Role of Learning Styles & Affective States in Web-based Adaptive Learning Environments

Farman Ali Khan[1], Sabine Graf[2], Edgar R. Weippl[1], Tassawar Iqbal [1], A Min Tjoa[1]
[1]Institute of Software Technology and Interactive Systems
Vienna University of Technology
[2] School of Computing and Information Systems, Athabasca University, Canada.
farman@ifs.tuwien.ac.at, sabineg@athabascau.ca, weippl@securityresearch.at, iqbal@ifs.tuwien.ac.at, tjoa@ifs.tuwien.ac.at

Abstract: Detecting students' learning needs is a challenging task in a Web-based learning environment. In a traditional learning environment teachers can easily observe and consequently recognize a student's learning needs. In web based learning environments where distance is a barrier, observing students' learning needs and characteristics is very difficult. Students' learning needs can be observed through their learning styles and affective states by detecting their behavioral patterns. However, for learning in a Web-based learning environment, a student's learning styles and affective states are rarely taken into consideration. In this paper, we explore the learning styles and affective states of a student that are key to learning and present an approach for making these learning styles and affective states visible in Web-based Learning Management Systems.

Introduction

Due to rapid technological advancements over the past half century, technology has become an integral part of learning environments. This has greatly changed the practice of learning. Witnessed in recent years has been an awareness of the adaptivity in e-Learning. This is due to the realization that traditional learning environments are not able to fulfill the requirements of individualized learning (i.e., learning environment tailored to the specific requirements and preferences of each individual) (Paramythis & Loidl-Reisinger, 2003). Adaptive systems aim to support and enhance a student's learning process (Branco Neto, Gauthier, & Modesto Nassar, 2005). In their provision of adaptivity, adaptive systems usually consider the user's knowledge, background, interest, goals, and/or preferences. Adapting to a student's affective states, such as emotions and motivation (Dautenhahn & Waern, 2002), or his-her learning styles is rarely considered. The Thalmann (2008) study reported that within 30 existing adaptive hypermedia systems, learning styles present 13 percent and affective states 3 percent of the adaptation criteria.

Learning management systems (LMSs), such as Moodle and Blackboard, are very successful in e-education but they do not accommodate full fledged adaptivity (Graf & Kinshuk, 2006) and, in particular, do not accommodate current adaptivity approaches, such as adaptivity based on learning styles and affective states. Graf, Kinshuk, and Liu (2009) investigated patterns with respect to student learning styles when considering learning-style based adaptivity in LMSs. Similarly, some efforts have been made to incorporate the affective factor in the self assessment test for LMSs (Gardner-Medwin, 1995), such as mentioning confidence level while attempting each question. However, these efforts have been made simply for the purposes of avoiding rapid guessing (gaming) and measuring students' actual knowledge.

Currently, two approaches are used for obtaining useful and accurate information with respect to student learning styles when considering learning-style based adaptivity. The first approach is based on filling out a questionnaire and then using the feedback from the questionnaire to detect each individual student's learning style. The second approach automatically collects information based on a student's actions and behavior when using the system for learning. Similarly, there are different approaches used for obtaining useful and accurate information with respect to students' affective states when considering affective-state based adaptivity. For example, there are verbal and nonverbal approaches and intrusive and non-intrusive approaches (Li & Ji, 2004).

Recent research trends are shifting towards systems that process a student's interaction with the system (non-intrusive approach), such as time spent on a task, etc., as a means of assessing learning styles (Graf, Viola, & Kinshuk, 2007) and affective states (Cocea & Weibelzahl, 2006) rather than directly involving the student. Information obtained in this way about students' learning styles and affective states would enable adaptive systems to tailor contents and interventions to the individual student. In this paper, we propose a method that investigates the suitable patterns in LMSs for the detection of learning styles and affective states. Some patterns have already been investigated and evaluated by (Graf, Kinshuk, & Liu, 2009) to detect students' learning styles. We introduce and investigate additional patterns, such as a discussion/peer rating forum related to the content objects, among others, as well as look into the potential of detecting affective states based on students' behavior in LMSs. These investigated patterns of behavior correspond to students' different learning styles and affective states, in order to provide the students with personalized support.

The paper is organized as follows. In the following section the work relevant to learning styles and affective states is presented. Subsequently, the implication of learning styles and affective states in educational systems is presented. After that the concept for identifying learning styles and affective states through students' behavioral patterns that are visible in learning management systems is introduced. The next section presents the mathematical notation of the proposed approach. The final section concludes the paper and presents future work.

Related Work

The following subsections present the work relevant to identifying learning styles and affective states.

Learning Styles

Related work deals with the identification of learning styles in adaptive systems, such as CS383 (Carver, Howard, & Lane, 1999), and ILASH (Peña, Marzo, & de la Rosa, 2002). These systems use a questionnaire to gather information on a student's learning style. According to Shute and Zapata-Rivera (2008), there are at least two problems associated with questionnaire (verbal instrument) based information. First, students may provide inaccurate data either purposefully due to privacy concerns or a desire to present themselves in a more prominent way or by accident, i.e., due to a lack of awareness of their own characteristics. The second problem is that completing the questionnaire during the online learning process can be time consuming, which may frustrate students and lead them to provide invalid data in order to arrive at the contents more quickly. To capture the students' learning style, other systems, such as Arthur (Gilbert & Han, 1999) and DeLeS (Graf, 2007) adopted an approach based on the actions and behavior of the students during their use of the system for learning. In this approach, no additional effort on the part of students is required in order to obtain information about their learning styles. The system infers their learning style from their actions and accommodates their needs. The information captured in this way is free from uncertainty.

Affective States

In this section four approaches to identifying affective states are presented.

1. Verbal approach

The verbal instrument can be classified as a questionnaire or self report instrument. The difference between questionnaire and self report instrument is, that a questionnaire is usually distributed to the students for submission, so that students can provide explicit information about themselves, i.e., about their affective states, before interaction with the learning environment takes place or after finishing the interaction with the learning environment. With a self-report instrument, on the other hand, students provide explicit information about themselves, i.e., their affective states, during the interaction with a learning environment. The use of a self report instrument is not recommended for either adults or children for the purpose of reporting their affective states. This is due to the fact that self report instruments reflect not only information about ones internal state at a particular moment, but also give an indication of how such a report is perceived (Picard et al., 2004). De vicente, and Pain (1999) reported that relying exclusively on the use of self report (verbal instruments) is not suitable as sometimes students do not update the self report facilities.

2. Nonverbal approach

A nonverbal or psycho-physiological instrument measures physical states, such as heart rate, blood pressure, skin conductance, finger temperature, and respiration, to detect affective states via sensors, for instance, strain gauges applied to mouse buttons, special wearable devices, etc (Weerasinghe & Antonija, 2005). Physiological (nonverbal) instruments are usually applied in controlled environments. (Picard et al., 2004) highlighted that conducting such controlled experiments dealing with affective states presents a challenge. These kinds of instruments could be limited to a certain type of application due to the possible negative reaction of a user to the use of body sensors (De Vicente & Pain, 1998). Picard (1995), for example, used this kind of instrument for a piano-teaching computer system capable of detecting a student's expressive timing. Such instruments have thus far not been used in computer instruction systems. This kind of instrument suffers due to limitations with regard to predictive power (Guhe et al., 2005).

*3. **Intrusive approach***

An intrusive instrument measures physical appearances by means of observational cues, such as head nods, eye gaze, gesture, posture, and linguistic expression among others. Picard and Daily (2005) highlighted that intrusive instruments influence a student's normal affective state and may thus lead to misinformation. This misinformation develops from a student's feeling that his/her activities are being monitored. Through the program ITSPOKE (Intelligent Tutoring SPOKEn dialogue system), Litman and Silliman (2004) investigated the detection of affective states that arose during interactive spoken conversation in natural language. ITSPOKE is a speech-enabled version of text-based dialogue tutoring systems, such as Why2-Atlas (VanLehn et al., 2002). Using ITSPOKE, a student first types a natural language answer to a qualitative physics problem, ITSPOKE then engages the student in a spoken dialogue to correct misconceptions and provide feedback, and to elicit more complete explanations. D'Mello et al. (2006) highlighted the importance of a participant's role and grounding criterion in conversation. The grounding criterion is the belief that one understands the other agent in a conversation. If a lack of understanding of the conversation exists between agents, affective states cannot be properly detected.

*4. **Non-intrusive approach***

The non-intrusive instrument measures the behavioral and cognitive patterns during interaction between students and the system. The affective state is identified through interaction with the system, such as in MOODS, a prototype of an intelligent tutoring system (ITS) for learning Japanese numbers with an added motivation of a self-report facility (De Vicente & Pain, 2002). In order to infer students' affective states, some rules were formulated. Their validated results suggest that it is feasible to infer an affective state diagnosis based on the information provided by the computer interaction.

Implication of Learning Styles and Affective States in Educational Systems

Learning styles specify a learner's preferred ways of learning. A learner with a specific learning style can face difficulties while learning when his/her learning style is not supported by the teaching environment (Felder & Silverman, 1988). Claxton and Murrell (1987) describe that when the instruction presented matches the student's learning style, the student learns more. Thus, consideration of learning styles in a learning environment influences a student's learning. In the present era, learning styles are being investigated in order to incorporate them into adaptive online learning environments (Graf & Kinshuk, 2006). According to Jonassen and Grabowski (1993), adaptive online learning environments are ideal for generating learning style based instructional material in large classes as they do not have the same limitations as human instructors who are unable to focus on individual students due to the lack of required resources and time.

In a traditional learning environment, it is very challenging for a teacher to address each student's individual needs due to the large number of students in a classroom. In such a situation, an experienced teacher considers factors such as students' preferred ways of learning and learning behavior. These preferred ways of learning determining students' learning styles and their learning behavior explains their affective states through patterns. Learning environments that consider a student's affective state boost the amount that can be learned and also augment a student's learning experience (Baker, Rodrigo, & Xolocotzin, 2007). Within the continuum of affective states, we find the traditional affective states, such as anger, fear, joy, surprise, and disgust identified by Ekaman and Friesen (1978) as well as other affective states, for instance confidence, confusion, and effort. However, Craig et al. (2004) reported that traditional affective states do not play a significant role in learning. Several parameters can be used to describe students' affective states, e.g., motivation, interest, and proclivity. Qu, Wang, and Johnson (2005) highlight confidence, confusion, and effort among the possible factors influencing a student's motivation. Similarly, the motivational model presented by De Vicente and Pain (2002) consists of variables related to trait (control, challenge, fantasy, and independence) and state (confidence, sensory interest, cognitive interest, effort, and satisfaction).

Summarizing these aspects, the conclusion can be drawn that both learning styles and affective states play an important role in learning and are to be addressed in online adaptive learning environments.

A Concept for Identifying Learning Styles and Affective States

In this study, we consider four learning style dimensions (FSLSM) identified by Felder and Silverman (1988) and also four affective states: confidence, effort, independence, and confusion identified from a set of affective states by Qu, Wang, and Johnson (2005) as well as De Vicente and Pain (2002). These learning style dimensions and affective states were selected because they are prevalent in student learning interactions in learning management systems.

Presented in the following subsections are patterns of behavior suitable to each learning style dimension and each selected affective state along with the concept/approach for calculating learning styles and affective states from these patterns.

Relevant Patterns of Behavior

Features commonly used in LMSs were selected as the basis for patterns, in order to make our approach a generally applicable one for LMSs. These features include: content objects, outlines, exercises, self assessment tests, examples illustrating concepts, discussion forum for assignment related queries, discussion /peer rating forum related to the content objects, and assignments. In addition, also considered is the students' navigational behavior within the course. Data obtained from all of these features provides relevant information for identifying students' learning styles and affective states.

The next sections describe characteristics of each learning style dimension and each affective state with respect to relevant models from literature and present the relevant patterns for identifying each learning style and affective state using the models from literature as basis.

Patterns of Behavior for Identifying Learning Styles

This section presents the approaches to identifying learning styles based on patterns of behavior.

*1. **Active/reflective dimension***

According to FSLSM, active learners are categorized as learners who prefer to process information actively by doing something with the learned material, such as discussing it, applying it, and explaining it to others. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to a student's active dimension. Participation in discussions through the discussion /peer rating forum related to the content objects gives us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of discussing. Trying a great number of self assessment tests and exercises gives us an indication of a student's behavior in terms of applying. Replying to queries related to assignments posted in the general forum as well as commenting on new posts forwarded by other students related to the content objects in the discussion/peer rating forum gives us an indication with regard to a student's behavior in terms of explaining.

According to FSLSM, reflective learners prefer to think about the material before they act and prefer to work alone. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to the student's reflective dimension. Returning to and spending more time with learning material, such as content objects, as well as spending more time looking at outlines gives us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of thinking. Moreover, spending more time on self assessment tests and exercises in order to produce good results also gives us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of thinking. Passive participation in the form of reading the "discussion/peer rating forum" and "assignment forum" postings rather than actively posting gives us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of working on their own.

*2. **Sensing/intuitive dimension***

According to FSLSM, sensing learners gravitate towards concrete material, such as facts and data. They like to solve problems through well-established procedures. Furthermore, they are more patient with details and work carefully but slowly, and often do well using repetition as a learning tool. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to a student's sensing dimension. The number of visits and time spent on examples gives us an indication about the student behavior in terms of learning from concrete material. Sensing learners tend to prefer examples in order to learn from concrete material. The more visits and more time spent on examples gives us an indication that a student wants to see and learn from existing approaches. Moreover, a great number of attempts at self- assessment tests and exercises provide an indication about a student's behavior in terms of checking the acquired knowledge. The time taken to submit the self-assessment tests and exercises gives us an indication about the pace at which a student works. Repeating the self assessment test and getting a satisfactory score in the final attempt provides an indication related to using the self assessment test as a learning tool.

According to FSLSM, intuitive learners prefer challenges and are bored by details. Another characteristic of intuitive learners is that they like innovation and dislike repetition. Furthermore, intuitive learners tend to work faster than sensing learners. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to a student's intuitive dimension. Solving an assignment in just a few attempts and also doing so quickly give us an indication about a student's behavior when faced with challenges. A great number of visits to content objects, longer time spent; and low number of visits to examples, shorter time spent, give us an indication about students' behavior of using examples only as supplementary material and are being bored by niceties. Not repeating the self assessment test, after getting a satisfactory score in the first attempt gives us an indication about a student's behavior with regard to disliking repetition.

*3. **Visual/verbal dimension***

According to FSLSM, visual learners remember best from what they can see, such as flowcharts, graphics, and images. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to the student's visual dimension. Performance on questions with visual metaphors can give us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of visual cues.

According to FSLSM, verbal learners prefer to learn from words, regardless of whether they are written or oral. Verbal learners tend to like discussion and communication with others. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to the student's verbal dimension. Frequent visits to and spending time at content objects by the student gives us an indication about a student's verbal dimension. Forwarding a great number of posts as well as a great number of comments on posts in discussion/peer rating forums related to the content objects gives us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of discussing and communicating.

*4. **Sequential/global dimension***

According to FSLSM, sequential learners are comfortable with details and follow logical stepwise paths when solving problems. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to a student's sequential dimension. The navigation of students through the course in a linear way gives us an indication about a student's sequential behavior.

According to FSLSM, global learners like to get an overview of the contents rather than going into too much detail of the contents being presented. Using this way of learning, they grasp the big picture and build their own cognitive map with respect to the presented contents. We can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to the student's global dimension: A great number of visits and more time spent on chapter outlines as well as on the course overview page provide an indication about a student's behavior with regard to obtaining the big picture with respect to the course contents.

The mentioned patterns related to the active /reflective dimension, sensing/intuitive dimension, visual/verbal dimension, and sequential/global dimension are presented in Table 1. The "-" and "+" indicate a low and high occurrence of the respective pattern from the active, sensing, visual and sequential dimension point of view.

Active /Reflective	**Sensing/Intuitive**	**Visual/verbal**	**Sequential/global**
content_visit(-)	content_visit(-)	quest_graphics(+)	outline_visit(-)
content_stay(-)	content_stay(-)	quest_text(-)	outline_stay(-)
outline_stay(-)	example_visit(+)	content_visit(-)	course_ovview_visit(-)
forum_content_post(+)	example_stay(+)	content_stay(-)	course_ovview_stay(-)
forum_content_post_reply(+)	selasses_visit(+)	forum_content_post(-)	navigation_skip(-)
forum_assignment_post_repl(+)	selfassess_stay(+)	forum_content_post_repl(-)	
selfassess_visit (+)	exercise_visit(+)		
selfassess_stay(-)	exercise_stay(+)		
exercise_visit(+)	selfassess_revision(+)		
exercise_stay(+)	assignment_revision(+)		
	assignment_stay(+)		

Table 1. Patterns of Behavior for the Detection of Learning Styles' Dimensions

Patterns of Behavior for Identifying Affective States

Presented in this section are the approaches to identifying the abovementioned affective states from patterns of behavior.

*1. **Confidence***

Sander and Sanders (2003) highlighted that confidence levels differ among students in the same situation and that they also have different levels of confidence in different situations. In this context, a new mediating term was proposed known as academic confidence. Besterfield-Sacre et al. (1998) highlighted that academic confidence influences a student's motivation, performance, and retention in their future academic studies. Sander and Sanders (2003) conducted a study to measure students' academic confidence. This study yielded six factors in academic confidence. These factors include studying, understanding, verbalizing, clarifying, attendance, and grades.

In our approach, we consider five factors of the six mentioned by Sander and Sanders for identifying academic confidence. The exempted factor is grades, which is the only factor that does not co-relate with the student's learning behavior. We can assume that the information related to the student's academic confidence can be obtained by observing the following student behavior: Number of visits to content objects, examples, and outlines gives us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of *studying*. Number of visits to exercises and self assessment tests gives us an indication about a student's behavior with regard to *understanding*. Forwarding a great number of posts as well as commenting on a great number of posts in discussion/peer rating forums related to the content objects gives us an indication about a student's behavior with regard to *verbalizing*. The number of visits to assignment related queries in the forum and also visits to posts related to the content objects via the discussion/peer rating forum give us an indication of a student's behavior with regard to *clarifying*. Counting a student's overall posts in a discussion/peer rating forum related to the content objects, comments/peer rating of posts and replies to queries posted on the assignment-related queries forum give us an indication about a student's behavior with regard to *attendance.*

*2. **Effort***

The Attribution Theory (Weiner 1986) highlights that effort is an unstable factor, although a student has a great deal of control over it. For example, a student can control his/her effort by trying harder or a student who fails repeatedly in a difficult course could succeed by taking an easier one. Weiner, Heckhausen, and Mayer (1972) remarked that student attribution of failure to unstable factors, such as effort or luck, facilitates performance and preserves expectations of future success. For example, if students attribute failure to their low ability, they will expect failure in the future because there is no way they can alter their ability but if students attribute failure to their low effort, they can try harder in the future and experience greater success. A Motivation Theory conception provided by Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) enumerates the factors for an individual's willingness to display an interest in learning or exerting effort, such as personal interest and the importance of a task, as well as a student's disposition toward doing the necessary work to complete the task.

Wise and Kong (2005) argued that rapid guesses in low-stake situations (absence of personal consequences associated with student test performance), represents low-effort behavior by unmotivated students. Qu, Wang, and Johnson (2005) derived the effort exerted by a student in a learning environment from the amount of time the student spent on performing tasks. De Vicente (2003) elicited seven rules related to effort from the expert responses about students' interactions in a learning environment. To validate those rules, an empirical study was conducted, which found five rules related to effort to be valid. Validated rules include, for example, if the number of correct answers is high relative to the number of questions within the exercise, the student's effort is to be considered high.

Following the motivational theory concept (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990), the Qu, Wang, and Johnson model (2005), and De Vicente's (2003) validated rules related to effort, we can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to a student's effort in a learning environment.

A great number of attempts at self assessment tests and exercises give us an indication about a student's behavior in terms of exerting high effort. A great number of visits to posts related to the content objects and consequently, a great number of comments/peer ratings of those visited posts on the discussion/peer rating forum predicts a great deal of effort from the student in such activities. Submission of assignments well before the deadline as well as revision and resubmission of assignments before the deadline in response to negative feedback on the first submission gives us an indication of a student's behavior with regard to exerting high effort.

*3. **Independence***

Independence (autonomy) is an attribute of a student, in which he/she exhibits agency (intentional behavior) in a learning environment. Academic discourse abounds with synonyms for "*independent learning,*" such as "independent study, student initiated learning, lifelong learning, and autonomous learning" (Kesten, 1987)**.** Jeffries et al. (1990) indicated that independent learning involves students' taking greater responsibility for what they learn, how they learn, and when they learn. Singh and Embi (2007) mentioned the importance of five factors for looking into a student's abilities to work autonomously during Web-based learning, i.e., planning, organizing, monitoring, evaluating, and computer abilities. Planning and organizing deals with the ability of a student to formulate materials and techniques, learning aims, and a schedule for accomplishing learning tasks; monitoring deals with the ability of a student to check, verify, and correct themselves during learning tasks; evaluating deals with the ability of a student to judge, evaluate, and make decisions on performance in achieving the learning tasks; computer abilities deals with a student's possession of basic computer application skills, to self-access course materials and related links to accomplish their learning tasks.

In our approach we consider four factors of the five mentioned by Singh and Embi for identifying autonomous abilities. The exempted factor is computer abilities, as we assume that students have similar abilities to access the course materials and related links to accomplish their learning tasks using the leaning management system. According to Singh and Embi (2007), we can therefore assume that the following behavior provides us with information related to a student's abilities to work autonomously: Visiting content objects, outlines, examples, and forwarding and visiting posts related to content objects on the discussion/peer rating forum give us an indication of a student's behavior in terms of planning; peer rating of posts in a discussion/peer rating forum related to the content objects, submission of assignments, even in several attempts, give us an indication of a student's behavior in terms of monitoring; attempts and revision of self assessment as well as attempts at exercises give us an indication of a student's behavior in terms of evaluating.

*4. **Confusion***

Recent research highlights confusion as an important affective state for scientific investigation (Rozin & Cohen, 2003a). Confusion is a state of uncertainty about how to act or what to do next (Keltner & Shiota, 2003). Craig et al. (2004) conducted a study related to the role of affective states in learning with Auto Tutor, coding confusion as a state when students seem perplexed and unsure of how to continue or are struggling to understand the material. Rozin and Cohen (2003b) indicated that confusion and cognitive disequilibrium often go hand-in-hand, and in states of uncertainty and perturbation there is need for clarification or more information. Qu, Wang, and Johnson (2005) indicated that a student is most likely to get stuck or frustrated in a highly confused state. Baker et al. (2004) mentioned that a confused student is likely to game the system.

According to Qu, Wang, and Johnson (2005) and Baker et al. (2004), we can therefore assume that students in a state of confusion can be divided into two types 1) stuck and 2) Gamer.

Stuck students are assumed to be those who solve a low number of exercises and self assessment tests. Moreover, they are assumed to be the ones who leave a great number of questions un-attempted in exercises and self assessment tests, and answer the same question twice or more often wrong in the self assessment test. Stuck students are also assumed to be those who visit a great number of examples and spend more time on each example. In terms of submission of assignments, stuck students are assumed to be the ones who post repeated and quick inquiry messages over the forum related to assignment. Stuck students are assumed to be the ones who have a high number of assignment submission attempts after negative feedback on their first submission. They are assumed to be the ones who stay longer on content objects. They tend to visit a great number of postings related to the content objects but in contrast, they are assumed to be the ones who forward a low number of peer ratings related to the posted content objects on the discussion/ peer rating forum. Gamer students are assumed to be those who misuse the available system. They are assumed to be involved in gaming activities while attempting the self assessment tests, such as inputting answers quickly and repeatedly, until the system provides the feedback, i.e., correct answer. These patterns of stuck and gamer students provide us with information related to a student's level of confusion.

The mentioned patterns related to confidence, effort, independence, and confusion are presented in Table 2.

Confidence	Effort	Independence	Confusion
i. Studying	selfassess_visit	**i. Planning & organizing**	selfassess_visit
content_visit	selfassess_stay	content_visit	exercise_visit
outline_visit	exercise_visit	outline_visit	example_visit
example_visit	exercise_stay	example_visit	example_stay
ii. Understanding	forum_content_visit	forum_content_visit	forum_assignment_post
exercise_visit	forum_content_post_repl	forum_content_post	assignment_revision
selfassess_visit	assignment_revision	**ii. Monitoring**	content_stay
iii. Verbalising		forum_content_post_repl	forum_content_visit
forum_content_post		assignment_revision	forum_content_post_repl
forum_content_post_reply		**iii. Evaluating**	
iv. Clarifying		selfassess_visit	
forum_assignment_visit		selfassess_stay	
forum_content_visit		selfassess_revision	
v. Attendance		exercise_visit	
forum_content_post		exercise_stay	
forum_content_post_repl			
forum_assignment_post_repl			

Table 2: Patterns of Behaviour for the Detection of Affective States

Modeling from Behavior to Learning Styles and Affective States

The patterns described in section "Relevant Patterns of Behavior" are incorporated for each learning style dimension as well as each affective state. The high or low occurrence of these patterns indicates a specific learning style preference and a specific affective state level. Based on this available information, data about students' behavior can be used to calculate hints for specific learning style preferences and also specific affective state levels. The approach involving calculating hints for specific learning style preferences and also specific affective state levels is based on measures proposed by Graf, Kinshuk, and Liu (2009) for calculation of learning styles from patterns of behavior. Hints are denoted by four values, i.e., 0–3 where 3, if used for learning style preference, indicates that the student's behavior gives a strong indication toward the respective learning style and similarly, if 3 is used for affective state level, it gives a strong indication toward the respective affective state. The value 2 used for either learning style preference or affective state level indicates that the student's behavior is average and therefore does not provide a specific hint. Similarly, value 1 used for either learning style preference or affective state level indicates that the student's behavior is in disagreement with the respective learning style or affective state, and value 0 indicates that no information about the student's behavior is available. In order to categorize the student's behavior for each pattern into four values, thresholds from the literature (e.g., Graf, Kinshuk, & Liu, 2009; Ran, 2005; Gracia, Amandi, Schiaffino, & Campo, 2007) are used as a basis, with the additional consideration of the characteristics of the respective course.

By adding up all hints and dividing them by the number of patterns providing available information, a measure for each respective learning style and respective affective state is individually calculated and the equivalent mathematical notation is shown in formula 1, where x denote a hint value for each pattern providing available information. The x can have a value in the range of 0 to 3, and n denote a number of patterns providing available information.

$$\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n} x_i}{n} \quad where \ 0 \le x_i \le 3 \qquad (1)$$

This measure is then normalized on a range from 0 to 1 for both learning style and affective state. The value 1 represents a strong positive level and the value 0 represents a strong negative level for learning style and affective state. In case no information is available for all patterns of a learning styles dimension or affective state, no conclusion can be drawn.

Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we presented an automatic student modeling approach for identifying learning styles as well as affective states in LMSs. The proposed approach uses students' behavior while learning to gather hints about their learning styles and affective states. Based on the obtained indications related to behavior, learning styles and affective states are calculated using a simple rule-based mechanism. The information about the students' behavior can be used as a basis for providing course material that matches the student's learning styles and affective states. The approach is not proposed for one specific system, but rather, for LMSs in general.

Future work deals with further verification of our approach. For this, we map out an additional experiment and compare the results derived from patterns with the results obtained from questionnaires used for the respective learning style and affective state.

There are different paths we could follow to ensure the privacy of data related to student profiles. For example, existing security mechanisms could easily be adapted to ensure who assesses sensitive information and role-based access control (Essmayr, Probst, & Weippl, 2004) presents a fine-grained access control model.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support of HEC (Higher Education Commission) of Pakistan, NSERC, iCORE, Xerox, and the research related gift funding by Mr. A. Markin.

References

Baker, R. S., Corbett, A. T., Koedinger, K. R., & Wagner, A. Z. (2004). Off-Task Behavior in the Cognitive Tutor Classroom: When Students "Game the System". In *SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. 2004. Vienna, Austria.

Baker, R.S., Rodrigo, M.M., & Xolocotzin, U.E.(2007). The Dynamics of Affective Transitions in Simulation Problem-Solving Environments. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction*.

Besterfield-Sacre, M.E., N.Y. Amaya, L.J. Shuman, C.J. Atman, & R. Porter. (1998). Understanding student confidence as it relates to first year achievement. *Frontiers in Education Conference*, November 1998, pp 258-263.

Branco Neto, W., Gauthier, F., & Modesto Nassar, S. (2005). An adaptive e-learning model for the Semantic Web. *In International Workshop on Applications of Semantic Web technologies for E-Learning*, Banff, Canada, pp 63-64.

Carver, C.A., Howard, R.A., & Lane, W.D. (1999). Addressing different learning styles through course hypermedia. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 42 (1), 33-38.

Claxton, D. S., & Murrell, P. (1987). Learning styles: Implications for improving educational practices. *ASHEERIC Higher Education Report No. 4*. Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Cocea, M. & Weibelzahl, S. (2006). Motivation-Included or Excluded From E-Learning. In *International Conference on Cognition and Exploratory Learning in Digital Age*. *CELDA 2006*. pp. 435-437.

Craig, S., Graesser, A., Sullins, J., & Gholson, B. (2004). Affect and learning: An exploratory look into the role of affect in learning. *Journal of Educational Media* 29(3): pp. 241-250.

Dautenhahn, K., & Waern, A. (2002). Book Review Rosalind Picard: Affective Computing, *Journal of User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, 12(1), pp 85-89.

De Vicente, A., & Pain, H. (1998). Motivation Diagnosis in Intelligent Tutoring Systems, Proceedings *of the Fourth International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems*, **V**ol 1452 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 86-95, Berlin. Heidelberg. Springer.

De Vicente, A. & Pain, H. (1999) Motivation self-report in ITS. In Lajoie S.P. and Vivet, M. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Ninth World Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, Amsterdam, IOS Press, pp. 648 -650.

De Vicente, A. & Pain, H. (2002). Informing the Detection of the Students' Motivational State: An Empirical Study. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems, vol 2363 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 933-943.*

De Vicente, A. (2003). *Towards tutoring systems that detect students' motivation an investigation*, Ph.D. thesis, School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, UK.

D'Mello,S.K., Craig, S.D., Graesser, A.C., & Sullins, J. (2006). Predicting Learner's Affective States from a Dialogue with AutoTutor. In *Presentation at the 16th annual meeting of the Society for Text and Discourse*. 2006. Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA.

Ekaman, P., & Friesen, W.V. (1978). *The facial action coding system: A technique for the measurement of facial movement*, Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Essmayr, W., Probst, S., & Weippl, E. (2004). Role-Based Access Controls: Status, Dissemination, and Prospects for Generic Security Mechanisms. *Electronic Commerce Research,* 4(1): pp. 127.

Felder, R.M., & Silverman, L.K., (1988) Learning and teaching styles in engineering education, *Engineering Education*, 78(7), pp. 674–681.

Gardner-Medwin, A.R. (1995). Confidence Assessment in the Teaching of Basic Science. *ALT-J (Association for Learning Technology Journal,* 1995. 3: pp. 80-85

Gilbert, J.E., & Han, C.Y.(1999). Adapting Instruction in Search of a Significant Difference, *Journal of Network and Computer Application*s, 22(3), 149-160.

Gracia, P., Amandi, A., Schiaffino, S., & Campo, M. (2007). Evaluating Bayesian networks precision for detecting students' learning styles. *Computers and Education,* 49(3): pp. 794-808.

Graf, S., Kinshuk, & Liu, T.C. (2009). Supporting Teachers in Identifying Students' Learning Styles in Learning Management Systems: An Automatic Student Modelling Approach. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12 (4), 3-14.

Graf, S., & Kinshuk. (2006). An Approach for Detecting Learning Styles in Learning Management Systems. in *Sixth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies*. Kerkrade, Netherlands, pp. 161-163.

Graf, S. (2007). Adaptivity in Learning Management Systems Focusing on Learning Styles. Ph.D Thesis, Vienna University of Technology.

Graf, S., Rita Viola, S., & Kinshuk (2007). Automatic Student Modelling for Detecting Learning Style Preferences in Learning Management Systems. *Proceedings of the IADIS International Conference on Cognition and Exploratory Learning in Digital Age* (Algarve, Portugal, , pp.172-179.

Guhe, M., Liao, W., Zhu, Z., Ji, Q., Gray, W. D., & Schoelles, M. J. (2005). Non-intrusive measurement of workload in real-time. in *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*. 2005, pp 1157-1161 Santa Monica, CA: Human Factors and Ergonomics Society.

Jeffries, C., Lewis, R.,-Meed, J., & Merritt, R. (1990). *A-Z of Open Learning*. 1990: National Extension College(Cambridge).

Jonassen, D. H., & Grabowski, B. L. (1993). *Handbook of Individual Differences, Learning and Instruction*. Lawrence Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Keltner, D., & Shiota, M.N. (2003). New displays and new emotions: A commentary on Rozin and Cohen (2003). *Emotion,* 3(1): pp. 86-91.

Kesten, C. (1987). Independent learning a common essential learning in Broad, J. Interpretation of independent learning in further education. *Further and Higher Education,* 1987. 30(2): pp. 119-143.

Li, X., & Ji, Q. (2004). User Affective State Assessment for HCI Systems. In *Americas Conference on Information Systems*.Aug.,2004.

Litman, D.J., & Silliman, S. (2004). ITSPOKE: An intelligent tutoring spoken dialogue system. In *human language technology conferenc*e: 3rd meeting of the North American chapter of the association of computational linguistics. 2004. Edmonton, Canada: ACL.

Paramythis, A., & Loidl-Reisinger, S. (2003). Adaptive Learning Environments and e-Learning Standards**.** In R. Williams (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2nd European Conference on e-Learning (ECEL2003*), Glasgow, Scotland, 6-7 November (pp. 369-379).

Peña, C.I., Marzo, J.L., & de la Rosa, J.L.(2002). Intelligent Agents in a Teaching and Learning Environment on the Web. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies*, pp 21-27

Picard, R. W., & Bryant Daily, S. (2005). Evaluating affective interactions: Alternatives to asking what users feel. In *CHI Workshop on Evaluating Affective Interfaces: Innovative Approaches.*

Picard, R.W. (1995). *Affective computing.* M.I.T Media Laboratory Perceptual Computing Section Technical Report No. 321. November, 1995.

Picard, R.W., S. Papert, W. Bender, B. Blumberg, C. Breazeal, D. Cavallo, T. Machover, M. Resnick, D. Roy, & C. Strohecker (2004), "*Affective Learning--A Manifesto,*" *BT Technical Journal*, Volume 22, No. 4, pp. 253-269.

Pintrich, P.R., & DeGroot, E.V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1990. 82: pp. 33-40.

Qu, L., Wang, N., & Johnson, W.L. (2005). Using Learner Focus of Attention to Detect Learner Motivation Factors, In Ardissono, L., Brna, P., Mitrovic, A.: User Modelling 2005, pp 70-73

Ran, C. (2005). *User Motivation and Persuasion Strategy for Peer-to-Peer Communities*. 2005, Oxford, Pergamon Press.

Rozin, P., & Cohen, A.B. (2003). *Confusion infusions, suggestives, correctives, and other, medicines, Emotion*. Vol. 3, pp 92-96.

Rozin, P., & Cohen, A.B. (2003). High frequency of facial expressions corresponding to confusion, concentration, and worry in an analysis of naturally occurring facial expressions of Americans. *Emotion,* 2003.

Sander, P., & Sanders, L. (2003). Measuring Confidence in academic study: a summary report University of Wales Institute, Cardiff. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology,* 1(5-3): pp. 113-130.

Shute, V. J., & Zapata-Rivera, D. (2008). *Adaptive technologies.* In J. M. Spector, D. Merrill, J. van Merriënboer, & M. Driscoll (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology (3rd Edition) (pp. 277-294). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Taylor & Francis Group.

Singh, R.K.A.P.G., & EMBI, M.A. (2007). Learner autonomy through computer mediated communication. *Jurnal Teknologi,* 2007. 46(E): pp. 99-112.

Thalmann, S. (2008) Adaptation Criteria for Preparing Learning Material for Adaptive Usage: Structured Content Analysis of Existing Systems. In: Holzinger, A.: *Proceedings of HCI and Usability for Education and Work. 4th Symposium of the Workgroup Human-Computer Interaction and Usability Engineering of the Austrian Computer Society*, USAB 2008, Graz, Austria, November 20-21, 2008.

VanLehn, K., Jordan.P.W., Rosé,C.P., Bhembe,D., Böttner, M., Gaydos, A., Makatchev,M., Pappuswamy, U., Ringenberg, M., Roque, A., Siler, S., & Srivastava, R. (2002). The Architecture of Why2-Atlas: A Coach for Qualitative Physics Essay Writing, in Intelligent Tutoring Systems. 2002. pp. 158.

Weerasinghe , A. , & Antonija, M. (2005) Using affective leaner states to enhance learning. *In international conference on Knowledge-based intelligent information and engineering systems*, Melbourne, pp 465-471.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. 1986: New York: Springer-Verlag.

Weiner, B.,Heckhausen, H., & Meyer, W (1972). Causal Ascriptions and achievement behavior: A conceptual analysis of effort and reanalysis of locus of control. *Journal of Personality and social psychology,* 1972. 21(2): pp. 239-248.

Wise, S.L., & Kong., X. (2005) Response time effort: A new measure of examinee motivation in computer-based tests. *Applied Measurement in Education*. 18(2), pp 163-183.