

An extensible domain-specific language for describing problem-solving procedures

Bastiaan Heeren¹ Johan Jeuring^{1,2}

¹ Open University of the Netherlands

² Utrecht University

July 1, AIED 2017, Wuhan

Problem-solving procedures

- ▶ Inner loop of ITS supports solving tasks step by step
 - inner loop services of ITSs are very similar (VanLehn 2006)
 - ... but their internal structures and representations are not
- ▶ Various approaches and paradigms for intelligent tutoring
 - model-tracing, constraint-based, data-driven, etc.



Problem-solving procedures

- ▶ **Inner loop** of ITS supports solving tasks step by step
 - inner loop services of ITSs are very similar (VanLehn 2006)
 - ... but their internal structures and representations are not
- ▶ Various approaches and paradigms for intelligent tutoring
 - model-tracing, constraint-based, data-driven, etc.
- ▶ Many domains have **problem-solving procedures** expressing how to solve a task by applying rules in a controlled way
 - procedures can be used for providing **hints** and **feedback**

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{1}{2}x - 4 = \frac{1}{4}(x - 3) & \textit{multiply by 4} \\ 2x - 16 = x - 3 & \textit{variable } x \textit{ to the left} \\ x - 16 = -3 & \textit{constants to the right} \\ x = 13 & \checkmark \end{array}$$



Contributions

1. We evaluate how problem-solving procedures are specified in ITS paradigms, based on reported **design principles**

These principles include:

- **explicit knowledge representation** for procedures
 - representation should be **modular and reusable**
2. We propose an **extensible domain-specific language (DSL)** for describing problem-solving procedures
 - the DSL provides a rich vocabulary for common patterns
 - we discuss how the DSL has been used for different task domains



Design principles for inner loop

We collected 17 principles from five papers: Anderson et al. (1995), Beeson (1998), Murray (1998), Murray (2003), and Alevan et al. (2009).

Beeson's principles for MathPert (algebra and calculus tutor)

- cognitive fidelity
- glass box computation
- customize step size to individual user



Design principles for inner loop

We collected 17 principles from five papers: Anderson et al. (1995), Beeson (1998), Murray (1998), Murray (2003), and Alevan et al. (2009).

Beeson's principles for MathPert (algebra and calculus tutor)

- cognitive fidelity
- glass box computation
- customize step size to individual user

Important qualities:

- ▶ Expressive representation: repetitive and template-like content should be avoided
- ▶ Customizable/extensible: for example, change step size
- ▶ Cost-effective: proven tactics are **authoring tools** and **reuse**



ITS paradigms

In our paper, we discuss:

- ▶ Cognitive tutors (based on production rules)
- ▶ Model-tracing tutors (based on procedures)
 - xPST: procedures are specified in a ‘sequence section’, based on 4 operators (Gilbert et al. 2015)
 - ASTUS: hierarchical procedure knowledge is represented as a graph (Paquette et al. 2015)
- ▶ Constraint-based tutors
- ▶ Example-tracing tutors
- ▶ Data-driven tutors

Observation: in most paradigms, an explicit description of a problem-solving procedure is missing



Problem-solving procedures

- ▶ Basic operators for combining procedures
 - **Sequence** ($A ; B$): first do A , then B
 - **Choice** ($A \mid B$): do A or B
 - **Fixed-point**: for expressing recursive procedures
- ▶ Special procedures *succeed* and *fail*
- ▶ Primitive procedures are the steps or rules

Realized qualities (by design):

- representation is **explicit**
- procedures are **modular**



Trace-based semantics

- ▶ Trace-based semantics for step-wise execution
- ▶ Traces are inspired by the CSP calculus (Hoare 1985)
- ▶ Sequence:

$$\mathcal{T}(s ; t) = \{x \mid x \in \mathcal{T}(s), \checkmark \notin x\} \\ \cup \{xy \mid x\checkmark \in \mathcal{T}(s), y \in \mathcal{T}(t)\}$$

- ▶ Choice:

$$\mathcal{T}(s \mid t) = \mathcal{T}(s) \cup \mathcal{T}(t)$$

Extensible: new composition operators can be added

- by using existing operators: *many* $s = \mu x.(s ; x) \mid \textit{succceed}$
- or by defining its trace-based semantics



Domain-specific language for procedures

- ▶ The composition operators are a simple DSL
- ▶ DSL helps authors to articulate procedures
 - generic traversal operators (for domains with sub-terms)
 - variations for choice (e.g., left-biased, preference)
 - interleaving (or permuting) procedures
- ▶ It captures common patterns and provides a rich vocabulary, which make the language **expressive**



Domain-specific language for procedures

- ▶ The composition operators are a simple DSL
- ▶ DSL helps authors to articulate procedures
 - generic traversal operators (for domains with sub-terms)
 - variations for choice (e.g., left-biased, preference)
 - interleaving (or permuting) procedures
- ▶ It captures common patterns and provides a rich vocabulary, which make the language **expressive**

$s ; t$	first s , then t	$not\ s$	succeeds if procedure s is not applicable
$s \mid t$	either s or t	$repeat\ s$	apply s as long as possible
$succeed$	succeeding procedure	$repeat1\ s$	as $repeat$, but at least once
$fail$	failing procedure	$try\ s$	apply s once if possible
$\mu x.f(x)$	fixed point operator	$s \triangleright t$	apply s , or else t
$label\ \ell\ s$	attach label ℓ to s	$somewhere\ s$	apply s at some location
$many\ s$	apply s 0 or more times	$bottomup\ s$	search location bottom-up
$many1\ s$	apply s 1 or more times	$topdown\ s$	search location top-down
$option\ s$	either apply s or not		



- ▶ Develop programs by step-wise refining holes (?)
- ▶ Feedback and hints calculated with procedures generated from annotated model solutions (Gerdes et al. 2016)





- ▶ Communicate! is a serious game for practicing interpersonal communication skills
- ▶ Final score and feedback are calculated afterwards
- ▶ It has a specialized scenario editor (Jeuring et al. 2015)



File... Scenario... Scenario: Negotiate

Subject Player Computer Situation Child Notepad Copy Cut Paste Delete Arrange Parents Validate Save Play

[-] Player

[-] Preconditions

Empty group
 + Add precondition
 + Add group

[-] Effects

User-defined

Goal \pm 5
 Relation \pm -5

+ Add effect

Character

Sad $:$ 1
 + Add effect

[-] Properties

Intent: Express wishes
 Feedback: Good to express



[-] Holidays

► Domain-specific features for consultations in the scenario editor:

- conditions under which certain options are offered or not
- (parts of) consultations may be interleaved in any order
- (parts of) consultations may be stopped at any point



Axiomatic

New exercise (E)  

1	$p \vdash p$	Assumption	X
2	$p \rightarrow q \vdash p \rightarrow q$	Assumption	X
998	$p, p \rightarrow q, q \rightarrow r \vdash r$		X
999	$p \rightarrow q, q \rightarrow r \vdash p \rightarrow r$	Deduction 998	X
1000	$q \rightarrow r \vdash (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$	Deduction 999	

Rule: Modus Ponens ⌵

$\Sigma \vdash_S \phi, (\Delta \vdash_S \phi \rightarrow \psi) \Rightarrow \Sigma \cup \Delta \vdash_S \psi$

$\Sigma \vdash_S \phi$ stepnr

$\Delta \vdash_S \phi \rightarrow \psi$ stepnr

$\Sigma \cup \Delta \vdash_S \psi$ stepnr

- ▶ Construct Hilbert-style axiomatic proofs by applying rules, forward and backward (Lodder et al. 2017)
- ▶ Feedback, hints, and worked-out solutions are available
- ▶ Procedure is captured in a graph-like structure



Conclusion

We presented a DSL for problem-solving procedures that:

- is compositional/modular
- is extensible (with new patterns)
- has a precise trace-based semantics (with laws)
- works for many domains

- ▶ Our approach positioned more towards **productivity** and **expressiveness** than learnability (Murray 2003)
- ▶ The trend is away from having explicit procedures; the DSL can help to make authoring procedures more cost-effective
- ▶ For more information, contact me at bhr@ou.nl, or see the project website <http://ideas.cs.uu.nl/>



References

- V. Aleven, B.M. McLaren, J. Sewall, and K.R. Koedinger. A new paradigm for intelligent tutoring systems: Example-tracing tutors. *Journal of AIED*, 19(2):105–154, 2009.
- J.R. Anderson, A.T. Corbett, K.R. Koedinger, and R. Pelletier. Cognitive tutors: lessons learned. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 4(2):167–207, 1995.
- M.J. Beeson. Design principles of MathPert: Software to support education in algebra and calculus. In *Computer-Human Interaction in Symbolic Computation*, pages 89–115. Springer, 1998.
- A. Gerdes, B. Heeren, J. Jeuring, and L.T. van Binsbergen. Ask-Elle: an adaptable programming tutor for Haskell giving automated feedback. *Journal of AIED*, pages 1–36, 2016.
- S.B. Gilbert, S.B. Blessing, and E. Guo. Authoring effective embedded tutors: An overview of the extensible problem specific tutor (xPST) system. *Journal of AIED*, 25(3):428–454, 2015.
- C.A.R. Hoare. *Communicating sequential processes*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985.
- J. Jeuring, F. Grosfeld, B. Heeren, M. Hulsbergen, R. JIntema, V. Jonker, N. Mastenbroek, M. van der Smagt, F. Wijmans, M. Wolters, and H. van Zeijts. Communicate! – a serious game for communication skills. In *EC-TEL 2015*, volume 9307 of LNCS, pages 513–517. Springer, 2015.
- J. Lodder, B. Heeren, and J. Jeuring. Generating hints and feedback for Hilbert-style axiomatic proofs. In *SIGCSE 2017*, pages 387–392, 2017.
- T. Murray. Authoring knowledge-based tutors: Tools for content, instructional strategy, student model, and interface design. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 7(1):5–64, 1998.
- T. Murray. An overview of intelligent tutoring system authoring tools: Updated analysis of the state of the art. In *Authoring Tools for Advanced Technology Learning Environments*, pages 491–544. Springer, 2003.
- L. Paquette, J.-F. Lebeau, G. Beaulieu, and A. Mayers. Designing a knowledge representation approach for the generation of pedagogical interventions by MTTs. *Journal of AIED*, 25(1):118–156, 2015.
- K. VanLehn. The behavior of tutoring systems. *Journal of AIED*, 16(3):227–265, 2006.

