Choosing to Interact: Exploring the Relationship Between Learner Personality, Attitudes, and Tutorial Dialogue Participation
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ABSTRACT
The tremendous effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems is due in large part to their interactivity. However, when learners are free to choose the extent to which they interact with a tutoring system, not all learners do so actively. This paper examines a study with a natural language tutorial dialogue system for computer science, in which students interacted with the JavaTutor system through natural language dialogue over the course of problem solving. We explore the relationship between students’ level of dialogue interaction and learner characteristics including personality profile and pre-existing attitudes toward the learning task. The results show that these learner characteristics are significant predictors of the extent to which students engage in dialogue with the tutoring system, as well as the number of task actions students make. By identifying students who may not engage with tutoring systems as readily, this work constitutes a step toward building adaptive systems that successfully support a variety of students with different attitudes and personalities.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Tutorial dialogue systems effectively support learning through rich natural language dialogue [7,8,14,19]. However, the effectiveness of tutorial dialogue systems, like other adaptive learning environments, depends in large part on students’ willingness to interact with them [18]. Interaction varies tremendously across individual students and student populations. We observe various types of disengagement including lack of motivation or interest for the learning task [10], as well as gaming an intelligent tutor by exploiting properties of the learning environment [2,4].

In addition to these factors, individual differences such as self-reported interest in the task and confidence in learning have been found to be strong predictors of engagement [6]. Similarly, students’ hidden attitudes toward learning [1] and motivation for the task [3] may be highly influential. Boredom, which is associated with reduced motivation to perform the activity [15], has been positively correlated with attention problems and negatively correlated with performance. Students’ participation in tutorial dialogue has also been found to be associated with the students’ expectations [11], and in human-human tutorial dialogue, student personality traits have recently been found to be significant factors [16]. However, the field is far from a full understanding of the factors that influence students’ choices to engage or interact with tutorial dialogue systems.

This paper presents an investigation into the relationship between student characteristics and interactions with a tutorial dialogue system. We hypothesized that students’ personality profile, for example their tendencies toward extraversion or openness, would be significantly associated with the level of natural language interaction observed within a tutorial dialogue system. We also hypothesized that students’ attitudes toward the learning task would be a significant factor in their interactions with the system. We examine these hypotheses within a data set of 51 university students interacting with the JavaTutor tutorial dialogue system for introductory computer science. Regression models were built that predict both dialogue and task participation by the students, who have the choice to interact with the dialogue system as little or as much as desired over the course of the learning tasks. The models demonstrate that students’ attitudes and personalities are significantly predictive of their willingness to interact with the tutorial dialogue system. The findings suggest that some learner characteristics may put students at risk of low participation with a tutorial dialogue system, and constitute a first step toward proactively adapting the systems to benefit these learners.

2. TUTORING STUDY
The JavaTutor tutorial dialogue system (Figure 1) supports students in solving introductory computer programming problems in the Java programming language while interacting in textual natural language. Students are provided with a series of learning tasks that build on each other to guide the students through creation of a simple text-based adventure game.¹

The study reported here was conducted with the JavaTutor tutorial dialogue system in 2014. The students (12 female; 39 male; mean age = 21) were drawn from a university-level engineering class. They interacted with the tutorial dialogue system for one session lasting approximately 45 minutes.

¹Implementation details of the system are beyond the scope of this paper but are described in [9].
Prior to interacting with JavaTutor, students took a pre-survey that included validated items to measure goal orientation [17], general self-efficacy [5], confidence in learning computer science and programming [13], and personality profile using a concise version of the Big Five Inventory [12]. Students also completed a pre-test and posttest before and after their interaction with JavaTutor.

3. ANALYSIS

Students were instructed that they could make comments, pose questions, and request feedback at any time through textual dialogue. Overall, students interacting with JavaTutor achieved significant learning gains from pre-test to posttest (average= 12%, median= 13.4%, stdev = 32%, \( p = 0.001 \)). However, we observed that 58.8% of students never made an utterance. For students who did engage in dialogue with the tutor, the average number of utterances was 5.1 (stdev=7.36, median= 2). Regardless of the extent to which they chose to engage in natural language dialogue, all students received some tutorial dialogue utterances based upon the system’s model of feedback for task events.

Our goal is to identify the factors that may be influential in students’ levels of interaction with the system. To this end, we built multiple regression models. The remainder of this section describes the analysis.

3.1 Response Variables

Based upon the logged interaction traces, we extracted dialogue and task events and used them to compute a numeric representation of the student’s level of interaction with the system. For dialogue interaction we utilized the number of utterances written by each student. The range of number of student utterances was between 0 and 33.

We extracted four features that represent interaction of students with the system throughout tutoring. The first of these four features is number of content changes which refers to the changes in the student’s programming code, as the code they write is referred to as content pane. We also computed the number of compile events and number of run activities. The number of compile/run events ranges from 4 to 224, whereas the number of content changes ranges from 88 to 1099 to complete the series of learning tasks.

Finally, we computed the number of tutor messages each student received. The tutoring systems provided students with feedback. The number of messages received is closely related to the number of actions that triggered tutor feedback, which is also a measure of participation. The minimum number of tutor messages provided to any student was 8, whereas the largest number of tutor messages to a student during a tutoring session was 121. We built separate multiple regression models to predict level of dialogue interaction and level of task interaction.

3.2 Predictor Variables

We hypothesized that several learner characteristics were significantly associated with level of interaction in the system. We provided these variables for selection within the models (see Table 1). All of the predictors were standardized to a common scale before model building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Example survey item/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer science confidence</td>
<td>I am sure that I can learn programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived computer science usefulness</td>
<td>I’ll need programming for my future work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation toward computer science</td>
<td>Programming is enjoyable and stimulating to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-efficacy</td>
<td>I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning goal orientation</td>
<td>I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance demonstration</td>
<td>I like to show that I can perform better than my coworkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure avoidance</td>
<td>Avoiding a show of low ability is more important to me than learning a new skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement goals</td>
<td>It is important for me to do better than other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male/female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age of the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University class standing</td>
<td>The year that the student is in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of student’s own computer skill</td>
<td>How skilled are you with computers, compared to the average person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who is talkative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who is helpful and unselfish with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who does a thorough job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who is depressed, blue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>I see myself as someone who is original, comes up with new ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test score</td>
<td>Score showing the performance of the student before tutoring session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Predictor variables from pre-survey and pre-test.

3.3 Modeling Level of Participation

We built separate models for each of the response variables (number of utterances, compile/run events, content changes, received tutor messages). For each response variable we used the whole dataset
and selected features via stepwise linear regression. Because the goal was to investigate relationships between pre-measures (student characteristics, attitudes) and level of participation, we conducted descriptive analyses using the entire data set for model building.

The model for number of dialogue utterances (Table 2) revealed that students’ failure avoidance characteristic is a significant predictor of tutorial dialogue interactivity. Students who indicated that they tend to avoid tasks in which they may have higher chance of failure wrote fewer utterances to the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of utterances</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure Avoidance</td>
<td>-0.3089</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1 (intercept)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ RMSE = 0.961 \]
\[ R^2 = 0.0954 \]

Table 2: Stepwise linear regression model for the number of utterances.

The model for number of compile/run events during tutoring session showed that students’ personality scores, particularly the binary agreeableness score, was a significant predictor of participation from a task-related perspective. The students who were more agreeable (indicated as a 1 for the model, rather than a 0) made more task interactions considering compile/run events as shown in Table 3. The other regression model having the number of content changes as a response variable did not produce significant results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of compile/run events</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (binarized)</td>
<td>0.2897</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1 (intercept)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ RMSE = 0.967 \]
\[ R^2 = 0.0839 \]

Table 3: Stepwise linear regression model for number of compile/run events.

Another important finding was that although pre-test was present in all regression models as an independent variable, it was not significantly predictive of either the number of utterances or the task activities. In other words, the level of participation was more correlated to student characteristics than to their incoming knowledge. These results are important for understanding how to better foster interaction with intelligent tutoring systems. If we can identify students who tend to participate less or become disengaged, the system can automatically adapt to these students with scaffolding. For instance, when a student with low motivation toward the task is identified, the tutorial dialogue system might put particular emphasis on moves that are part of “adjacency pairs,” such as asking a question and awaiting a student response. Adapting the task may also be appropriate in these cases. By utilizing information that we can glean from quick pre-measures, we may be able to significantly improve the effectiveness of the system.

4. CONCLUSION

Adapting to broader populations with varying characteristics is crucial for increasing the use of intelligent tutoring systems and making them more effective. A central challenge is determining the factors that might affect level of participation with intelligent systems. The current literature is far from totally understanding underlying relationships between student characteristics and how they affect system interactions during tutoring. The findings presented here have identified student characteristics such as level of failure avoidance which are particularly strongly associated with low interaction.

Several directions of future work are promising. First, incorporating multiple sources of information such as multimodal features (e.g., posture, gesture, eye gaze) can help us better understand students and respond in real time to engage them in more interactions. Each of these types of features has been shown to contribute to modeling student behavior. Additionally, customizing scaffolding to different learner characteristics is very promising. Modifying the realized utterances delivered to students based on their personality style, gender, and skill are likely to improve interactions with the system. It is important to devise and investigate strategies for learners of all characteristics in order to better engage students and help them learn more.
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