

Research evaluating NLP tools designed to assist
instructors with formative assessment for students
in large-enrollment STEM education classes

Matthew Beckman
Penn State University

June 14, 2024

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?
- Results

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?
- Results
 - Marking by NLP tool agrees with humans ($QWK \approx 0.7+$)

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?
- Results
 - Marking by NLP tool agrees with humans ($QWK \approx 0.7+$)
 - *Almost* as well as humans agree ($QWK \approx 0.8+$)

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?
- Results
 - Marking by NLP tool agrees with humans ($QWK \approx 0.7+$)
 - *Almost* as well as humans agree ($QWK \approx 0.8+$)
 - Promising Human-Machine partnership ($\approx 0.85+$)

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?
- Results
 - Marking by NLP tool agrees with humans ($QWK \approx 0.7+$)
 - *Almost* as well as humans agree ($QWK \approx 0.8+$)
 - Promising Human-Machine partnership ($\approx 0.85+$)
 - Clustering is harder to judge so far

Overview

- “short-answer” tasks are good for students, but hard to scale
- Can NLP tools help instructors give students feedback?
 - Mark & group student responses first
 - Need some basis for comparison
 - What might scalable, personalized feedback look like anyway?
- Results
 - Marking by NLP tool agrees with humans ($QWK \approx 0.7+$)
 - *Almost* as well as humans agree ($QWK \approx 0.8+$)
 - Promising Human-Machine partnership ($\approx 0.85+$)
 - Clustering is harder to judge so far
 - Examining promising approaches to such feedback derived from learning theory, yet unproven

Motivation

- “Write-to-learn” tasks improve learning outcomes (Graham, et al., 2020)
- Critical for citizen-statisticians to communicate effectively (Gould, 2010)
- Frequent practice w/ communicating improves statistical literacy and promotes retention (Basu, et al., 2013)
- Formative assessment benefits both students & instructors (Black & Wiliam, 2009; GAISE, 2016; Pearl, et al., 2012)
- A majority of U.S. undergraduates at public institutions take at least one large-enrollment STEM course (Supiano, 2022)
- **Logistics of constructed response tasks jeopardize use in large-enrollment classes** (Garfield & Ben-Zvi, 2008; Woodard & McGowan, 2012)

Easy!



Erm...



Goal

Develop technology that can assist instructors for large (STEM) classes with providing targeted formative assessment feedback to students, such that instructor burden is similar to small class (~30 students)





Figure 1: image created with assistance of DALL·E 2 by Open AI

Project Schematic



Goal: Computer-assisted formative assessment feedback for short-answer tasks in large-enrollment classes, such that instructor burden is similar to small class (~30 students)

Research Questions

- **RQ1:** What level of agreement is achieved among trained human raters labeling (i.e., scoring) short-answer tasks?
- **RQ2:** What level of agreement is achieved between human raters and an NLP algorithm?
- **RQ3:** What sort of NLP representation leads to good clustering performance, and how does that interact with the classification algorithm?

Pilot Study

Lloyd, S. E., Beckman, M., Pearl, D., Passonneau, R., Li, Z., & Wang, Z. (2022). Foundations for AI-Assisted Formative Assessment Feedback for Short-Answer Tasks in Large-Enrollment Classes. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on teaching statistics*. Rosario, Argentina.

Collaborators

Susan Lloyd



Dennis Pearl



Zhaohui Li



Matt Beckman



Becky Passonneau



Semantic Feature-Wise
Transformation Relation
Network (SFRN)



Methods (Sample)

Study utilized de-identified extant data & scoring rubrics (Beckman, 2015)

- 6 short-answer tasks
- 1,935 students total
- 29 class sections 15 distinct institutions

Note: this sample is *not* a single large class at some institution; the available data includes introductory statistics students from many class sections at many institutions—some classes were quite small.



Figure 2: image created with assistance of DALL·E 2 by Open AI

Methods (Short-answer task)

4. Walleye is a popular type of freshwater fish native to Canada and the Northern United States. Walleye fishing takes much more than luck; better fishermen consistently catch larger fish using knowledge about proper bait, water currents, geographic features, feeding patterns of the fish, and more. Mark and his brother Dan went on a two-week fishing trip together to determine who the better Walleye fisherman is. Each brother had his own boat and similar equipment so they could each fish in different locations and move freely throughout the area. They recorded the length of each fish that was caught during the trip, in order to find out which one of them catches larger Walleye on average.

a. Should statistical inference be used to determine whether Mark or Dan is a better Walleye fisherman? Explain why statistical inference should or should not be used in this scenario.

b. Next, explain how you would determine whether Mark or Dan is a better Walleye fisherman using the data from the fishing trip. *(Be sure to give enough detail that a classmate could easily understand your approach, and how he or she would interpret the result in the context of the problem.)*

Figure 3: Sample task including a stem and two short-answer prompts.

Methods (RQ1)

- 3 human raters typical of large-enrollment instruction team
- entire sample (1,935 students) distributed among the team with sufficient intersection to assess rater agreement
- 63 student responses in common for each *combination* of raters to quantify agreement (e.g., pairwise, consensus, etc)

May 2024 Follow Up Investigation

- 4 Undergraduate Teaching Assistants marking responses

Methods (RQ1)

- 3 human raters typical of large-enrollment instruction team
- entire sample (1,935 students) distributed among the team with sufficient intersection to assess rater agreement
- 63 student responses in common for each *combination* of raters to quantify agreement (e.g., pairwise, consensus, etc)

May 2024 Follow Up Investigation

- 4 Undergraduate Teaching Assistants marking responses
- UTA's are important part of large-enrollment teaching team

Methods (RQ1)

- 3 human raters typical of large-enrollment instruction team
- entire sample (1,935 students) distributed among the team with sufficient intersection to assess rater agreement
- 63 student responses in common for each *combination* of raters to quantify agreement (e.g., pairwise, consensus, etc)

May 2024 Follow Up Investigation

- 4 Undergraduate Teaching Assistants marking responses
- UTA's are important part of large-enrollment teaching team
- Again, 63 student responses

Methods (RQ1)

- 3 human raters typical of large-enrollment instruction team
- entire sample (1,935 students) distributed among the team with sufficient intersection to assess rater agreement
- 63 student responses in common for each *combination* of raters to quantify agreement (e.g., pairwise, consensus, etc)

May 2024 Follow Up Investigation

- 4 Undergraduate Teaching Assistants marking responses
- UTA's are important part of large-enrollment teaching team
- Again, 63 student responses
- Only 4 of 6 short-answer tasks

Results (RQ1)

RQ1: What level of agreement is achieved among trained human raters labeling (i.e., scoring) short-answer tasks?

Comparison	Reliability
Rater A & Rater C	QWK = 0.83
Rater A & Rater D	QWK = 0.80
Rater C & Rater D	QWK = 0.79
Raters A, C, & D	FK = 0.70

Reliability interpretation¹: $0.6 <$ substantial $< 0.8 <$ near perfect < 1.0

¹Viera & Garrett (2005)

Preliminary Results: May 2024 UTA's

- pairwise agreement with “instructor”
- consensus

Comparison	Reliability
Rater A & Rater E	QWK = 0.57
Rater A & Rater F	QWK = 0.72
Rater A & Rater G	QWK = 0.73
Rater A & Rater H	QWK = 0.71
Raters A, E, F, G, & H	FK = 0.54

Reliability interpretation²: $0.6 <$ substantial $< 0.8 <$ near perfect < 1.0

²Viera & Garrett (2005)

Methods (RQ2)

The set of task-responses were randomly split four ways:

- 90% of data for development purposes (training)
 - training (72%),
 - development (9%)
 - evaluation (9%)
- 10% of data held in reserve (test)

Results (RQ2)

RQ2: What level of agreement is achieved between human raters and the machine (an NLP algorithm)?

Comparison	Reliability
Rater A & SFRN	QWK = 0.79
Rater C & SFRN	QWK = 0.82
Rater D & SFRN	QWK = 0.74
Raters: A, C, D, & SFRN	FK = 0.68

Reliability interpretation³: $0.6 <$ substantial $< 0.8 <$ near perfect < 1.0

³Viera & Garrett (2005)

Methods (RQ3)

How similar is feedback provided by trained humans?

- Two reviewers independently evaluated 100 “partial credit” responses
- Each reviewer provided free-text feedback to each student
- Verbatim feedback captured for each reviewer and cross-tabulated for analysis.

Experiment with NLP representations

- retrain k-means & k-medoids clustering & evaluate stability
- compare representations with higher & lower dimensionality
- Alternative: Answer-state Recurrent Relational Network
 - (AsRRN; Li, Lloyd, Beckman, & Passonneau, 2023)
 - clustering => FB Classifier??
 - Group students into pre-determined feedback categories
 - Two reviewers execute manually & compare with AsRRN

Results (RQ3 humans)




Figure 4: Cross-tabulation of feedback distribution for the two reviewers for the initial feedback (left) compared with the same analysis for the portion of feedback related to the statistical concept at issue (right).

- Reviewer 1 favored feedback on statistical concepts (only).
- Reviewer 2 provided same, plus a quote from the student
- Reviewer 2 parsed her feedback to compare her remarks related to the statistical concepts (only) with the feedback of Reviewer 1.

Results (RQ3 humans)

Feedback Code	Feedback verbatim text suggested by the Reviewer
FB1_A (Reviewer 1)	What can we do to evaluate whether [the] result is better than we would expect for someone that is strictly guessing?
FB2_A (Reviewer 2)	Think about what inferential statistical method might we use to evaluate the percentage of correctly identified notes.
FB1_B (Reviewer 1)	Good idea to have a threshold for comparison, but it's very important that it be established carefully. For example, how might you establish a threshold that...
FB2_B (Reviewer 2)	Why this threshold? What inferential statistical method might we use to evaluate the percentage of correctly identified notes?

Figure 5: Verbatim feedback most frequently provided by each reviewer for responses to task 2B.

Results (RQ3 machines)

RQ3: What sort of NLP representation leads to good clustering performance, and how does that interact with the classification algorithm?

- SFRN ($D = 512$) produced reasonably consistent clusters when retrained (0.62)
- Highest consistency (0.88; $D = 50$) was achieved using a matrix factorization method that produces static representations (WTMF; Guo & Diab, 2011)
- AsRRN compared to humans (A & B) grouping students by pre-determined feedback categories:

Task	Sample Size	A & B	A & AsRRN	B & AsRRN
1	90	0.71	0.53	0.69
2	100	0.45	0.70	0.41

Discussion

- **RQ1:** Substantial agreement achieved among trained human raters provides context for further comparisons
- **RQ2:** NLP algorithm produced agreement reasonably aligned to results achieved by pairs/groups of trained human raters
- **RQ3:** Promising results based on “man-made clusters” but classification and clustering have competing incentives when it comes to dimensionality of NLP vector representations
 - Lower Dim is generally better for cluster stability
 - Higher Dim better for classification reliability
 - Exploring Topological Analysis as alternative to clustering
 - Feedback as a classifier (Li et al., 2023)

Current Events: Refining our algorithm

Current Events: Human-Machine Partnership

Our work is first (that we know of) to implement controllable, selective prediction deferral policy for the classifier (i.e., marking) step

Threshold	Deferral Rate	Simulated HIL Accuracy
0.68	0.095	0.855
0.75	0.132	0.861
0.80	0.160	0.871
0.85	0.202	0.884
0.90	0.256	0.899
0.95	0.418	0.931

Current Events: Ongoing Data Collection

- challenge system with diverse tasks, institutions, student populations;
 - several large intro statistics classes in U.S. (ISU, MSU, PSU, UCSB, UF, UTEP)
 - two “consensus” tasks implemented by all
 - 2-3 local tasks at each institution
- accumulated data to be shared with broader NLP community
 - this data set would be among the largest open data sources of it's kind
 - addresses barriers imposed by proprietary data sources on NLP research

Acknowledgment

- We're grateful to the US National Science Foundation for funding this research
- Project CLASSIFIES (NSF DUE-2236150)

References (1/3)

- ① Attali, Y., Powers, D., Freedman, M., Harrison, M., & Obetz, S. (2008). Automated Scoring of Short-Answer Open-Ended Gre® Subject Test Items. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2008(1), i–22.
- ② Basu, S., Jacobs, C., & Vanderwende, L. (2013). Powergrading: a Clustering Approach to Amplify Human Effort for Short Answer Grading. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1, 391–402. https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00236
- ③ Beckman, M. (2015). Assessment Of Cognitive Transfer Outcomes For Students Of Introductory Statistics.
<http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/175709>
- ④ Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, pp 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- ⑤ GAISE College Report ASA Revision Committee (2016). Guidelines for Assessment and Instruction in Statistics Education College Report 2016. URL: <http://www.amstat.org/education/gaise>

References (2/3)

- ⑥ Gould, R. (2010). Statistics and the Modern Student. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique*, 78(2), 297–315. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27919839>
- ⑦ Guo, W., Diab, M. (2012) Modeling Sentences in the Latent Space. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 864–872. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- ⑧ Graham, S., Kiuhara, S. A., & MacKay, M. (2020). The Effects of Writing on Learning in Science, Social Studies, and Mathematics: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(2), 179–226.
- ⑨ Li, Z., Tomar, Y., & Passonneau, R. J. (2021). A Semantic Feature-Wise Transformation Relation Network for Automatic Short Answer Grading. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 6030–6040. Association for Computational Linguistics.
<https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.487>
- ⑩ Li, Z., Lloyd, S., Beckman, M. D., & Passonneau, R. J. (2023). Answer-state Recurrent Relational Network (AsRRN) for Constructed

References (3/3)

- ⑩ Page, E. B. (1994). Computer Grading of Student Prose, Using Modern Concepts and Software. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 62(2), 127–142.
- ⑪ Pearl, D. K., Garfield, J. B., delMas, R., Groth, R. E., Kaplan, J. J., McGowan, H., & Lee, H. S. (2012). Connecting Research to Practice in a Culture of Assessment for Introductory College-level Statistics. URL: <http://www.causeweb.org/research/guidelines/> ResearchReport_Dec_2012.pdf
- ⑫ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations, Washington, DC.
- ⑬ Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: the kappa statistic. *Family Medicine*, 37(5), 360–363.
- ⑭ Woodard, R., & McGowan, H. (2012). Redesigning a large introductory course to incorporate the GAISE guidelines. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 20(3).

Thank You

Research evaluating NLP tools designed to assist
instructors with formative assessment for students
in large-enrollment STEM education classes

Matthew Beckman
Penn State University

June 14, 2024

Resource Page URL: <https://mdbeckman.github.io/UKCOTS2024/>

NLP for Educational Use

- Natural language processing (NLP) involves how computers can be programmed to analyze language elements
- NLP-assisted feedback for educational use:
 - automated short-answer grading (ASAG) from 2009
 - essays & long-answer tasks earlier
- Human-machine collaboration is a promising mechanism to assist rapid, individualized feedback at scale (Basu, 2013)
- Deep neural networks application since 2016
- Relational (neural) networks

SFRN Detail (Li et al., 2021)

SFRN is an end-to-end model with 3 components:

- ① encode QRA triples producing vector representations for question (Q), a possible reference (R), and student answer (A)
- ② when relation network includes multiple QRA triples, a learned feature-wise transformation network merges all relation vectors for a student answer into a single relation vector by leveraging attentions calculated by a QRA triple;
- ③ the resulting vector representation is passed as an input to a classifier (i.e., neural network)




Figure 6: The g_θ MLP function computes the relation vector for each $[Q, R, A]$ triple. A set of relation vectors is combined (+) using SFT. The f_ϕ MLP function is the assessment classifier.

Google Photos Illustration



Same or different person?



Same



Different



Not sure

Google Photos “Deferral”



Can you identify this person?



Same



Different



Not sure