en	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-nl	VP-fr	VP-sv	VP-it	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
es	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-es	VP-it	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
et	<b>VP-100k</b>	VP-es	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
fa	<b>XLSR-53</b>	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
fr	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
id	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-es	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-it	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
it	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-it	VP-es	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
ja	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-es	VP-it	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
nl	<b>VP-100k</b>	VP-nl	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
pl	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-it	VP-sv	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
pt	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-es	VP-it	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
ru	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	VP-sv	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
sv	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-sv	VP-nl	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
th	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
uk	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
zh	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-nl	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
<b>Test</b>							
ar	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-it	VP-nl	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
de	<b>XLSR-53</b>	VP-nl	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
en	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-nl	VP-fr	VP-sv	VP-es	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
es	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-es	VP-it	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
et	<b>VP-100k</b>	VP-sv	VP-es	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
fa	<b>XLSR-53</b>	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
fr	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
id	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-it	VP-fr	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
it	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-it	VP-es	VP-fr	VP-sv	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
ja	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-es	VP-it	VP-sv	VP-nl	VP-fr	<b>NP</b>
nl	<b>XLSR-53</b>	VP-nl	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	<b>NP</b>
pl	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-it	VP-sv	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
pt	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-es	VP-it	VP-fr	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
ru	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-fr	VP-es	VP-it	VP-sv	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
sv	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-sv	VP-nl	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	<b>NP</b>
th	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	VP-nl	<b>NP</b>
uk	<b>XLS-R</b>	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-es	VP-nl	VP-sv	<b>NP</b>
zh	<b>US-ML</b>	VP-sv	VP-fr	VP-it	VP-nl	VP-es	<b>NP</b>

Table 22: The p-value of post-hoc hypothesis test on **VoxPopuli monolingual** models' performance. Values where  $p > 0.05$  are marked in bold-face.

	es fr	es it	es nl	es sv	es NP	fr it	fr nl	fr sv	fr NP	it nl	it sv	it NP	nl sv	nl NP	sv NP
Validation															
ar	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.02	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	0.00
de	0.02	<b>0.40</b>	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.00
en	0.03	<b>0.73</b>	0.00	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.73</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.00
es	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.78</b>	0.01	0.02
et	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.62</b>	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.68</b>	0.03	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.68</b>	0.04	0.02	<b>0.68</b>	0.00
fa	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.91</b>	0.03	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.11</b>	0.03	<b>0.91</b>	0.00
fr	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.26</b>	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.30</b>	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.23</b>	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>1.00</b>
id	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.25</b>	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.43</b>
it	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.78</b>	0.02	0.01
ja	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	0.02	<b>0.19</b>	0.00	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.14</b>	0.01	<b>0.14</b>	0.00	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.21</b>	0.02
nl	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00
pl	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.64</b>
pt	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
ru	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.59</b>	0.02	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.36</b>	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.49</b>
sv	0.03	<b>0.99</b>	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.01	<b>0.99</b>	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.06</b>	0.00	0.00
th	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.08</b>
uk	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.40</b>	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.44</b>	0.04	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>1.00</b>
zh	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.21</b>	0.03
Test															
ar	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	0.05	0.05
de	0.02	<b>0.78</b>	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00
en	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.13</b>	0.05	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.35</b>	0.00	0.00	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.13</b>	0.05	0.00	0.01
es	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.15</b>	0.00	0.03
et	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01
fa	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.73</b>	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.78</b>	0.04	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.12</b>	0.04	<b>0.79</b>	0.00
fr	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.26</b>	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.30</b>	0.03	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.23</b>	0.02	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>1.00</b>
id	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.28</b>	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.82</b>
it	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.78</b>	0.02	0.01
ja	<b>0.13</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.00	<b>0.29</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.01	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.44</b>	0.01
nl	<b>0.40</b>	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.00
pl	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.74</b>
pt	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
ru	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.60</b>	0.02	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.34</b>	0.01	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.47</b>
sv	0.03	<b>0.45</b>	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	<b>0.19</b>	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	<b>0.07</b>	0.00	0.00
th	<b>0.69</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.04	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.57</b>	0.04
uk	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.43</b>	0.04	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.57</b>	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>1.00</b>
zh	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.05	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.22</b>	0.04

Table 23: The frequency with which a **VoxPopuli monolingual** fine-tuned model pair showed no statistical difference (p-value above 0.05). No-pretraining is presented in bold-face font.

Validation		
VP-es	VP-it	16
VP-nl	VP-sv	14
VP-fr	VP-nl	13
VP-fr	VP-sv	13
VP-fr	VP-it	12
VP-it	VP-sv	12
VP-es	VP-fr	11
VP-es	VP-sv	11
VP-nl	<b>no-pretraining</b>	10
VP-it	VP-nl	10
VP-es	VP-nl	9
VP-it	<b>no-pretraining</b>	8
VP-es	<b>no-pretraining</b>	7
VP-sv	<b>no-pretraining</b>	6
VP-fr	<b>no-pretraining</b>	5
Test		
VP-es	VP-it	15
VP-nl	VP-sv	15
VP-es	VP-fr	13
VP-fr	VP-nl	13
VP-fr	VP-sv	13
VP-es	VP-sv	12
VP-it	VP-sv	12
VP-es	VP-nl	11
VP-fr	VP-it	11
VP-it	VP-nl	11
VP-nl	<b>no-pretraining</b>	10
VP-it	<b>no-pretraining</b>	9
VP-es	<b>no-pretraining</b>	6
VP-sv	<b>no-pretraining</b>	5
VP-fr	<b>no-pretraining</b>	4




Figure 23: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Arabic** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 24: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **German** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 25: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **English** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 26: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Spanish** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 27: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Estonian** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 28: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Persian** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.






Figure 29: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **French** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 30: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Indonesian** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 31: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Italian** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 32: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Japanese** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 33: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Dutch** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 34: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Polish** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.



Figure 35: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Portuguese** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 36: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Russian** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 37: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Swedish** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 38: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Thai** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 39: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Ukrainian** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.




Figure 40: Overall performance over the **monolingual** pre-trained models for the **Chinese** language. The dashed green line is the performance of the best multilingual of the language and the red one is the performance of the fine-tuned model without any pre-training.