Selection of Suitable Sentences for Language Learning Exercises: extending the initial algorithm

Ildikó Pilán, Elena Volodina, Richard Johansson

Språkbanken (Swedish Language Bank) University of Gothenburg, Sweden

> February, 12 2015 Vienna, Austria





Aims

- **Extend** the initial selection algorithm:
 - · Increase the number of aspects taken into consideration
 - · Use machine learning methods besides heuristic rules
- Create a **module** for experimenting with sentence selection within our free online language learning platform, **Lärka**
- HitEx: HIT ta EXempel [Find examples] or HIT EXamples

AIM: select sentences based on their readability

≈ how difficult a textis for the reader(CEFR levles: A1-C2)



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG



HitEx: Resources used

- Swedish corpora of a variety of genres (Korp)
- **COCTAILL corpus**:
 - Corpus of CEFR Textbooks as Input for Learner Level modeling
 - Collection of course book texts for L2 Swedish
 - 5 proficiency levels: A1 C1
- **Kelly list**: a frequency-based vocabulary list with CEFR levels for each item





Overview of HitEx



HitEx: user interface

Experiment with parameters for ranking corpus hits 🌣

Set parameters below and add values for penalty ("score reduction"). Click "Search and rank". For more details



list of parameters

HitEx: results



Rule-based approach: parameters

Structural parameters

	#10	Sentence length	#17	Pronoun / noun ratio		
	#11	Average word length	#18	Relative pronoun %		
-	#12	Elliptic sentences	#19	Adverb %		
	#13	Negative formulations	#20	Preposition %		
	#14	Modal verbs	#21	Con- and subjunction %		
	#15	Participles	#22	Average dependency depth		
	#16	S-verbs				

Lexical parameters

	#23	Penalize words below a freq. limit	#25	Proper Names	AL COLOR
Språk-	#24	% of words above target CEFR level	#26	Abbreviations	
BANKEN				G	OTHENBURG

allow / avoid

Machine Learning for CEFR level classification

- Supervised classification methods (SVM algorithm)
- 28 features (mostly based on linguistic information e.g. parts of speech, dependency relations)

2358	50%
2323 (795 +1528)	50% (17% + 33%)
4681	100%
	4681

Classification results and top features

Classifier	Accuracy	F1	within B1 Precision	within B1 Recall
Baseline	0.50	0.66	0.50	1.00
All	0.71	0.70	0.73	0.68

	Rank	Feature ID	SVM weight
Mostly	1	Percentage of difficult words	0.576
lexical 🔍	2	Average number of senses per word	0.438
and	3	Nr of difficult words	0.422
morpholo	4	Sentence length (nr of tokens)	0.258
gical •	5	Nr of modifiers	0.223
Teatures	6	Average frequency in Kelly word list	0.215
Snråk.	7	Nominal Ratio (Nominal to verbal cat.s)	0.132
BANKEN	8	Adverb variation	0.114



Evaluation

- **<u>Purpose</u>**: evaluate whether **sentences** selected with our system from generic corpora are **suitable** for B1-level students
- 200 sentences selected with both heuristics-only and the combined approach
- <u>Participants (34)</u>:
 - 26 Students at B1 level
 - 3 Teachers of Swedish as L2
 - 5 Linguists (+ one lexicographer)





Evaluation: results



- Overall 7 out of 10 sentences rated as understandable
- 5% more sentences selected with the heuristics-only approach "accepted" by raters





Current work

- Machine learning model extended to 5 **CEFR levels (A1-C1)**
- Additional features (additional morpho-syntactic info etc.)
- Experiments repeated with data **annotated** at **sentence level**:
 - **63%** accuracy for distinguishing 5 CEFR levels
 - **92%** adjacent accuracy (=errors within 1 class distance)
- **text-level** experiments: 81% for 5-level classification





Conclusion and future work

- An approach for the **selection of readable sentences** for **language learning** purposes (7 out of 10 understandable)
- Sentences used in **automatically generated exercises** <u>Future work</u>:
- Re-evaluate new models with users
- Optimization, increasing user-friendliness etc.





Demo





Thank you!





