An On-Line Japanese Handwriting Recognition System integrated into an E-Learning Environment for Kanji

Steven B. Poggel
steven.poggel@gmail.com

Friday 19th February, 2010

Contents

Chapter 1

E-Learning

1.1 Introduction to E-Learning

The term *e-learning* refers to a number of different methods, concepts and techniques. It is therefore difficult to confine the term sharply. Thus, in literature, there are different definitions of what e-learning is and what it is supposed to be. Rosenberg (2006) defines e-learning as follows:

> **E-learning** is the use of Internet technologies to create and deliver a rich learning environment that includes a broad array of instruction and information resources and solutions, the goal of which is to enhance individual and organisational performance.

It can be noted that Rosenberg (2006) defines e-learning purely by terms of instruction and information resources. Further, *the use of Internet technologies* is seen as a necessary condition for e-learning. The definition does not take into account educational software. Seel and Ifenthaler (2009) claim that the terms *e-learning* and *learning on-line* are synonymous.

Richert (2007) criticises the definition of Rosenberg because she sees no reason for such equality of terms. She constitutes her view with the fact that electronic (learning) applications are not limited to the Internet. Richert (2007) defines e-learning as:

> Unter E-learning wird das computergestützte Lernen (vorwiegend von Einzelpersonen) mit hypertextbasierten, multimedialen, interaktiven Systemen verstanden, das zeit- und ortsunabhängig sowohl online als auch offline erfolgen kann.

in English:

> E-learning is defined as computer-aided learning (mainly by individuals) with hypertext- and multimedia-based interactive systems. The learning process can take place independent of time and location both on-line and offline.

It is important to note that the term is broader than the definition of Rosenberg, but is restricted to *learning systems*. That means concretely that electronic media like dictionaries may be included in e-learning systems as a tool, however, they can only form a part of a more general e-learning environment. Electronic media itself is not necessarily understood as e-learning system.

1.2 Classification of E-Learning Systems

E-learning systems can be classified by their their degree of freedom for user interaction. On one end of the scale there are *Drill-and-Practise* programs that do not allow for freedom of interaction. On the other end there are interactive programs allowing the user to interact and control the application. Judged by the definition of Richert this classification does not seem very suitable (Richert 2007).

Another possibility to classify e-learning systems is the the kind of storage media used. This classification allows for a distinction between *on-line* and *offline* e-learning systems. *Offline systems* are those systems that are offered on passive storage media like floppy disk, CD-ROM. Offline systems are usually called *Computer Based Training* (CBT) systems. *On-line systems* on the other hand are web server based systems that fall under the category of *Web Based Training* (WBT) systems (Richert 2007).

Additionally, Richert (2007) defines *hybrid systems* that are CBT systems but use the Internet as a means of communication with other learners. Table 1.1 shows the classification of e-learning systems after (Richert 2007).

		Using the WWW for storage	
		Yes	No
Using the WWW for communication	No	WBT	CBT
	Yes	Learning platforms	Hybrid CBT

Table 1.1: Classification of e-learning systems

1.3 Technical Context of E-Learning

1.3.1 Multimedia Systems

The term *Multimedia* has several definitions. Simple versions of multimedia definitions state that multimedia refers to a combination of different forms of information from several sources. Those forms can contain textual information, graphic, video and audio. With a broad definition of that kind any television news report could be regarded as multimedia. Richert (2007) understands *multimedia* more holistically than that. She sees multimedia as a technological concept that allows for the interaction of a user and a multiple media system. More than one sensorial modality should be should be presented by the system.

1.3.2 Classification of Interactivity

Interactivity can be defined in several steps. The concept of *interaction* serves as a basis for the classification, because in a sociological sense there can, by definition, be no mutual interference between man and machine. Interactivity in the sense of interaction comprises the ability to access and control different functionalities of a software system (Richert 2007).

Six classes of interactivity can be described. They differ by their degree of interaction between the user and a software system. The gamut of interactivity is used to evaluate e-learning applications:

1. **View and absorb objects**
   The multimedia components can be viewed and played by the user. The user can not further influence the components in any way.

2. **View and absorb multiple displays**
   Program components offer more than one display. For instance, a user could click on a picture and be shown a different one. No modification of components is possible.

3. **Varying the form of representation**
   On this level, users can gain the feeling they could actively influence the multimedia components. They can scale objects or view them from different perspectives. Users can influence the form of representation but not the content.

4. **Changing the content of a component - parameter or data variation**
   Contents of a multimedia component are generated by the user. Users can input data or text. They can not change films or pictures. A usage example of that type could be the selection methods of statistics programs. Users can modify objects and the program yields different results.

5. **Generating objects or the content of a representation**
   This mode of interaction is reached by applications that offer tools to create and change content. For example visualise thoughts with mind maps, or render new forms and models.

6. **Constructive and manipulative actions through situation-dependent feedback**
   On this level of interaction symbols can be manipulated and the result of the interpretation can be interpreted by the program. That allows for the generation of useful and context-sensitive feedback. User input can be evaluated by the application.

The gamut is described after (Richert 2007).

1.4 Pedagogical Context of E-Learning

The pedagogical context of e-learning is a crucial part of any e-learning environment. The learning targets need to be defined and a conceptual design of a software needs to be based on those.

1.4.1 Learning

The term *learning* is of a complex nature. A definition of learning is therefore never sharply confined. The definition of *learning* by Lefrancois (1994) shows how broad the term can be perceived:

> *Lernen umfasst alle Verhaltensänderungen, die aufgrund von Erfahrungen zustandekommen.*

In English:

> Learning compasses all changes in behaviour that are based on experience.

The changes in behaviour include those processes that do not aim at acquiring information, but also those changes in behaviour of an unknown cause (Lefrancois 1994). According to (Richert 2007), this means the acquisition of competences of different kinds.

1.4.1.1 Educational Objectives

Cognitive learning targets comprise all targets that include acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge can refer to both reproduction of content, but also acquiring the ability to solve problems. The area of cognitive learning targets can be differentiated further. Richert (2007) distinguishes the acquisition of:

- **Declarative knowledge** or **factual knowledge**. Knowledge that can be categorised as *knowing that* as opposed to *knowing how*.

- **Procedural knowledge** or **dynamic knowledge**. Knowledge that contains approaches to problems and their resolution procedures. Procedural knowledge can be seen as a series of declarative inventory of knowledge, nevertheless it can be categorised as *knowing how*. The distinction to the regular ability of a human to solve problems lies in the fact that declarative knowledge is needed in order to solve specific types of problems. For instance, in order to be able to successfully use a map for navigating, a human needs to know that a certain object is a map, what the symbols on the map mean and where or what the four cardinal points are.

- **Contextual knowledge**. Knowledge that contains application situations. This category is centred around *when and where* to apply knowledge. What abilities and which factual knowledge can be used in which situations?

Affective learning targets are educational objectives that aim at changing behaviour. It is difficult to actualise affective learning targets by cognitive learning only. In order to achieve affective learning targets, feelings, evaluations and attitudes of humans need to be taken into account. In learning situations at school often personal enthusiasm, credibility and charisma of the teacher play a role (Richert 2007).

Psychomotor learning targets is the class of learning targets that aim at the acquisition of manual abilities and motion sequences. That includes playing of musical instruments or using tools. Analogue to the procedural knowledge learning, theoretical knowledge about the objects involved is necessary in order to achieve the psychomotor abilities. That theoretical knowledge is a necessary condition for the psychomotor learning process, but it is not sufficient, psychomotor learning involves practising motor sequences (Richert 2007).

1.4.1.2 Self-Driven Learning

Learning is often seen as a behaviourist stimulus-reaction process. Different views observe an active and constructive process. In the constructionist view on learning there is a continuum from *self-learning* to *autonomous learning*. *Self-driven learning* can be classified by that continuum.

Self-learning defines a type of learning with a focus on the self-initiative and self-responsibility of a learner. Richert (2007) reports of the opinion that it is impossible to not self-learn, because learning always assumes the intention of the learner. This view conjectures that each learner has to accomplish the task of self-construction of knowledge. However, self-learning defines solely the self-initiative of the learner, the learning material is provided by an external source.

Autonomous learning is distinct from self-learning in the way, that it focuses on teacher-independent organisation of learning. While in self-learning, the learner can decide to learn, independently of a teacher, in autonomous learning the learner is self-responsible for defining learning targets and has an analytical view on the learning process (Richert 2007).

Self-driven learning is a type of learning that can be seen somewhere on the continuum from self-learning to autonomous learning. In self-driven learning the learner is given all instructions and decisions concerning the learning process in the learning materials. The self-direction is therefore limited to the location and the time of learning (Richert 2007).

1.4.2 Intelligent Tutorial Systems

Intelligent tutorial systems fall under the paradigm of cognitive learning. The general scheme of such a system is depicted after (Richert 2007) in figure 1.1. The declarative knowledge of a system is stored in the expert module. The student module holds information about the learning progress and the course module holds the lessons of the application. The communication module interacts with the learner. A problem of these systems is that they cannot distinguish between small oversights and serious


Figure 1.1: General scheme of intelligent tutorial systems

1.5 E-Learning of Languages

In *computer assisted language learning* (CALL) most the systems are not necessarily bound to the key competences for language learning.

- linguistic (grammatical) competence
- socio-linguistic competence
- discourse competence
- strategic competence
- social competence
- sociocultural competence

(Richert 2007) Instead, the systems can offer specific parts of the language as a learning focus. The learner decides what to learn when. (Bailey and Meurers 2008) report about an intelligent CALL system that aims at diagnosing meaning errors. Generally, most CALL systems are based on structural analysis of language. Nevertheless, the systems often focus on fixed patterns and rely on repetition. The drill of a certain pattern is meant to automate the reproduction, however, allowing no room for creativity. The problem is that the repetition of stereotype structures is that they are just a form without a function (Richert 2007). Some e-learning systems add little or no value to the learning process, because they focused solely on the management and measurement of the training process(Ismail 2002). However, due to the impersonal nature of e-learning systems compared to face-to-face classroom work, the pedagogical acts can be objectified, free from personal animosities that might occur between a teacher and a learner (Zimmer 2009).

1.5.1 E-Learning of Japanese

Some efforts for e-learning of Japanese have been made. Nagata (2002) report about the BANZAI system, that is a classical CALL application. It uses syntactical parsing in order to teach grammatical constructs. It does not aim at teaching Japanese characters, but focuses on the structure of the language.

List of Figures

Listings

List of Tables

References

Bailey, S. and D. Meurers (2008). Diagnosing Meaning Errors in Short Answers to Reading Comprehension Questions. In *EANL '08: Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, Morristown, NJ, USA, pp. 107--115. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ismail, J. (2002). The Design of an E-Learning System: Beyond the Hype. *The Internet and Higher Education 4*(3-4), 329--336.

Lefrancois, G. R. (1994). *Psychologie des Lernens (in German)*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Nagata, N. (2002). BANZAI: An Application of Natural Language Processing to Web-Based Language Learning. *CALICO Journal 19*(3), 583--599.

Richert, A. S. (2007, Dec). *Einfluss von Lernbiografien und subjektiven Theorien auf selbst gesteuertes Einzellernen mittels E-Learning am Beispiel Fremdsprachenlernen (in German)*. Ph. D. thesis, RWTH Aachen, Aachen. Manuscript committee: Prof. Dr. phil. Rudolf Beier, Prof. Dr. phil. Uwe Michelsen.

Rosenberg, M. J. (2006). *Beyond E-Learning. Approaches and Technologies to Enhance Organizational Knowledge, Learning and Performance*. San Francisco, USA: Pfeiffer.

Seel, N. M. and D. Ifenthaler (2009). *Online lernen und lehren (in German)*. Munich, Germany: Reinhardt UTB.

Zimmer, G. (2009). Bildung mit E-Learning (in German). In B. Mikuszeit and U. Szudra (Eds.), *Multimedia und ethische Bildung*, Chapter 1.3, pp. 61--92. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.

Document created on Friday 19th February, 2010 at 09:58