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An emerging field of educational data mining (EDM) is building on and contributing to a wide variety of disciplines through analysis of data coming from various educational technologies. EDM researchers are addressing questions of cognition, metacognition, motivation, affect, language, social discourse, etc. using data from intelligent tutoring systems, massive open online courses, educational games and simulations, and discussion forums. The data include detailed action and timing logs of student interactions in user interfaces such as graded responses to questions or essays, steps in rich problem solving environments, games or simulations, discussion forum posts, or chat dialogs. They might also include external sensors such as eye tracking, facial expression, body movement, etc. We review how EDM has addressed the research questions that surround the psychology of learning with an emphasis on assessment, transfer of learning and model discovery, the role of affect, motivation and metacognition on learning, and analysis of language data and collaborative learning. For example, we discuss (1) how different statistical assessment methods were used in a data mining competition to improve prediction of student responses to intelligent tutor tasks, (2) how better cognitive models can be discovered from data and used to improve instruction, (3) how data-driven models of student affect can be used to focus discussion in a dialog-based tutoring system, and (4) how machine learning techniques applied to discussion data can be used to produce automated agents that support student learning as they collaborate in a chat room or a discussion board. © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

Educational data mining (EDM) is an exciting and rapidly growing new area that combines multiple disciplines toward understanding how students learn and toward creating better support for such learning. Participating disciplines (and subdisciplines) include cognitive science, computer science (human–computer interaction, machine learning, artificial intelligence), cognitive psychology, education (psychometrics, educational psychology, learning sciences), and statistics. The data that make EDM possible are coming from an increasing variety of sources and is being used to address a variety of questions about both the psychology of human learning and how best to evaluate and improve the student learning (see Figure 1).

The vertical axis of Figure 1 illustrates the various educational data types that come from different sources. Starting at the bottom are simpler data types including menu-based choices with their timing coming from mouse clicks, such as multiple choice questions in MOOCs and other online courses, educational games and simulations, and simple tutoring systems. Moving up the vertical axis, more complex problem-solving environments and intelligent tutoring systems produce data types that include short text inputs and symbolic expressions. Researchers are also building affect sensors and doing classroom...
FIGURE 1 | The data that makes educational data mining possible is produced from educational technologies that produce a wide variety of data types (the vertical axis) and is being used to explore a wide variety of psychological constructs relevant to learning (the horizontal axis). Different research paradigms and projects have emerged, exemplified in the content of the figure, and are discussed in the paper.

observations of student engagement and emotional states. At the top of Figure 1 are more complex forms for student writing or sometimes speaking, including student answers to essay questions or their dialogs within chat rooms or discussion boards.

The horizontal axis of Figure 1 illustrates the spectrum of psychological constructs that educational data miners have been exploring with these kinds of data. These constructs include tacit cognitive skills, explicit concepts and principles, metacognitive skills and self-regulatory learning strategies, student affect and motivations, skills for social discourse and argument, and socio-emotional dispositions and strategies.

Within Figure 1, we illustrate a sampling of research projects/paradigms that have used different types of data to advance understanding of different psychological constructs. Cognitive skills and principles have been explored using many different types of data. Data on student correctness of their click choices or their text or symbolic input over opportunities to practice has been explored in models of learning, especially Bayesian Knowledge Tracing. That same kind of data has been used to evaluate cognitive models and aid discovery of data-driven cognitive model improvements. Complex symbolic problem solutions (e.g., computer programs) are being analyzed to understand changes in students’ skills and strategies over time. Peer grading of open-ended writing and interface design provides the basis for mining both the quality of student responses and the quality of their ability to evaluate them. Data corpora of written essays and answers, from students and experts, have been used to create automated methods for essay grading and dialog-based intelligent tutors or dialog support for collaborative learning.

Moving to the right in Figure 1, student metacognition and self-regulatory learning has been explored using student data from intelligent tutor interaction and from multimedia interaction. Such data also has been used along with formal classroom observation data to drive machine-learned detectors of forms of student disengagement. This data has been further augmented with real-time surveys and with affect sensors. Addressing issues of social interaction, researchers have analyzed student collaboration data including student entries in MOOC discussion boards.

Another dimension of relevance, not shown in Figure 1, is the time course of observations reflected in the data. Click choice and timing data observations tend to occur in the range of 100s of milliseconds to 10s of seconds. Text fields and symbolic expression data tend to take as long as 10 s to 100 s of seconds. Essay and discourse data points may take many minutes to produce. As discussed elsewhere, the complexity of psychological constructs (roughly, left to right in Figure 1) tend to occur at a
correspondingly increasing time scale, with the exception of affective physiological data, which can operate in the millisecond range.

EDM is defined by Baker and Yacef\(^2\) as ‘an emerging discipline, concerned with developing methods for exploring the unique types of data that come from educational settings, and using those methods to better understand students, and the settings which they learn in.’ Other empirical methods, besides EDM, for driving discoveries relevant to education include experimentation, surveys, and design research. EDM is set apart primarily by the fact that wide use of educational technology is producing volumes of ecologically valid data on student learning in a context in which experiments and surveys can be embedded. It is similar to design research with a focus on data from natural settings, but rather than being qualitative, it is different (complementary) in its focus on quantitative analysis using machine learning and statistical methods. It is similar to experimentation and survey methods in that those methods can be employed in the context of educational technologies, but is broader in that it also includes analysis of naturally occurring student interaction data either without or in conjunction with experimental manipulation or embedded surveys.

Research fields are grounded in the community of engaged researchers and in the conferences and journals in which they communicate. EDM is no exception. The primary conferences are EDM, which began in 2008, and Learning Analytics and Knowledge (LAK), which began in 2011. Each has peer reviewed, published proceedings. The International Journal of Educational Data Mining began in 2009 and the Journal of Learning Analytics began in 2014. Elements of EDM research have a longer history as revealed by deep analyses of learner data in publications in the proceedings of the Intelligent Tutoring Systems conference (established in 1988), the Artificial Intelligence in Education conference (established 1997), and the Cognitive Science conference (established 1979). More recently, an expansion of interest in EDM has been revealed through workshops and papers in other conferences, both pre-existing (Neural Information Processing Systems, and Knowledge, Discovery, and Data Mining) and new (Learning at Scale).

This article is organized around different kinds of research questions regarding the psychology of learning that EDM research has been addressing. Section 2 discusses the status of current EDM research especially on questions of assessment, transfer, motivation, and language. Section 3 provides related challenges and future research opportunities.

EDM ADDRESSES RESEARCH QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

EDM has addressed a variety of research questions regarding the psychology of learning. The following five sections discuss assessment of cognition, learning, and achievement (Section 2.1), transfer of learning and discovery of cognitive models (Section 2.2), affect, motivation, and metacognition (Section 2.3), language and discourse analytics (Section 2.4), and other applications of EDM (Section 2.5). In each section, we summarize both technical and empirical research that is sometimes descriptive, yielding new insights about the nature of learning, and sometimes prescriptive, indicating methods for yielding better student learning outcomes. In particular, we illustrate connections from efforts to use data to build models that reflect insights on learning to efforts to ‘close-the-loop’ by translating those models or insights into systems and testing whether they produce better learning outcomes. A desirable sequence in a program of research (which often involves multiple projects/papers and may involve different teams) starts with data mining yielding new statistical models of that data. Next an adaptive system is built using the resulting statistical models. Sometimes that model is used directly, for example, as in a detector of student disengagement behavior that prompts students to re-engage\(^3\) or a language interpretation system that provides students feedback in response to their typed entries\(^3\) or provides recommendations for how to engage more productively.\(^3\) In other cases, the model resulting from data mining may be interpreted for insights that can be employed to an adaptive system design (e.g.,\(^4\)). In both cases, a desirable final step is to ‘close-the-loop’ by running an experiment (an ‘A/B test’) comparing the original adaptive system to one with the data-driven adaptive features.

Assessment, Growth Modeling of Learning, and Prediction of Achievement

Educational technologies provide rich data for understanding and developing assessment of students’ skills, concepts, mental models, beliefs, and learning trajectories. Collectively, these aspects of human intelligence can be referred to as a ‘knowledge base’ with elements of this knowledge base referred to as ‘knowledge components’ or KCs. Koedinger, Corbett and Perfetti\(^4\) define a KC as ‘an acquired unit of cognitive function or structure that can be inferred from performance on a set of related tasks’.

Two aspects of assessing these KCs have defined themselves in EDM research. The first being the
TABLE 1 | Simplified Sample of Data Used in the KDD Cup Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence ID</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Problem ID</th>
<th>Step ID</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>KC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td>WATERING VEGGIES</td>
<td>WATERED AREA-Q1</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Circle-Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td>WATERING VEGGIES</td>
<td>WATERED AREA-Q2</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Circle-Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td>WATERING VEGGIES</td>
<td>TOTAL AREA-Q1</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Rectangle-Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td>MAKING CANS</td>
<td>POG AREA-Q1</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Circle-Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

statistical model, a mathematical abstraction of student behavior measurements, and the second, the cognitive model, which involves the mapping of KCs to items or tasks. This knowledge-to-task mapping provides a way to convert a symbolic cognitive model, which a cognitive scientist might produce, into a form that can be used, along with the statistical model, to make predictions about student performance. This specialized form of a cognitive model is referred to as a KC model (in EDM), a Q matrix (in Psychometrics), or a student model (in AI in Education). The statistical model and the cognitive model are inexorably linked, conceptually, when referring to a predictive model of student learning. However, the mathematics for quantifying learning (the form of the statistical model) has been an active research area in and of itself, separable from the question of identifying an empirically justified cognitive model, which has been in equal measure represented in the literature.

Student Performance Prediction Showcase

An EDM competition in 2010 (http://pslcdatashop.web.cmu.edu/KDDCup/) provided a forum to compare statistical models of student performance and learning from EDM to models from the broader machine learning community. The competition scored the models on their ability to forecast the correctness of student responses to multi-step problems within Intelligent Tutoring Systems for junior high mathematics. Table 1 depicts a simplified example of the student event log dataset that was provided by the competition. Each row in the dataset represented a student action or a ‘step’ toward solving a math problem given by a Cognitive Tutor, which was the source of the competition’s data. The modeling task was to use past information, such as students’ responses related to a particular skill or KC, in order to predict the probability of correct responses on future problem steps. There were 24 million rows worth of past information and 8 million rows to be predicted. Selected meta-information about the row being predicted was omitted, such as time to response and number of attempts, but information such as the student, problem, and KC associated with the problem step remained. Participants were scored on the average error between their predictions of correctness and the actual correctness.

The most successful approach to the prediction task featured a combination of Hidden Markov Models (HMMs), random decision trees, and logistic regression on millions of machine generated features of student interaction.43 The second best overall prediction was achieved with a collaborative filtering approach44 much like the methods used in Netflix movie rating predictions. In this method orthogonal matrices of latent factors of students and questions are machine learned and multiplied together to recover a matrix of predicted student responses to steps. Standard matrix factorization methods do not take into account time (and thus ignore learning); however, expanding the dimensions to include time, using tensors, has resulted in significant predictive gains in subsequent work.45 Finally, the fourth place finisher (third place did not disclose their methods) featured random decision trees and a student individualized Bayesian Network model,46 a computational form of cognitive diagnostic models that leverages inference techniques and optimizations from the broader family of probabilistic graphical models.47 All top participants combined their featured statistical model with other methods in an ensemble in order to maximize predictive performance. Using ensembles of methods instead of a single best method produced a 10% gain in prediction accuracy when applied to a different eighth grade math tutoring platform.6

While the 2010 competition demonstrates how EDM research explores the boundaries of predictive models, the field has focused even greater attention on the science of learning, seeking explanation for knowledge gain, and performance through the careful and deliberate investigation of learning data.

Bayesian Knowledge Tracing Based Models of Learning

Bayesian Networks provide a computational approach to modeling student learning by elegantly capturing the dynamic of knowledge probabilistically. The base Bayesian Networks model of reference, called Knowledge Tracing,4 has roots in Cognitive
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**Model parameters**
- \( P(L_0) = \) Probability of initial knowledge
- \( P(T) = \) Probability of learning
- \( P(G) = \) Probability of guess
- \( P(S) = \) Probability of slip

**Node states**
- \( K = \) Two state (0 or 1)
- \( Q = \) Two state (0 or 1)

**Node representations**
- \( K = \) Knowledge node
- \( Q = \) Question node

**Standard knowledge tracing model**

---

Science. Atkinson and Paulson\(^48\) laid the foundation for the model of instruction and Anderson\(^49\) formalized a continuous increase in the activation level of procedural knowledge with practice, which is mapped to a probability in Knowledge Tracing. The standard Bayesian Knowledge Tracing (BKT) model, shown in Figure 2, can be described as a HMM with such a model being defined for each KC. The acquisition of knowledge is defined in the binary latent nodes while the correctness of responses to questions is defined in the observables.

Research on and expansion of the BKT model has been fueled by advances in statistical parameter learning and by the use of the model in practice inside the popular Cognitive Tutor(c) suite of ITSs\(^50\) where BKT is used to determine when a student has mastered a particular KC and is thus no longer asked to answer steps consisting only of mastered KCs. The standard BKT model has four parameters per KC: (1) a single point estimate for prior knowledge, (2) a learning probability between opportunities to practice, (3) a guessing probability for when a student is correct without knowing, and (4) a slip probability for when a student is incorrect despite knowing. Pardos and Heffernan\(^5\) introduced student individualization to the BKT model through modifying the conditional graph structure of the model. Specifically, they found that by using a bimodal prior, bootstrapped on the student’s first response, prediction improved on 30 of 42 datasets (average correlation increases from 0.17 to 0.30). This particularly individualized prior approach allowed for students to be in one of two priors, adding only a single parameter per KC over the standard four parameter per KC model. Performance prediction is often used as a proxy for assessment quality in EDM models with error and accuracy metrics signifying the goodness of a model. While these metrics are a convenient way to quantitatively compare models, they can be unsatisfying in explaining the real-world impact of prediction improvement on an individual student. Addressing this, Lee and Brunskill\(^51\) evaluated the impact of model individualization on the average number of under and over practice attempts compared to a non-individualized model. They concluded that individualized BKT can better ensure that struggling students get the practice they need and that better students are not wasting time with extensive busy work (i.e., about 20% of students would be given twice the practice opportunities if standard BKT is used than they would be if individualized BKT is used). Individualization in student modeling is further explored by Yudelson, Koedinger, and Gordon\(^52\) and in Section 3.1.

**Logistic Regression Based Models of Growth**

Logistic regression models are another family of statistical models, which can be compared with the BKT family of models (see Table 1). Logistic regression models extend a history of elaborations on Item Response Theory including the addition of a KC model (or ‘Q- matrix’) in the Linear Logistic Test Model (LLTM).\(^53\) Further additions were made to model learning across tests\(^54\) and within an intelligent tutor.\(^55\) These learning models introduced a growth term that models learning by including an estimated increment in predicted success on a KC for each time a student gets practice on an item (or problem step) that needs that KC, as indicated by the Q matrix. This model, later called the Additive Factors Model (AFM), was picked up in efforts to evaluate and search...
TABLE 2 Various Statistical Models and Parameters That Have Been Used to Assess Student Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statistical Family</th>
<th>Global Student</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Prior Success/Failure</th>
<th>Sample References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IRT 3PL</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Proficiency(1/stu)</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>Guess (1)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Wilson &amp; DeBoeck, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LLTM</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Proficiency(1/stu)</td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Wilson &amp; DeBoeck, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Proficiency(1/stu)</td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>KC (=KC#)</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Spada &amp; Magaw, Cen, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>KC (=2*KC#)</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Pavlik et al., 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IFM</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Proficiency(1/stu)</td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>KC (=3*KC#)</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Chi et al., 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CFM</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Proficiency(1/stu)</td>
<td>KC multi-skill</td>
<td>KC (=KC#) multi-skill</td>
<td>none (0)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Cen, Cen et al., 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BKT</td>
<td>Bayesian Knowledge Tracing</td>
<td>none(0)</td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>KC (=2*KC#)</td>
<td>Guess &amp; Slip (2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Corbett &amp; Anderson, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>iBKT</td>
<td>Bayesian Knowledge Tracing</td>
<td>Proficiency(1/stu)</td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>KC (=2*KC#)</td>
<td>Guess &amp; Slip (2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Pardos &amp; Heffernan, Lee et al., 51, Yudelson et al., 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>cBKT</td>
<td>Bayesian Knowledge Tracing</td>
<td>none(0)</td>
<td>KC multi-skill</td>
<td>KC (=2*KC#) multi-skill</td>
<td>Guess &amp; Slip (2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Koedinger et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IRT 3PL, Item Response Theory 3 Parameter Logistic Model; LLTM, Linear Logistic Test Model; AFM, Additive Factors Model; PFA, Performance Factors Analysis; IFM, Instructional Factors Analysis Model; CFM, Conjunctive Factor Model; BKT, Bayesian Knowledge Tracing; iBKT, Individualized BKT; cBKT, Conjunctive BKT.

for alternative cognitive models. Other efforts have explored logistic regression variations including modeling learning with a separate count of correct versus incorrect practice attempts of a KC (PFA), modeling student variations in learning rate (e.g.,), modeling different learning rates depending on the nature of instruction such as feedback practice versus seeing an example (IFM).

Comparison of Model Approaches

As a way of summarizing, Table 2 indicates features of an incomplete, but representative set of statistical models that have been used to assess student proficiency and, in most cases, student learning. It illustrates features of two families of statistical models, logistic regression and BKT, by indicating the way the models parameterize student and task domain attributes. As indicated in the Student parameter column, most of the models have a parameter value for each student that indicates that student’s overall general proficiency. Notably BKT (row 7) does not. However, approaches, such as iBKT, have extended BKT to include a student proficiency parameter (row 8).

In the terms used by Wilson and De Boeck, the models that separately represent difficulty of each task are ‘descriptive’ whereas the models that represent fewer latent KCs across multiple tasks are ‘explanatory’ in that they provide an account for task performance correlations (same KCs) and performance differences (different KCs). In the Task parameters column, we see that most of these models include KCs as latent variables for assessing task difficulty. Some models, in contrast, have a parameter for each unique task or item, particularly IRT (row 1) and PFA (row 4).

Older psychometric models, such as IRT 3PL (row 1) and LLTM (row 2) do not model learning (see the Learning parameters column) but have useful features (e.g., a guess parameter) that could be incorporated into a learning model. All the BKT models and the newer logistic regression models model learning by including estimates of learning for each KC. These models use knowledge components as the basis for explaining learning, though it is possible to have a descriptive model of learning (not shown in Table 1) that would have a single learning parameter across all tasks, as in a faculty theory of transfer (cf.,).

The performance parameters column shows how the BKT models distinguish themselves from logistic regression models by including explicit parameters to estimate the amount of student guessing or slipping. Logistic regression models of learning have not included performance parameters, but as illustrated by IRT 3PL (row 1), it is possible to
incorporate such parameters into a logistic regression model.

The final Prior Success/Failure parameters column illustrates the difference in models that have explicit differentiation of past student task success or task failure. These models are more dynamic in their ability to adjust to student and knowledge-specific variations in performance. The success of these models over alternative models that do not make this distinction\(^{33,34,60,61}\) suggests there are student by knowledge component interactions in learning rate.

**Transfer of learning and discovery of cognitive models from data**

Most of the statistical models in the prior section assume a cognitive model of student knowledge or skill. But how are these cognitive models created and how can they be evaluated for their empirical validity? Data mining provides an answer. Further, data-driven cognitive model improvements can be used to design novel instruction that yields better student learning and transfer.

The general version of this question of how cognitive models are discovered is addressed by techniques for cognitive task analysis (CTA)\(^{63,64}\) particularly qualitative methods such as interviews of experts or think alouds of expert or student problem solving. CTA is a proven and relevant method for improving student performance and learning through instructional redesign (e.g., medical\(^{65}\), military\(^{66}\), mathematics\(^{67}\), aviation industry\(^{68}\)). However, CTA methods are expensive both in time and effort, generally involve a small number of experts or cases, and are mainly powered by human action.

Thus, new quantitative approaches to cognitive task analysis that use educational data and promise improved efficiency have emerged. The key idea is that a good cognitive model of student knowledge should be able to predict differences in task difficulty and/or in how learning transfers from task to task better than an inferior cognitive model.

One such method, called difficulty factors assessment (DFA), goes beyond experts’ intuitions by employing a knowledge decomposition process that uses real student log data to identify the most problematic elements of a given task. The basic idea in DFA is that when one task is much harder than a closely related task, the difference implies a knowledge demand (at least one “knowledge component”) of the harder task that is not present in the easier one. In other words, one way to empirically evaluate the quality of a cognitive model is to test whether it can be used to accurately predict task difficulty (cf.,\(^{69–73}\)). Cognitive models have been developed using this technique in domains including algebraic symbolization,\(^{74,75}\) geometry,\(^{76}\) scatterplots,\(^{77}\) and story problem solving.\(^{78,79}\)

To further accelerate and scale the process of improving cognitive models, automated techniques have been developed that make analysis more efficient (i.e., search a much larger space in a reasonable amount of time) and more effective (i.e., by reducing the probability of human error). Furthermore, these directed search techniques maintain skill labels from the student model unlike many of the prominent machine learning techniques that have been applied to educational data that result in unlabeled, difficult or impossible to interpret models. The models created by an automated process (e.g., Learning Factors Analysis, LFA) are interpretable and have led to real instructional improvements.\(^{42,80}\)

Early automated efforts in model discovery involved human generation of model improvements followed by machine testing (i.e., model comparison) using a variety of established data mining metrics (e.g., Akaike information criterion (AIC), Bayesian information criterion (BIC), and cross-validation (CV)).\(^{80}\) More sophisticated automated techniques have been developed such as LFA,\(^{56}\) Rule Space,\(^{81}\) Knowledge Spaces,\(^{82}\) and matrix factorization.\(^{53,84}\)

In LFA, a search algorithm automatically searches through a space of KC models represented as Q-matrices\(^{81,85}\) to uncover a new model that (best) predicts student-learning data. The input to LFA includes human-coded candidate factors (called the P-matrix) that may (or may not) affect student performance and learning. Table 3 shows a simple illustration of the mapping of problem steps to Q and P matrices and how a new Q-matrix is created (see Q’) by applying a split operator to a factor in the Q-matrix (e.g., Subtract) using a factor from the P-matrix (e.g., Negative Result). Additional new factors are created as a consequence of the split (e.g., Sub-Positive and Sub-Negative) that make different (and better) predictions about task performance and transfer.

Koedinger, McLaughlin and Stamper,\(^7\) applied a form of the LFA algorithm to 11 datasets from different technologies (e.g., intelligent tutors, games) in different domains (e.g., mathematics, language). In all the datasets, a machine-generated cognitive model was more predictive (according to AIC, BIC, and CV) of student learning than the models that had been created by human analysts. Having a general empirical method for discovering and evaluating alternative cognitive models of student learning is an important contribution of EDM to cognitive science. One specific
### TABLE 3 | Example Q Matrix, P Matrix and the Resulting Q’ Matrix from a Split on Negative Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Step</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q’ split (Q, Negative Result)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiply Subtract Negative Result Order of Op Multiply Sub-Positive Sub-Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*8-30 = &gt; 16-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30 = &gt; -14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-2*8 = &gt; 30-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-16 = &gt; 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example of an LFA discovery comes from its application to data from student learning in cognitive tutor geometry unit on finding area. The original cognitive model in that tutor distinguished (had separate KCs), for each area formula, whether the formula is applied in the usual ‘forward’ direction (to find the area given linear measures) or ‘backward’ (given the area, find a missing linear measure). LFA revealed that this distinction was mostly unnecessary — backward application was no harder and there is no lack of transfer from practice on forward applications. However, the distinction is critical for the circle area formula. Finding the radius given the area of a circle is much harder than finding the area given the radius and there is, at best, only partial transfer from forward application practice to backward application performance.

This empirical method for comparing alternative cognitive model proposals has also been used to demonstrate that automatically generated cognitive models, produced by a computational model of human learning called SimStudent, are often better than models built by hand. For example, when trained on algebra equations, SimStudent learned separate KCs (production rules) for removing the coefficient in problems such as ‘5x = 10’, where the coefficient is a number, from problems such as ‘−x = 10’, where the coefficient is implicit. The hand built model did not make this distinction, but the learning curve data support it as a real difference in cognitive processing and transfer. Students make twice as many errors when the coefficient is implicit rather than explicit and practice on the explicit problem type does not transfer to performance on the implicit problem type.

Making better predictions about student learning is a first step toward both improving understanding of student cognition underlying learning transfer and improving learning outcomes. A second step is interpretation of data mining results in terms of underlying cognitive mechanisms. For example, consider the data mining discovery, mentioned above, that backward applications of area formulas are harder than forward applications for circle and square area but not for other figures. A cognitive interpretation is that students have trouble learning when to use the square root operation (i.e., to find s in A = s^2 or r in A = πr^2 given A). Such cognitive interpretation not only suggests a scope of generalization and transfer that can be tested (cf., it is critical to translating a data mining result into a prescription for instructional design. In this case, it suggests practice tasks, examples, and verbal instruction that precisely target good decision making about when to use the square root.

A final step toward both better understanding of transfer and better student learning is to run a ‘close-the-loop’ experiment that compares student learning from instruction that is redesigned based on the data mining insight with learning from the original instruction. For example, Koedinger, Stamper, McLaughlin, and Nixon showed how a data mining discovery revealing hidden planning skills could be translated into a redesign of an intelligent math tutor that produced more efficient and effective student learning.

### Affect, Motivation, and Metacognition

It is widely acknowledged that affect, motivation, and metacognition indirectly influence learning by modulating cognition in striking ways. In line with this, EDM researchers have been studying these processes as they unfold over the course of learning with technology. For example, researchers are interested in analyzing log traces to uncover events in a learning session that precede affective states like confusion, frustration, and boredom. They might also analyze physiological data to develop models that can automatically detect these states from machine-readable signals, such as facial features, body movements, and electrodermal activity. Similarly, researchers might be interested in real-time modeling of log traces in order to make inferences about students’ motivational orientations (e.g., approach vs. avoidance) or their meta-cognitive states, evidenced via the use of self-regulated learning strategies (e.g., re-reading vs. self-explanation). In general, EDM approaches
to model affect, motivation, and metacognition follow two main trajectories: (1) use of EDM methods to computationally model affect, motivation, and metacognition and (2) embedding these models into learning environments to afford dynamic intervention (e.g., re-engaging bored students).

EDM researchers typically use supervised learning to model the multi-componential, multi-temporal, and dynamic nature of affect, motivation, and metacognition during learning. Supervised learning attempts to solve the following problem. Given some features (e.g., facial features, eye blinks, interaction patterns) with corresponding labels (e.g., confused or frustrated) initially provided by humans, can we learn to model the relationship between the features and the labels so as to automatically provide the correct labels on future unseen data (i.e., features from new students without corresponding labels)? In other words, after a training period, the computer now automatically provides assessments of the students’ mental states. Supervised learning methods have been used for modeling of students’ affective, motivational, and metacognitive states as elaborated in the examples below.

Affect modeling aims to study and computationally model affective states that are known to occur during learning and that indirectly influence learning by modulating cognitive processes. For example, Pardos, Baker, San Pedro, and Gowda developed an automated affect model for the ASSISTments mathematics ITS. Their model discriminated among various affective states (confusion, boredom, etc.) based on the digital trace of students’ interactions stored in log files (e.g., use of hints, performance on problems). Their model successfully predicted performance on a state standardized test as well as college enrollment several years later, thereby demonstrating the utility of EDM-based affect models to predict the important academic outcomes. In addition to an offline analysis of existing data, researchers have also explored real-time models of affect. One example is Affective AutoTutor, a dialog-based ITS for computer literacy that automatically models students’ confusion, frustration, and boredom in real time by monitoring facial expressions, body movements, and contextual cues. The model is then used to dynamically adapt the tutorial dialog in a manner that is responsive to the sensed states (e.g., empathetic and motivational dialog moves when frustration is detected). A randomized controlled trial revealed learning benefits for students who interacted with the Affective AutoTutor compared to a non-affective version, but only for low-domain knowledge students. Other EDM systems for affective modeling and dynamic intervention have been developed in the domains of Physics, microbiology, mathematics, and many others—see review by D’Mello, Blanchard, Baker, Ocumpaugh, and Brawner.

Meaningful learning requires motivation or the intention to learn. Demotivated students will likely disengage from a learning task entirely or engage in shallow levels of processing-like skimming or re-reading. On the other hand, motivated students are expected to engage at deeper levels of processing, such as inference generation and effortful deliberation. Of course, contemporary theories of motivation go beyond simply differentiating between motivated and demotivated students by considering different aspects of student motivation orientations (e.g., mastery vs. performance and approach vs. avoidance). However, these theories largely conceptualize motivation as stable traits rather than as dynamic processes that unfold over a learning session. Taking a somewhat different approach, researchers have been applying EDM techniques to model the dynamic nature of motivational processes and have also developed interventions to re-engage demotivated students. For example, M-Ecolab or Motivation Ecolab is a motivational version of Ecolab-II, a system that teaches concepts pertaining to food chains and food webs to 5th grade students. M-Ecolab models students’ motivation based on how they interact with the system (e.g., use of help resources, answer correctness) and intervenes by providing motivational feedback and cognitive scaffolding. A preliminary comparison of M-Ecolab to its non-motivationally supportive counterpart yielded increased motivation but no measured learning improvements. Other pertinent studies have utilized EDM techniques to model motivation-related constructs, such as self-efficacy and disengagement. However, when compared to modeling of affect, motivation modeling is still in its infancy, so there are likely to be more advances in the next few years.

Both affect and cognition are under the watchful eye of metacognitive processes (thinking about thinking). According to Dunlosy, Serra and Baker monitoring-control framework, students continually monitor multiple aspects of the learning process (e.g., ease-of-learning, feelings-of-knowing, quality of information-sources) and use this information to adjust or control their learning activities (e.g., deciding what to study, when to study, how long to study). These self-regulatory behaviors provide critical insight into the metacognitive processes that underlie learning. Students might engage in productive strategies like self-explaining or self-correcting errors. They might also use less beneficial activities like failing
to utilize help utilities despite making repeated errors or abusing these utilities to get quick answers.¹¹¹ In line with this, researchers have been applying EDM techniques to model self-regulatory behaviors in order to encourage more productive strategies while simultaneously discouraging less productive ones.¹¹² For example, Baker et al.¹¹³ applied supervised classification methods to detect and respond to instances of ‘gaming the system’—succeeding by attempting to exploit systematic properties of the system (abusing hints and other help resources). Roll, Aleven, McLaren and Koedinger¹¹⁸ applied EDM techniques to analyze ‘help seeking skills’ and to leverage these insights to develop adaptive tutorial interventions to help students improve these skills. Finally, MetaTutor¹¹⁴ is an ITS specifically designed to model and scaffold students’ use of effective self-regulated learning strategies and relies heavily on EDM methods to achieve this goal. An important research question emerging from this overall line of research concerns the extent to which machine- and student- estimates of self-regulatory strategies align and if this information can be used to correct misconceptions and biases in students’ perceptions of self-regulatory strategy use.¹¹⁵

EDM projects in this area contribute to cognitive science by producing insights into the interplay between student affect and cognitive states. For example, the use of sequential data mining techniques to study how affective states arise and influence student behaviors while solving analytically reasoning problems (e.g.,¹¹⁶) adds an affective perspective to theories of problem solving. Similarly, EDM approaches to studying self-regulation (motivation and metacognitive) are guided in contemporary learning theories, so patterns discovered can be used to systematically test these theories and revise them as needed.

Another set of insights comes from work on the interplay between student affect and cognitive states. EDM techniques have revealed how affective states arise and influence student behaviors during complex problem solving. For example, confusion, which is often perceived as being a negative affective state, can positively impact learning if accompanied by effortful cognitive activities directed toward confusion resolution.¹¹⁷

To summarize, EDM techniques have had a profound influence on computationally modeling the complex, elusive, and evasive constructs of affect, motivation, and metacognition. They allow the researcher to go beyond the norm of simply capturing a few static snapshots of these processes with self-report questionnaires. Instead, they afford the construction and use of rich behavior-informed dynamic models that are inherently coupled within the learning context. The diversity and richness of research can be appreciated by consulting recent reviews and edited compilations in this area.²⁸,¹⁰⁰,¹¹⁸–¹²⁰

**Language Data and Collaborative Learning Support**

Language technologies and machine learning have been applied to analysis of verbal data in education relevant fields for nearly half a century. Major successes in this area enable educational applications such as automated essay scoring,¹³ tutorial dialog,¹,¹¹¹,¹¹² computer-supported collaborative learning environments with context sensitive dynamic support,³,¹²³,¹²⁴ and, most recently, prediction of student likelihood to drop out in Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs).²⁸,²⁹ Across all of these application areas, a key consideration is the manner in which raw text or speech is transformed into a set of features that can be processed using machine learning. Researchers have explored a wide range of approaches. The most simplistic are ‘bag of word’ approaches that represent texts as the set of words that appear at least once in the text.¹²⁵ The most complex approaches extract features from full linguistic structural analyses.³ A consistent finding is that representations motivated by theoretical frameworks from linguistics and psychology show particular.³,²⁹,¹²⁶,¹²⁷ The impact on student learning is achieved through the ability to detect and adapt to individual student.³,¹²³,¹²⁸

One of the earliest applications was automated essay scoring,²³ which has recently experienced a resurgence of interest.¹³ The earliest approaches used simple models, like regression, and simple features, such as counting average sentence length, number of long words, and length of essay. These approaches were highly successful in terms of reliability of assignment of numeric scores (e.g.,¹²⁹), however they were criticized for lack of validity in their usage of evidence for assessment. Later approaches used techniques akin to factor analysis such as latent semantic analysis¹³⁰ or Latent Dirichlet Allocation¹³¹ to incorporate approximations of content-based assessments. Other keyword-based language analysis approaches such as CohMetrix¹³² have been used for assessment of student writing along multiple dimensions, including such factors as cognitive complexity, narrativity, and cohesion. In highly causal domains, approaches that build in some level of syntactic structural analysis have shown benefits.³ In science education, success with assessment of open-ended responses has
been achieved with LightSIDE,37,133 a freely available suite of software tools supporting use of text mining technology by non-experts. Applications such as Why2-Atlas122 and Summary Street38 use these automated assessments to offer detailed feedback to students on their writing. An in-depth discussion of reliability and validity trade-offs between alternative approaches to automated text analysis has been published in prior work.25

In the past decade, applications of machine learning have been applied to the problem of assessment of learning processes in discussion. This problem is referred to as automatic collaborative learning process analysis.25 Automatic analysis of collaborative processes has value for real-time assessment during collaborative learning, for dynamically triggering supportive interventions in the midst of collaborative learning sessions, and for facilitating efficient analysis of collaborative learning processes at a grand scale. This dynamic approach has been demonstrated to be more effective than an otherwise equivalent static approach to support.123 Early work in automated collaborative learning process analysis focused on text-based interactions and clickstream data.25,134–137 Early work toward analysis of collaborative processes from speech has begun to emerge as.127,138

One aspect of collaborative discussion processes that has been a focus in this area of research is Transactivity.139 This research is a good example of how insights about the relevant processes from a psychological perspective inform computational work. The concept of Transactivity originally grows out of a Piagetian theory of learning where this conversational behavior is said to reflect a balance of perceived power within an interaction.140 Transactive contributions make reasoning public and relate expressions of reasoning to previously contributed instances of reasoning in the conversation. It is argued to reflect engagement in interactions that may provide opportunities for cognitive conflict. Research in the area of sociolinguistics suggests that the underlying power relations might be detectable through analysis of shifts in speech style within a conversation, where the speakers shift to speaking more similarly to one another over time. This convergence phenomenon is known as speech style accommodation. It could be expected, then, that linguistic accommodation would predict the occurrence of Transactivity, and therefore a representation for language that represents evidence of such language usage shifts should be useful for predicting occurrence of Transactivity. This hypothesis has been confirmed through empirical investigation.127 Consistent with this work, it has also been demonstrated that in a variety of efforts to automatically identify Transactive conversational contributions in conversational data, the more successful ones were those in which one or more features were include that represents similarity (in terms of word usage or topic coverage) between the language contributed by different speakers within a conversation.25,141

EDM projects in this area contribute to cognitive science models of student learning by providing insights into how social processes can impact cognitive processes, in part by manipulating how safe or attractive opportunities for cognitive engagement appear to students. For example, Howley, Mayfield and Rosé142 found in a secondary analysis of an earlier study,143 that expressed aggression within collaborative groups resulted in students who were the targets of aggression engaging in less functional help seeking patterns. This less functional help-seeking pattern was associated with significantly less learning.

Most recently, machine learning has been used in a MOOC context to detect properties of student participation that might signal likelihood of dropping out of the course. The goal is to identify students who are in particular need of support so that the limited instructor time can be invested where it is most needed. This form of automated assessment has been used to detect expressed motivation and cognitive engagement,29 student attitudes toward course affordances and tools,28 relationship formation and relationship loss.27 It has also been used to detect emergent subcommunities in discussion forums that differ with respect to content focus.144 In each case, the validity of these measures has been assessed by measuring the extent to which differential measurements predict attrition over time in the associated courses. Simplistic applications of sentiment analysis make significant predictions about dropout in some MOOCs,28 however the pattern is not consistent across MOOCs. A careful qualitative analysis demonstrates that coarse-grained approaches to sentiment analysis pick up on different kinds of signals depending on the content focus of the course, and thus interpretation of such patterns must be treated with care.

With respect to student motivation and cognitive engagement, approximations have been made either using unsupervised probabilistic graphical modeling techniques144 or using supervised learning over carefully hand-labeled data rated on a Likert scale from highly motivated to highly unmotivated, and using linguistically inspired features related to cognitive engagement.29 In both cases, the story is the same, namely, dips in detected motivation predict higher likelihood of dropout at the next time point. However, a more accurate prediction results from the supervised method using linguistically motivated features.
Other Areas of EDM

Many other questions have been explored with EDM. We give brief examples of some of these areas. Some researchers have demonstrated promise for using learning data to identify instructional policies or pedagogical tactics predicted to optimize learning. One ideal source for such analysis is from data where some instructional choice is randomized. For example, Chi, VanLehn, Litman, and Jordan\textsuperscript{146} had students use a Physics intelligent tutoring system where for each solution step in a problem given to a student, the system would randomly either show the student an example of how to solve that step or ask the student to perform the step on his or her own. They used this data to train Markov Decision Process (MDP) policies and in a follow-up experiment, they showed that students learned more from an MDP policy trained to maximize student learning gains than from one trained to minimize student learning gains. Other researchers have begun to extend these efforts using Partially Observable MDP (POMDP) planning (e.g.,\textsuperscript{147–149}).

Some researchers have demonstrated how models trained on educational technology interaction data can predict long-term standardized test results (e.g.,\textsuperscript{150}) or college enrollment (e.g.,\textsuperscript{94}). Others have built models to predict when students will get stuck in a course\textsuperscript{151} or drop out (e.g.,\textsuperscript{152}). Other areas of interest include employing recommender systems in education (e.g.,\textsuperscript{153}), social network analysis (e.g.,\textsuperscript{154}), and peer grading.\textsuperscript{9,11,12}

CURRENT CHALLENGES AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

Future Work: Assessment, Growth Modeling of Learning, and Prediction of Achievement

Table 2 provides a jumping-off point for suggestions for future research in EDM. While some work has approached the question of how best to model student performance when multiple skills or strategies (KCs) are needed or possible (rows 6 and 9), more work is needed in this area. In particular, researchers should explore consequences of adding learning parameters to multi-skill assessment approaches (cf.,\textsuperscript{155}).

Missing combinations of features in Table 2 suggests new research. For example, the only logistic regression family model that has performance parameters is IRT 3PL, however that model does not have learning parameters. Creating a logistic regression model that has both learning and performance parameters is quite feasible but, to our knowledge, has not been done. It is also an open issue whether other kinds of parameters are potentially productive in modeling. For example, combining multiple parameters per student, as in multidimensional IRT, along with learning parameters has not been sufficiently explored.

Models based on Bayesian Networks take advantage of strong statistical inference techniques and abundant computational resources in order to maximize fit to the data while striving to converge to pedagogically informative parameters maximize fit to the data. However, the error gradients of these models, which guide the learned parameter values toward convergence, can be complex and non-convex leading to local optima that may describe the data with high accuracy but have an explanation that is not educationally plausible.\textsuperscript{156} This problem of model identifiability is especially pronounced in canonical model forms, such as the HMM that BKT is based on. This necessitates parameter constraining heuristics such as bounding to plausible regions or biasing the starting parameter values. More complex models that take into account information outside of KC and response sequence have demonstrated improved predictive accuracy\textsuperscript{157,158} as have models accounting for individual learning differences\textsuperscript{5,52,58,159} and difference in learning by type of help seen in an ITS\textsuperscript{160,161} and in a MOOC.\textsuperscript{162} Still, some argue for parsimony opting to instead simplify models down to a form where they may be analytically solved.\textsuperscript{163} Striking a balance between complexity, interpretability, and validity remains a challenge in mainstreaming model-based discovery and formative assessment.

Future Work: Transfer and Cognitive Model Discovery

Perhaps the most important need for future work in the area of cognitive model discovery is for further examples of close-the-loop experiments that demonstrate how cognitive models with greater predictive accuracy can be used to improve student learning (cf.,\textsuperscript{7,41}).

Empirical comparison of cognitive models of transfer of learning has been done mostly using the AFM as the statistical model. It is unknown whether the results of such comparisons would change if other statistical models were used (e.g., BKT). While substantial differences (e.g., cognitive model A is much better than B with AFM but B is much better than A for BKT) seem unlikely, the issue deserves attention especially given that BKT is more widely used in fielded intelligent tutoring systems.

Given that most of the datasets that have been used for cognitive model discovery in particular, and EDM in general, are naturally occurring data sets, there are related open questions of interest and importance. For example, estimations of learning and item
difficulty can be confounded by sampling issues. A lack of randomization of items in a curriculum might be responsible for performance variance due to learning being attributed to item parameters (cf.,62). For example, an item that is consistently completed at the end of a unit is more likely to benefit from transfer of learning from earlier items than an item that is randomly distributed throughout the unit. Here the future research issue may be less about the statistical modeling framework and more about identifying or creating data sets that include more random variation of task ordering.

Future Work: Scope and Scale of Models of Affect, Motivation, and Metacognition

We discussed how EDM techniques have become essential tools for researchers interested in modeling affect, motivation, and metacognition in digital learning contexts. The field has made much progress relative to its infancy, yet there is much more to be done. One open area pertains to the constructs themselves. Researchers have focused on individual components of each construct, despite the constructs being multi-componential in nature. For example, engagement is a complex meta-construct with affective, cognitive, and behavioral components,164 yet researchers mainly model its individual sub-components. At a broader level, complex learning inherently involves an interplay between cognition, affect, motivation, and metacognition, so it is important to consider unified models that capture the interdependencies and unfolding dynamics of these processes. For example, a learner with performance-avoidance orientations (motivation) might experience anxiety (affect) due to fear of failure, which leads to rumination on the consequences of failure (metacognition), thereby consuming working memory resources (cognition), ultimately resulting in failure. Models capable of capturing multiple links in this chain of events, without being overly diffuse, would represent significant progress. Another research goal involves devising models that scale. While, cognitive models have enjoyed widespread implementation in intelligent tutoring systems used by tens of thousands of students each day, the same cannot be said for models of affect, motivation, and metacognition. The challenge of scaling up has been difficult due to the use of supervised machine learning techniques, which require labeled data to infer relationships between observable behaviors and latent mental states. Labeled data can be collected in small-scale research studies, where log-files, videos, and other artifacts can be meticulously annotated, but this approach does not scale to the hundreds of thousands of students who learn from MOOCs and other online resources each day. Alternate modeling techniques, such as semi-supervised or unsupervised approaches might be needed to resolve the scalability issue. Thus, expanding the scope and scale of the models reflect two of the several potential avenues for research.

Future Work: Language Data and Collaborative Learning Support

As more and more emphasis is placed on scaling-up work on computer-supported instruction, we turn to application of the frameworks and technologies developed so far in contexts such as MOOCs. In this context, social interaction occurs within online environments such as threaded discussion, twitter, blog sites, Facebook study groups, and small group breakout discussions, sometimes in chat, and sometimes in computer-mediated video. Some work has already successfully produced automated analyses of discussion forum data in MOOCs.27–30,144,145 This recent work has interesting similarities and differences with past research on student dialogs. For example, discussions in the threaded forums in MOOCs are much less focused and task oriented than the typical chat logs from computer-supported collaborative learning activities. While some work applying automated collaborative learning process analysis to audio data has been done,127 this is still largely an open problem, and even less work has been done so far on automated analysis of video. While some work on threaded discussion data has been done,165 much more work in the computer-supported collaborative learning literature has focused on analysis of chat.165,169 The language phenomena that have been studied in a chat context will look different in other modes of communication, and therefore work must be done to adapt approaches and frameworks developed for one mode of communication to others. MOOCs also bring with them the opportunity to apply the analysis to different problems. For example, addressing the problem of attrition was not a major focus of work in computer-supported collaborative learning because it was not an issue in those environments, but is an extremely central concern in the context of MOOCs. Thus, the shift in contexts opens new opportunities for impact going forward.

CONCLUSION

We set out to describe the exciting and rapidly growing area of EDM. It is an area of interest as it touches upon basic research questions of how students
learn and how learning can be modeled in a manner that is relevant to multiple disciplines within and beyond cognitive science. It is important as it contributes to the development of better human and technical support for more effective, efficient, and rewarding student learning. EDM will play a central role in the anticipated ‘two revolutions in learning’, the boom in affordable and accessible online courses and the increased attention on learning science.
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