# Computing & Modifying Deep Knowledge Tracing for Multi-step Problems

**TAIL** Teachable Al Lab

Qiao Zhang, Zeyu Chen, Natasha Lalwani, Christopher J. MacLellan Drexel University, College of Computing and Informatics



### Introduction

- Previous studies suggest that Deep Knowledge Tracing (DKT) has fundamental limitations that prevent it from supporting mastery learning on multi-step problems.
- We believe DKT's loss function does not evaluate predictions for skills and steps that do not have an observed ground truth value.
   We revised the loss function and evaluated the revised DKT model on human students' data.
   Our analysis shows that the modified loss function produced improvements in the consistency of DKT model's predictions.

# Methodology

- We revised the loss function of DKT by using â to represent the updated ground truth values that populate missing cells using the value from the next observation of each skill.
- In Figure 2, the colored cells denote

# Model Evaluation

- We downloaded data from DataShop, took a complete student sequence and generated correctness predictions for each skill using the DKT model.
- In the top heatmap in Figure 3,

#### **Challenges with DKT**

 Even though DKT has many advantages over other knowledge tracing models like Bayesian Knowledge Tracing (BKT), Streak Model and Performance Factor Analysis (PFA), the model still has several limitations. observed student performance (0/red equals incorrect and 1/green equals correct). Cells with white backgrounds are extrapolated from the next observation of each skill.

kill 1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
kill 2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
kill 3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1								

**Figure 2**: Graphical depiction of  $\hat{a}$ .

The original DKT loss function and the revised loss function are presented below.

L<sub>Original</sub>

the DKT predictions fluctuate over time. There is also a pattern of inconsistent predictions on several knowledge components.

 In the bottom heatmap, the problem of wavy DKT predictions (alternating correct and incorrect predictions for different skills) is largely addressed.

#### Conclusion

- We revised DKT's loss function to improve prediction consistency across all KCs over time.
- We proposed a novel way of modifying the DKT loss function.
  The DKT model trained with the revised loss function showed much smoother, more consistent predictions that started lower and improved steadily over the course of training.

- DKT models are difficult to interpret.
- DKT makes inconsistent predictions.
- DKT only consider the correctness of skills that are observed on each time step.

Correctness		×	×	×	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	×	$\checkmark$
OKT Mastery	36%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%

**Figure 1**: An example showing DKT model predictions on a single knowledge component given one student correctness sequence.

 $T_i - 1$  $l(y_t \cdot \delta(q_{t+1}^i), a_{t+1}^i)$  $\overline{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(T_{i}-$ 

**Function 1** : The original DKT loss function.

$$L_{Next} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (T_{i,k} - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i,k}-1} l(y_{t,k}, \hat{a}_{t+1,k}^{i})$$

*Function* 2 : The revised DKT loss function.

# **Future Works**

- Make another revision of the DKT loss function by weighting each evaluation with a decay factor γ.
- Move online and evaluate how well the revised DKT model operates in an online mastery learning context.



Figure 3: Model performance comparison between DKT models trained with the original and revised loss functions.

#### Acknowledgement

This work was funded by NSF award #2112532.

AS.

The views, opinions, and/or findings expressed are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official view or policies of the funding agency.