Equitable Ability Estimation in Neurodivergent Student Populations with Zero-Inflated Learner Models

Niall Twomey*
Kidsloop Ltd, United Kingdom
niall.twomey@kidsloop.live

Sarah McMullan
Kidsloop Ltd, United Kingdom
sarah.mcmullan@kidsloop.live

Anat Elhalal
Kidsloop Ltd, United Kingdom
anat.elhalal@kidsloop.live

Rafael Poyiadzi
Kidsloop Ltd, United Kingdom
rafael.poyiadzi@kidsloop.live

Luis Vaquero
Kidsloop Ltd, United Kingdom
luis.vaquero@kidsloop.live

ABSTRACT
At present, the educational data mining community lacks many tools needed for ensuring equitable ability estimation for Neurodivergent (ND) learners. On one hand, most learner models are susceptible to under-estimating ND ability since confounding contexts cannot be held accountable (e.g. consider dyslexia and text-heavy assessments), and on the other, few (if any) existing datasets are suited for appraising model and data bias in ND contexts. In this paper we attempt to model the relationships between context (delivery and response types) and performance of ND students with zero-inflated learner models. This approach facilitates simulation of several expected ND behavioural traits, provides equitable ability estimates across all student groups from generated datasets, increases interpretability confidence, and can double the number of learning opportunities for ND students in some cases. Our approach consistently out-performs baselines in our experiments and can also be applied to many other learner modelling frameworks.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Achievement gaps due to Neurodivergent Conditions (NDCs) occur early in life and persist through adolescence into adulthood [13]. In many cases, impeded learning opportunities for ND students result from unsuitable learning contexts or lack of adequate student support rather than intrinsically low student ability [36]. However, as learning begins to move further into the digital space [20, 43], Learner Models (LMs), which are statistical models of student attainment, will use historic performance to estimate student ability. Owing to a legacy of potentially poor learning contexts, the ability of ND students tends to be under-estimated by LMs since they are not equipped to distinguish between context- and ability-based explanations of performance. Without deliberate effort, therefore, it is very likely that LMs will become biased and offer inequitable recommendations for ND students. On the other hand, opportunities to quell these achievement gaps before they grow are at hand in smart learning environments if LMs are empowered to reason about alternative explanations of performance.

In the UK, it is estimated that 15% of the population are ND, having neurological functions that differ from what is considered typical [29]. Neurodiversity covers the range of differences in individual brain function and behavioural traits, regarded as part of normal variation in the human population [46]. Each NDC uniquely affects how information is absorbed, processed, and communicated [37, 5]. Our objective is to adapt LMs for the individual requirements of a select number NDCs in learning environments, focusing specifically on dyslexia, dyscalculia and Sensory Processing Disorder (SPD) (with prevalences of 10%, 6% and 5-15% respectively [11, 45, 15]).

LM research is highly active in the Educational Data Mining (EDM) community. State-of-the-art approaches include deep neural networks [42, 17, 35], and nonparametric Bayesian methods [21]. We find that the literature is sparse for inclusive LMs applied to ND populations, and we were unable to find many bespoke models or datasets (real or synthetic) even in recent literature reviews [1, 28]. Kohli et. al. [22] introduced an approach for identifying dyslexic students based on historic patterns of behaviour and Artificial Neural Network (ANN). They were able to predict dyslexia in this setting with approximately 75% accuracy, but did not investigate improving the environment for dyslexic learners. Mejia et. al. [33] approached the task by estimating learner’s cognitive deficit specifically for students with dyslexia or reading difficulties. Although a promising and inclusive architecture, this work does not report specific results, and instead discusses several principles. Such work may enable continuous screening for dyslexia that is mandated in many states [14] but neither work addresses the question of equity in ability estimation and perception for ND students when compared to Neurotypical (NT) students.

*Corresponding author.
Ensuring the equity of LM is an important area of research. Doroudi et al. [12] consider equity in Knowledge Tracing (KT) models based on mixed groups of ‘fast’ and ‘slow’ learners. Ultimately, it demonstrates that mastery is most equitable in self-paced learning. It has been reported that equity can be improved by offering multiple assessment Delivery and Response Types (DRTs) [36]. This is an intuitive but important determination since it indicates that ability perception can be compromised by contexts outside of the control of a student. Other works have elaborated further on scores and metrics for ethical and equitable recommendation systems with broad stakeholders, including dyslexic students [32]. They do not explicitly report on these students, however. Equity is also explored along explainability and interpretability axes. Some classical LMs like Item Response Theory (IRT) are readily interpretable and offer intuitive explanations of datasets [39, 31]. However, caution must be exercised to avoid over-interpreting models [27], particularly when the training data is biased [19].

ND students face at least two additional hurdles in learning environments: 1) their ability is inaccurately modelled due to LMs shortcomings; and 2) choosing the most suitable learning context for them to express their true ability is rarely considered. Furthermore, the EDM community currently lacks datasets and simulation tools for developing LMs and assessing equity for NDC contexts. Our ambition here is to address these three limitations in this work. We tackle the first by motivating and defining LMs that are able to estimate unbiased ability for ND students (Sec 2.1 to 2.3). Using this, we describe a simulation environment (Sec 2.4) and demonstrate the behavioural characteristics that it encodes for the set of NDCs considered. Our results first demonstrate the properties of simulation data (Sec 3.4) before demonstrating that the proposed model delivers unbiased parameter estimation and a new metric for measuring contextual inequity (Sec 3.2.1). Additionally, we show that active DRT selection can increase learning opportunities by a factor of two in some settings (Sec 3.2.3). We conclude on our contributions in Sec 4.

2. METHODS

2.1 Zero-Inflated Learner Models

Our model is built on the assumption that certain contexts will result in an excess of zeros (i.e. incorrect responses), which we call the Impedance Factor (IF). Zero-Inflated Models (ZIMs) [23] adapt to these settings as follows:

$$ Pr(Y = y) = \begin{cases} \pi + (1 - \pi) \cdot (1 - p) & \text{if } y = 0 \\ (1 - \pi) \cdot p & \text{if } y = 1 \end{cases} \tag{1} $$

where \( \pi \) relates to the IF (the context sabotaging learning), and \( p \) to the predicted outcome of a LM in learning environments. We refer to this general form of ZIM in learning settings as Zero-inflated Learner Model (ZILM).

ZILMs (unlike alternative hurdle models [10]) provide two explanations of zeros because of the mixture model [23]:

1. Some zeros are due to unsuitable context when \( \pi \) is large which can result in skipped attempts; and
2. Other zeros are due to to incorrect responses due to low ability relative to difficulty (small \( p \)).

The consequence of this structure is that ZILMs models reason about the nature of zeros, meaning that 0 from a student with otherwise high ability in an unsuit context can be explained by \( \pi \) since it has high responsibility for the 0 [4].

The model in Eqn (1) does not define how the variables \( \pi \) and \( p \) are specified, making the ZILM framework very general. A straightforward specification is for \( \pi \) to be influenced linearly by content features using logistic regression (i.e. features that describe the traits of an item) and for \( p \) to be described by a classical IRT model [2]. However, \( \pi \) may be influenced by many factors and models and any (differentiable) LM can provide predictions for \( p \), including logistic factor [35] or deep [12] models. ZILM can address inequity if features are suitably defined, and in the next section we demonstrate how it can address inequity for ND students.

2.2 Delivery and Response Weakening

We adapt the model above for NDCs by taking inspiration from techniques used in Weakly Supervised Machine Learning (WSML) [51]. Our approach is to model the interplay between item DRTs and NDCs. Let a binary random variable be drawn from a Bernoulli distribution, \( y \sim \text{Ber}(p) \), and let us assume that a label flipping process acts upon \( y \) and this results in observations of the corrupted labels, \( \tilde{y} \).

The mixing matrix, \( M \), is defined as follows:

$$ \begin{pmatrix} 1 - q_0 & q_1 \\ q_0 & 1 - q_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Pr(\tilde{Y} = 1|Y = 1) & Pr(\tilde{Y} = 1|Y = 0) \\ Pr(\tilde{Y} = 0|Y = 1) & Pr(\tilde{Y} = 0|Y = 0) \end{pmatrix} $$

The \( q_\text{y} \) variables can be selected using prior knowledge and assumptions on the data distributions [34, 41]. In our setting, we are interested particularly in the contexts when learning of ND students is being sabotaged by the environment, i.e. \( q_0 \). We therefore model \( q_0 \) (previously introduced as a global parameter) and parameterise it with new features for DRTs (\( x_d, x_r \)) and NDCs (\( x_{(n_\text{d})} \)) and weights \( \psi \):

$$ q_0 = \sigma \left( \psi^\top (x_d; x_r; x_{(n_\text{d})}) \right) \tag{2} $$

2.3 IRT-based Zero-Inflated Learner Model

Our IRT-based ZILM (IRT-ZILM) merges the two components above as follows:

$$ Pr(Y = y | x) = \begin{cases} \pi(x_e) + (1 - \pi(x_e))(1 - p(x_p)) & \text{if } y = 0 \\ (1 - \pi(x_e))p(x_p) & \text{if } y = 1 \end{cases} $$

where \( \pi \) and \( p \) from Eqn (1) are now functions of IF features (\( x_e \)) and LM user and item collaborative features (\( x_p \)). Specifically, \( \pi() \) is a logistic regression model influenced by IF features (c.f. Sec 2.5), and \( p() \) is an IRT function. Internally, the outcome of \( \pi() \) is the product of two IFs: one based on NDC-specific IF’s (i.e. Eqn (2)) and the other based on shared IFs. This approach is more interpretable and explainable than alternatives, relates closely to an ‘and’ operation (students ability explains success only if context and ability are suitable), but also since it resonates with the mixing process defined above in weak learning.
Table 1: Description of parameter distributions used to generate synthetic dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value (Range)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>$(-\infty, \infty)$</td>
<td>$N(0, 1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND condition</td>
<td>Dyslexia, SPD</td>
<td>$0.1, 0.06, 0.11$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>$(-2, 2)$</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>$(0.5, 4)$</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing</td>
<td>$(0, 0.15)$</td>
<td>uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Maths, English</td>
<td>$0.5, 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content type</td>
<td>Letter, Digit, Both</td>
<td>$M: 0.1, 0.5, 0.6,$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$E: 1, 0, 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. attempts</td>
<td>$20$</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. density</td>
<td>$(0.1, 1)$</td>
<td>$N(0.35, 0.15)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery type</td>
<td>Read, Listen, Both</td>
<td>$0.3, 0.3, 0.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response type</td>
<td>Written, Speak, Click Picture, Click Read</td>
<td>$0.4, 0.2, 0.2, 0.2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By separating the functional contribution of confounders ($\pi$) and ability ($f$) in IRT-ZILM, we hope to unambiguously decouple these aspects from each other and improve interpretability and explainability. The model is learnt by gradient descent of negative log likelihood of the training data to optimise all parameters. In WSMI it is common to learn in a two-step process, for example, by iteratively fixing and optimising IRT and weak label weights \[41\].

2.4 ZIM Discussion

ZIMs have been used to account for excess zeros in many counting tasks using Poisson and negative binomial models \[23\] \[50\] \[47\] \[30\], and in learning analytics as statistical counting models in self-regulated learning \[15\]. An important property of statistical models is identifiability as it allows for the precise estimation of the values of its parameters \[16\] Sec 4.5. Parallel theoretical analysis has considered identifiability of the counting model parameters \[44\] and the mixture components \[29\]. It is worth noting that IRT also suffers from identifiability problems \(c.f.\ [7\] p.6\) and \[16\] Sec 14.\) but using priors or regularisation can alleviate these.

As far as we are aware, this is the first work to incorporate ZIM in this manner in EDM and NDCs. Choosing IRT as the base LM in IRT-ZILM over alternative options is motivated for several reasons. Firstly, IRT is well-understood and simple to interpret, and using this model as a platform to demonstrate new properties of equity in this early work carries the same benefits. Secondly, Bayesian Knowledge Tracing (BKT) is known to have over- and under-estimation problems \[9\] \[24\] which may muddle our understanding of equity for ND students. Additionally, several technical hurdles need to be overcome, notably adaptation for contextualised individualisation in mixed graphs. Finally, although Deep Knowledge Tracing (DKT) \[12\] models can probably learn latent representations that correlate to DRT preferences, this is at the expense of control and interpretation of the effects.

2.5 Simulations

In this section we explore IRT-ZILM simulations. We assume that the ability of ND and NT students are drawn from the same distribution, meaning that ability and NDCs are independent. The NDCs considered in this initial work are dyslexia, dyscalculia, and SPD. These chosen conditions reflect a wide range of effects from different delivery and response types, but this work could be applied to others.

Table 1 details all of the parameters used to generate the synthetic dataset of users, items, and interactions. To simulate a basic digital learning environment, each item is randomly assigned difficulty, discrimination, and guessing parameters, as well as a subject \(c.e.\) Maths or English. Simple and high-level features are assigned to the items based on whether they contain letters or digits, if the delivery style requires the user to read and/or listen, and how the user responds from four possible options—write their answer, speak their answer, click from a choice of pictures, or click from a choice of words they need to read. Each item is also given an information density value from 0.1 to 1, which describes how much information is provided in the item, where 0.1 represents only a few words and 1 represents a large block of text. This parameter is designed to reflect how clearly the item is presented to the users, and is a parameter that, if used with real data, would identify which items need clarifying/simplifying by the item designer.

These features are deliberately specified to capture contextual interaction features that may be relevant for the modelling task. They contribute to the estimation of IFs \(c.f.\ Sec 2.1\) but are also flexible enough to express rich variety of behaviour. We also introduce ND-specific features. For example, features for dyslexic users relate to delivery types that involve reading letters, and when the response type involves reading letters to click on the correct answer(s) or writing an answer that includes letters. Dyscalculia is affected by delivery and response type that involves digits. The features that are assumed to effect someone with SPD are when the delivery type involves both reading and listening with either letters and/or digits, as this can cause sensory overload. See, for example, \[39\] for more information.

Collectively, these features contribute to contexts that solicit additional zeros, due to skipped assessments (large $\pi$) or incorrect answers (small $p$). Datasets are created based on the parameters outlined in Table 1. Generating dataset

![Figure 1: This image shows that IFs can make the perceived ability of an affected student much lower than their true unobserved ability. ◯ shows a student’s true ability, □ shows the impact of IF, and ▪ shows the perceived ability with IF of 0.](image-url)
Figure 2: Performance differences for selected students across subject- and NDC-oriented contexts. Bar chart colour indicates NDCs. Large positive and negative values in the bar charts indicates that a group has been affected by the context. While every NDC is affected (indicated in parentheses in subfigure captions), no significant effects present for NT students.

Figure 3: Comparison of attempt outcomes for various delivery types and NDC (dyslexia: upper left; dyscalculia: upper right; SPD: lower left; all: lower right). R and L correspond to ‘reading’ and ‘listening’ respectively.

The analysis in this section demonstrates the various ways that IFs and related biases can be expressed across subjects, DRTs and NDCs. Fig 2 shows a population-wide approach for visualising the differences in the counts of ‘correct’, ‘incorrect’ and ‘not answered’ interactions over selected contexts. For these images, we selected a small number of ND and NT students and point out particular traits of note. Colours indicate NDC and are consistent across subplots.

Fig 2 (left) shows behavioural differences for dyscalculic students by probing performance in English vs. Maths. Students with dyscalculia have attempted more English items than Maths (large spike on ‘Not answered’). Additionally, when maths is attempted, there is a lower success rate than in English (dip in ‘Correct’). Dyscalculic students performance in terms of ‘Incorrect’ counts in English and Maths are equivalent. However, this tally is achieved with 30% fewer attempts, indicating the poor performance in Maths, further illustrating the effect of their NDC (i.e. 10/20 vs. 5/15).

Fig 2 (middle) shows differences with read vs. listen DRT. The most noticeable effects are seen by a clear increase number of not answered items and decrease in the number of correct answers for ‘dyslexia’ and ‘dyslexia & SPD’ students. SPD students are unaffected by these DRTs.

Fig 2 (right) shows the difference between ‘read & listen’ and ‘read’, and previously discussed properties of the ‘read’ delivery type are reflected here with the dyslexia group. The SPD group is shown to be significantly affected by co-occurrences of ‘read’ and ‘listen’ with a large increases on ‘not answered’ and decreases on ‘correct’.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Behavioural Data Analysis

3.1.1 Predictive Distribution

Fig 1 shows several Item Characteristic Curves (ICCs) for various values of IF which can be seen to reduce the the upper asymptote, thus lowering the probability that the user will answer the item correctly. We can see that a user’s perceived ability is lower if impedance is not considered when estimating a user’s ability. Increasing IF has similar effect to increasing ‘inattention’ that is used in the 4-parameter IRT model [16]. However, IF and inattention use different covariates in achieving this effect, and indeed ZILM’s base LM may still directly estimate inattention.

3.1.2 Differences Across Contexts

requires specification of the weight vectors for each NDC. This is a subjective process but allows us to express our intuition and instincts about the influential pathways. These are fully described in our implementation. As an example, we specify that ‘reading’ is positively correlated with IF for dyslexic but not for dyscalculic students.

3.1.3 Effects of Forced Formats

A second area that can be explored with simulated datasets is how ND users perform with different learning material formats. Three additional datasets were created, each with a single learning material format, using the same randomised seed so all user and item parameters were the same. In the first, all items were delivered only in a reading format, the second, all were listen only, and in the third, all items were delivered in a format with both reading and listening.

Fig 3 compares the average performance for different sets of
users with each of the delivery formats. Across the full neurodiverse dataset, the mean performance is approximately the same for all learning material formats. There are also no observable differences in performance on different material formats for users with dyslexia. However, for users with dyslexia or SPD there are noticeable differences. For users with dyslexia, they answer 6–11% more attempts correctly and are able to attempt 9–15% more items when the item has a listening component. For users with SPD, they answer an item correctly, and are able to attempt 19–24% more attempts when the item is only delivered in one format compared to multiple formats. Some users have multiple conditions and are included in multiple groups, so this also affects how they perform—most noticeable for users who have both dyslexia and SPD.

3.2 IRT-ZILM Parameter Recovery

3.2.1 Parameter Recovery

The values of true vs. estimated ability from simulated datasets are shown in Figs. 4a and 4b for IRT and IRT-ZILM respectively. Additionally, we have coloured the points based on the number of NDCs for each student. A perfect estimation would place all of the dots along the diagonal black dotted line. However, with IRT we can see that most of the ability values are under-estimated, particularly for students with 1 or 2 NDCs. Under-estimated ability makes sense given our expected inflated zero counts. However, the bias of under-estimated ability for ND students is concerning given that ND and NT abilities were drawn from the same distribution. On the other hand, with IRT-ZILM, we can see that on average the estimated and true parameters are much closer (many points close to the black dotted line). Additionally, we do not see any obvious gap in ability estimates for students with 1 and 2 NDCs compared to those with 0. We note that although ability is under-estimated for many NT students in Fig. 4a that this alone does not indicate inequity amongst NT students since all abilities lie on the same manifold. Inequity arises when one group is under-estimated with respect to another.

A similar trend is seen with difficulty parameters, shown in Figs. 4c and 4d. We observed that ability is under-estimated for IRT and here we can observe difficulty is nearly always over-estimated. As the confounding factors reduce the users’ perceived ability, in turn the difficulties are perceived to be higher as users are under-performing on them. In other words, difficulty is adjusted to account for the dynamics in the dataset and loses close links with true values. This also explains why IRT-ZILM is better able to estimate difficulty parameters (Fig. 4d) because with accurate ability estimates it does not have to distort difficulty to model the dataset.

We summarise coefficient estimation with Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients in Table 2 and have included linear Knowledge Tracing Machine (KTM) [49] (using contextual features) as another baseline. KTM, like IRT also under-estimates ND ability, and IRT-ZILM is a significantly better estimator of the true parameters. Importantly, under the modelling assumptions, the interpretability and explainability of IRT parameters carry persistent inequities: ND students are perceived to have lower ability, and the difficulty and discrimination factors of items then becomes compromised by the context of an interaction

Finally, in Fig. 5 we separately show the IFs (blue), unimpeded success probability (orange) and combined output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Spearman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also experiment with changing the generative model from IRT-ZILM to IRT. IRT and IRT-ZILM performance are indistinguishable across all metrics in this setting, implying that IRT-ZILM can reduce to IRT when appropriate.

Figure 4: Scatter plots of true vs. of estimated ability and difficulty parameters from IRT and IRT-ZILM. Perfect estimation will place all points on diagonal. IRT under-estimates ability and biases it against ND students, and also over-estimates difficulty, while IRT-ZILM parameter estimation is very reliable.

Table 2: Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients between true and recovered parameters. Values of 1 indicate perfect matches. IRT-ZILM parameter estimation is the most accurate across both metrics for all parameters.
We also explore the effect that occurs when the least suitable DRT is selected (e.g. as a result of poorly estimated parameters or logical errors), and in the ‘drop’ row of the table show that inappropriate DRT selection comes close to fully depleting learning opportunities for some students.

![Figure 5: Example IRT-ZILM predictions (f) illustrating how IFs (π) combine with unimpeded success likelihoods (p).](image)

3.3 Further Discussion

Our contributions in this paper include developing IRT-ZILM specifically for ND contexts, constructing a data simulation environment that expresses ND traits, and demonstrating its superior performance model on generated datasets. Although IRT and KTM compete with IRT-ZILM in terms of predictive performance, they both recover model parameters that are biased against ND students and only loosely correlate with the ground truth. Given this exposition, practitioners may have higher confidence using IRT-ZILM in predictive and explanatory settings owing to significantly more accurate parameter recovery and that it reduces to simpler models. When considering IRT-ZILM for real data, care must be taken to define suitable contextual features, predictive features and the base learner model (e.g. LFA- or PFA-based ZILM). Traditional model selection techniques can be employed for this. From a structural perspective, we point out that IRT-ZILM resembles the 3PL-IRT model [16, Sec 14.3]. Whereas IRT-ZILM allows for explanations of zeros (context vs. ability) 3PL-IRT offers explanations of ones (guess vs. ability). However, these two methods are not equivalent, and are parameterised differently.

Although the purpose of this research is to provide equitable estimates of student ability and to provide enabling technology that selects the most appropriate DRT for students, we note that we may also identify students that need additional support in specific areas by recognising potentially unidentified NDCs. We can approach this by creating two models: let \( M_0 \) be the model for a student’s reported NDC state (the ‘null’ model), and let \( M_1 \) be a model trained on data assuming an alternative NDC state (the ‘alternative’ model). Since we have already shown that metrics and likelihood is improved with IRT-ZILM, a statistical hypothesis test can be performed on both likelihoods to determine whether the null or alternative NDC offers a better explanation of data. We leave further elaboration of this approach as future work since it is outside the scope of our direct objectives.

This preliminary work shows early positive results of ZIM models for EDM contexts, particularly for improved equity, interpretability, and explainability of the data, and that the IRT-ZILM model can decouple contextual confounders and ability during parameter estimation. Our subsequent work will extend experimentation to real data environments. We will also expand our synthetic data experiments and explore cases with multiple paths of inequity, e.g. with fast and slow learners [23] [12] which will introduce ZIM Bayesian KT [9] contexts. We will also explore incorporating ZIM into mastery [10] and wheel spinning [3] criteria.

4. CONCLUSIONS
Our application of zero-inflated models in learning contexts offers a rich simulation environment of neurodivergent conditions in question answering settings, unbiased evaluations of neurodivergent learners, encourages increased learning opportunities, and more reliably recovers unbiased ability parameters. On the basis of our successful results we believe that further study and exploration of zero-inflated learner models can yield an inclusive framework for equitable, explainable, and reliable learner models in diverse educational data mining contexts.
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