Manipulating the Difficulty of C-Tests



Ji-Ung Lee, Erik Schwan, Christian M. Meyer Ubiquitous Knowledge Processing Lab (UKP) Department of Computer Science, Technische Universität Darmstadt https://www.ukp.tu-darmstadt.de



1 Motivation

How to automatically generate exercises of different target

What are C-Tests?

C-Tests are fill-the-gap exercises where the

St. Louis si in t center o a relatively



Static approach

Proposed approach

- Language learning requires a lot of effort and motivation
- Personalized exercises can help keeping learners motivated
- ► For example, using their favorite book as a basis for exercises

2 Overall Architecture

1. Create standard C-Test

- 2. Assess difficulty
- 3. Manipulate C-Test
- 4. Go to 2. if not
 - a) Reached target difficulty au



second half of a word is turned into a gap for every second word in a text. To provide some contextual information, the first and the last sentence of a text do not contain any gaps. Due to the first half remaining as a hint, C-Tests have less ambiguity but still require orthographic, morphologic, syntactic, and semantic competencies.

slow-growing a in so places stag mid-continent region . Slac regional dem for St. Lo goods a services refl the reg 's relative la of purch power. N all St. Lo industries, o course, ha a market ar confined t the immediate neighborhood.

6 Evaluation of Achievable Target Difficulty

- ► Automatic evaluation on the Gutenberg, Reuters, and Brown corpus
- Assess influence of the underlying text for a target difficulty τ
- Create maximally ($\tau_{max} = 1.0$) and minimally ($\tau_{min} = 0.0$) difficult C-Tests and estimate their difficulty using SEL and SIZE
- ► Most texts produce C-Tests with $\tau \in [0.0, 0.4]$
- ► Error-rate ranges $\tau_{\text{max}} \tau_{\text{min}}$ for different corpora



6 User Study for C-Tests of Different Target Difficulties



b) No manipulation possible 5. **Return** resulting C-Test

Target \rightarrow	C-test 🛃 🛃	<pre>classing of the Netronalizer St. Look Straty of HE and the match detected platters of the HE match of HE and Strategy of the Strategy of HE and Strategy of the Strategy of the organization and the St. Loop and the match and the St. Loop and the match and the St. Loop and the match and the St. Loop and the strategy of gardy of the St. Loop and strategy of gardy of the</pre>
au		cartical C_ the sensitive subject root. An for these which is the the descepted of the true has a retirecting affect as the astropolytex con.

O C-Test Difficulty Prediction



- Reproduction study of the work done by Lisa Beinborn (2016)
- Seemingly small changes may lead to different results (e.g., using a newer system dictionary)
- Achieved similar performance as the original system

Original dataNew dataModel ρ RMSE $qW\kappa$ ρ RMSE $qW\kappa$ SVM (original).50.23.44 $ -$ SVM (reproduced).49.24.47.50.21.39MLP.42.25.31.41.22.25BiLSTM.49.24.35.39.24.27	JI Features						
ModelρRMSE qWκρRMSE qWκSVM (original).50.23.44SVM (reproduced).49.24.47.50.21.39MLP.42.25.31.41.22.25BiLSTM.49.24.35.39.24.27		Or	igina	l data	N	ew d	ata
SVM (original).50.23.44SVM (reproduced).49.24.47.50.21.39MLP.42.25.31.41.22.25BiLSTM.49.24.35.39.24.27	Model	ρ	RMSE	qwκ	ρ	RMSE	qwκ
SVM (reproduced).49.24.47.50.21.39MLP.42.25.31.41.22.25BiLSTM.49.24.35.39.24.27	SVM (original)	.50	.23	.44	_	_	_
MLP.42 .25.31.41 .22.25BiLSTM.49 .24.35.39 .24.27	SVM (reproduced)	.49	.24	.47	.50	.21	.39
BiLSTM .49 .24 .35 .39 .24 .27	MLP	.42	.25	.31	.41	.22	.25
	BiLSTM	.49	.24	.35	.39	.24	.27

4 C-Test Difficulty Manipulation

3:

4:

5:

6:

7:

8:

9:

10:

11:

12:

13:

14:

15:

Algorithm 1 Gap size strategy (SIZE)1: procedure INCREASEDIFFICULTY(T, τ)2: $G_{SIZE} \leftarrow G_{DEE}$

Algorithm 2 Gap selection strategy (SEL)1: procedure GAPSELECTION(T, τ)2: $G_{\text{FULL}} \leftarrow \{(i, \lceil \frac{|w_i|}{2} \rceil \mid 1 \le i \le 2n\}$

- Sample four texts $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4\}$ of medium difficulty from the Brown corpus
- Use T_1 as the reference C-Test (same for all participants)
- ► For $\{T_2, T_3, T_4\}$, create an easy ($\tau = 0.1$), hard ($\tau = 0.5$), and default version with SEL and SIZE.
- ► Two groups of 30 participants each solve either SEL or SIZE modified C-Tests.
- Each participant solves four C-Tests and provides feedback on a five-point Likert-scale, their error-rate, and by ranking all C-Tests according to their perceived difficulty.



7 Conclusion

► Both manipulation strategies were able to create C-Tests of a tar-

	O SIZE O DEF
3:	$D \leftarrow d(T)$
4:	while $D < \tau$ do
5:	$g^* = (i, \ell) \leftarrow \arg \max \Delta_{inc}(g)$
6:	$\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$ $g \in G_{\text{SIZE}}$
7:	$D \leftarrow D + \Delta_{\rm inc}(g)$

- 8: return G_{SIZE}
- SIZE: Modifying the gap size
 Keep the initial gaps G_{DEF}
 - Only change the gap size ℓ
 - Increase (decrease) gap size for higher (lower) C-Test difficulty Δ_{inc} (Δ_{dec})
- SEL: Changing the gap selection
 Create all possible gaps G_{FULL}
 - Select gaps closest to target difficulty
- $G_{\text{FULL}} \leftarrow \{(i, |\frac{|W_{1}|}{2}| | 1 \le i \le 2n\}$ $G_{\text{SEL}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ while $|G_{\text{SEL}}| < n$ do $G_{\le\tau} \leftarrow \{g \in G_{\text{FULL}} | d(g) \le \tau\}$ if $|G_{\le\tau}| > 0$ then $g^* \leftarrow \arg\min|d(g) \tau|$ $g \in G_{\le\tau}$ $G_{\text{SEL}} \leftarrow G_{\text{SEL}} \cup \{g^*\}$ $G_{\text{FULL}} \leftarrow G_{\text{FULL}} \setminus \{g^*\}$ $G_{>\tau} \leftarrow \{g \in G_{\text{FULL}} | d(g) > \tau\}$ if $|G_{>\tau}| > 0$ then $g^* \leftarrow \arg\min|d(g) \tau|$ $g \in G_{>\tau}$ $G_{\text{SEL}} \leftarrow G_{\text{SEL}} \cup \{g^*\}$ $G_{\text{FULL}} \leftarrow G_{\text{FULL}} \setminus \{g^*\}$ return G_{SEL}
- get difficulty τ and were also perceived accordingly
- This allows us to create language learning exercises from a learner-preferred basis of texts to keep them motivated
- Work towards personalized learning process for different learners

Code and Data

https://github.com/UKPLab/acl2019-ctest-difficulty-manipulation

We thank Lisa Beinborn and the language center of Technische Universität Darmstadt for providing us with the necessary data to reproduce their experiments. We also thank Claudia Schulz, Tristan Miller, Chris Stahlhut and the anonymous reviewers for their detailed and helpful comments to improve this work. This work was supported by the Hessian research excellence program LOEWE as part of the *a! - automated language instruction project* under grant No.521/17-03 and by the German Research Foundation as part of the Research Training Group AIPHES under grant no. GRK 1994/1.