

A New Way to Characterize Learning Datasets

Céline Treuillier^{1,2} and Anne Boyer^{1,2}

¹Lorraine University, 34 Cours Léopold, 54000 Nancy, France

²LORIA, 615 Rue du Jardin Botanique, 54506 Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy, France

Keywords: Learning Analytics, Corpus Representativeness, Learning Indicators, Learner Personas.

Abstract: The student's interaction with Virtual Learning Environments (VLE) produces a large amount of data, known as learning traces, which is commonly used by the Learning Analytics (LA) domain to enhance the learning experience. Digital learning systems are generally based on the processing of these traces and must be able to adapt to different student profiles. However, the information provided in raw traces is diversified and can't be directly used for the profile identification task: it requires defining learning indicators pedagogically relevant, and measurable directly from learning traces, and then classify learners profiles according to these indicators. The paper's main contribution remains on the characterization of LA datasets both in terms of groups sizes and observed digital behaviors. It answers the lack of clearly stated information for LA systems developers, who need to ensure that their algorithms do not introduce bias, especially by disfavoring specific categories of students, which would only worsen existing inequalities in the student population. To go further, the embodiment of these identified profiles by translating them into learner personas also participates in the improvement of the explicability of LA outcomes by providing easy-to-interpret descriptions of students. These personas consist of fictitious representative student profiles, expressing different needs and learning objectives to which the LA systems must respond.

1 INTRODUCTION

The intensified use of Learning Analytics (LA) has led to a significant shift in learning: learners can participate in a specific course from anywhere and at any time. While attending different courses online, learners produce a large amount of data, known as learning traces, which are commonly processed by several algorithms to understand learning and potentially improve it (Siemens and Long, 2011). These traces can be very diverse, and reflect the student's behaviors on the learning platform.

Obviously, not all students engage in similar behaviors, both in distance and face-to-face courses and thus need to receive adapted and quality support (Xu and Jaggars, 2014). All students must be accompanied and supported in their learning tasks, and none should be privileged or, on the contrary, disadvantaged.

These notions of adaptability and equity are essential and need to be insured when dealing with LA systems (Slade and Prinsloo, 2013). These last learn from learning traces to provide results that will help actors in their decision-making to improve learning.

However, the heterogeneous nature of the data, coupled with the diversity of behavior of each student, makes the task tricky: it requires identifying distinct learning behaviors, allowing the description of learning profiles, and this directly from the learning traces. Hence, we ask ourselves **how to characterize learning dataset in terms of representativity of learning profiles? (RQ1)** We hypothesized that a new and complete description of the dataset could participate in the reduction of inequalities that persist in distance learning by giving important clues to LA actors, and in particular to systems' developers who implement algorithms processing the diverse data. Finally, this complete characterization of the datasets can pretend to participate in the generalization of fair learning, which is adapted and accessible to all students. Indeed, this could ensure that LA solutions are adapted to the different student profiles identified and that they do not introduce any bias.

However, before we can imagine improving online learning, we must ensure that the results provided are understandable and accepted by LA actors. In this regard, we wondered **how to improve the explicability of the identified learning profiles? (RQ2)** We

thought that the translation of the identified learning profiles in a narrative and comprehensible form is essential to make sure that all the potential users can understand the results, measure the importance of the computed indicators, and act accordingly.

This work is part of the LOLA (Laboratoire Ouvert de Learning Analytics) project, which aims at setting up a collaborative platform on which the different LA actors will be able to share datasets, models, and results. To complete its offer, the platform proposes a complete evaluation environment that relies on the use of indicators, both technical, algorithmic, and pedagogical. The work presented then participates in the elaboration of this environment.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents key concepts on which the presented work is based. The methodology applied to identify the learning profiles as well as the associated results are presented in Section 3. The translation of these results in a narrative and understandable form is then presented in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 presents conclusions and some interesting perspectives.

2 RELATED WORKS

2.1 Learning Styles

The learning process relies on cognitive foundations, which are essential to the acquisition of complete knowledge, allowing learners to interact with their environment. The french neuroscientist (Dehaene, 2013) described four pillars of learning :

- **Attention:** brain's mechanisms allowing the selection of information on which the student needs to focus.
- **Active Engagement:** active pedagogy avoiding wandering of the mind and thus supporting the adoption of an active behavior toward the learning task.
- **Information Feedback:** feedback in the form of error signals, essential for efficient learning.
- **Daily Consolidation:** storage of received information, on a regular basis.

These various concepts result in the adoption of diverse learning behaviors allowing to receive and to process the information. Students present different strategies to deal with a large amount of information they receive every day, and some are more adapted and beneficial than others. In this context, many frameworks, based on different observations

(student's personality, information processing, pedagogical preferences...) have been defined to describe learning behaviors (Sadler-Smith, 1997). One of the most popular is the framework described by (Felder et al., 1988), which is still used to describe the style of thousands of learners each year. This well-known framework classifies students into different categories based on the way they perceive the world, reason, receive the information, process the information, and finally, understand this information. In total it allows describing 32 learning styles, to which the students belong. It is important to note that learners' behaviors can change over time: one student can be associated with several categories during an extended period of learning.

Interestingly, the framework's authors showed that there are also some teaching styles, which can be in line with the learning styles or not. In the latter case, students may become discouraged and experience declines in performance or may even drop out. For that reason, it is essential for teachers to understand how their students learn, even if it's very difficult when dealing with large groups of students, to adapt their pedagogy accordingly and pretend to enhance learning. In that sense, (El-Bishouty et al., 2019) showed that Felder and Silverman's framework is applicable in an online learning context and that a course that took into account different learning styles could improve learning. Thus, LA systems processing the data about thousand of students simultaneously represent an important tool to support teachers: they participate in the development of an Adaptive Learning (Nijhavan and Brusilovsky, 2002), which adapt according to student's needs and offer an adapted and personalized support helping to improve learning performances.

Many researchers have been interested in identifying learner profiles from learning data (Paiva et al., 2015; Mojarad et al., 2018; Mupinga et al., 2006; Lot-sari et al., 2014): all of them have relied on different methods, using different data and therefore providing different results. The next subsection details some useful learning indicators that were used in previous studies, and which are particularly interesting in the context of our work.

2.2 Learning Indicators

The identification of learning styles must be based on some indicators that provide useful insights into the students' behaviors. In our context of the study, what sets these indicators apart from those existing (e.g. in the educational sciences field) is the fact that they must be directly evaluable from the learning data collected about students. They remain, how-

ever, based on strong theoretical concepts from the educational sciences, and must reflect relevant learning behaviors, providing useful information about the learning process. Then, these indicators need to be refined according to the available data, and will therefore allow characterizing different behaviors according to the specific parameters selected from the learning traces. Hence, in this study, we rely on the following definition of learning indicators: "An indicator is an observable that is pedagogically significant, computed or established with the help of observations, and testifying to the quality of interaction, activity, and learning. It is defined according to an observation objective and motivated by an educational objective" (Iksal, 2012).

Many learning indicators may be of interest to us. However, for this work, only the most significant in an online learning context has been computed. The first selected indicator refers to student engagement which is, as detailed earlier, essential to ensure a quality learning process (Dehaene, 2013). Student engagement was discussed in many studies: in 2014, (Chi and Wylie, 2014) defined the ICAP model, describing four modes of engagement: Interactive, Constructive, Active, and Passive. Each mode is associated with different learning behaviors, allowing a more or less in-depth learning process, and therefore have different consequences on the learning outcomes. In another way, some researchers tried to quantify this engagement directly from learning traces, as (Hussain et al., 2018) who used predictive models to identify low-engagement students. Other interesting studies focus on some different learning indicators, particularly interesting in the context of the study: (Boroujeni et al., 2016), for example, quantified the students' regularity to study its impact on learning outcomes. Others authors, as (Arnold and Pistilli, 2012), detailed an interesting method based on learning traces and demographic data to predict learning performances.

In our case, we want to characterize student profiles according to a broad spectrum of indicators. We have therefore not focused on the characterization of one indicator but computed several based on those mentioned in this section. This set of indicators serves as a basis for a clearer and fuller definition of the behaviors adopted by the students described by a specific dataset (Ben Soussia et al., 2021). We hypothesized that this description will allow characterizing the datasets and will be used to study their representativeness. The choice of these indicators is based on the available data, which can vary significantly depending on the learning traces. The complete methodology is described in section 3.

3 DESCRIPTION OF LEARNING BEHAVIORS

3.1 Methodology

The methodology allowing the identification of learner profiles according to selected indicators can be divided into five steps (*See Figure 1*):

- Selection of a LA dataset of interest.
- Selection of learning indicators depending on the available data in the selected dataset. Learning traces that are recorded when students interact with VLE can be diverse and do not always reflect the same behaviors. Hence, it is essential to systematically select indicators adapted to the studied corpus. A unique indicator can be evaluated from different parameters.
- Data selection and pre-processing once the indicators are selected. Only the data used to compute indicators are selected and pre-processed to improve the performance of the model.
- Identification of homogeneous groups of students (i.e. students adopting similar behaviors). To do that, a classification method regrouping data with similar properties in an unsupervised manner seems to be the best solution.
- Description of the learning profiles according to the identified groups and learning indicators selected.

The data selection was performed using R (Ripley et al., 2001). Other steps were all performed thanks to the ScikitLearn library for Python (Pedregosa et al., 2011). Results are detailed in the following section.

3.2 Results

3.2.1 Selection of a Dataset

The methodology was applied on the well-known Open University Learning Analytics Dataset (OULAD) (Kuzilek et al., 2017), which gathers data about 32,593 students involved in distance learning at Open University, one of the largest distance learning universities worldwide. It is fully anonymized and contains both demographic data, interaction data, as well as the results of the various evaluations. The dataset gathered information about 22 courses, called modules, which can be dispensed multiple times during the year, and are thus differentiated by the year (2013 or 2014) and the month of the beginning (B=February, J=October) of the considered presentation.




Figure 1: Different steps of the applied methodology.

To analyze a homogeneous set of students, we chose to select a single presentation among those available in OULAD. We have thus selected the February 2013 (2013B) presentation of the module DDD, which is a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) course that involved 1303 students and lasted 240 days during which 14 evaluations were spread.

3.2.2 Selection of Indicators According to the Selected Dataset

The information contained in OULAD is multiple and detailed: we focus mainly on learners' activity on the VLE and rendering modalities and performances in the exams. Furthermore, it is important to note that the data concentrates information about 20 types of material, with which users can interact. However, some types of activities have more influence on learning outcomes: *forumng*, *oucontent*, *homepage* and *subpage* activities (*as entitled in the dataset*) are, for example, the most important predictors of engagement according to (Hussain et al., 2018). We have therefore only selected these four activity types.

Together, the data allowed us to work on 5 learning indicators: **engagement** (Hussain et al., 2018), **performance** (Arnold and Pistilli, 2012), **regularity** (Boroujeni et al., 2016), **reactivity** (Boroujeni et al., 2016) and **curiosity** (Pluck and Johnson, 2011). The definition of the indicators and the associated features selected in the dataset are detailed in Table 1.

3.2.3 Data Pre-processing

Once the data is selected, it undergoes a pre-processing phase which is necessary to improve the performance of the model. We first handled missing values (NAs) by replacing them: if no activity is recorded or the student does not get a grade (assignment not handed in), the value is replaced by 0. In that latter case, the delay is equal to 240, corresponding to the total duration of the considered course.

At this stage, the 1303 students were divided into 4 sub-datasets corresponding to their final result, which can be: withdrawn, fail, pass, or distinction (the information is available in the initial dataset). The common data standardization phase is then applied to rescale the numerical data to better analyze it. The several standardization methods available in ScikitLearn were first compared and the *RobustScaler*, which is described as particularly suitable for data containing outliers, was selected. Finally, we applied the *IsolationForest* algorithm (Liu et al., 2008) to detect outliers. In our context, outliers represent learners adopting atypical behaviors, who can't be associated with any other students. However, we emphasize that the identification of these non-standard students is essential because their atypical behaviors do not allow them to benefit from the same support as the other students, so they need to be analyzed differently. From an algorithmic point of view, their parallel treatment allows enhancing the performances of the model. Therefore, inliers and outliers are divided into different sub-datasets. Only inliers are studied for the next phase, but outliers are not set aside. They are simply treated differently and will be described independently to provide a complete characterization of the dataset.


3.2.4 Identification of Homogeneous Groups of Students

Once inliers and outliers are identified and separated in distinct sub-datasets, the goal is to identify homogeneous groups of students among the inliers and according to the selected learning indicators. In concrete terms, the goal of this stage is to identify some subsets S_k composed by profiles P_i described by a sequence of learning traces $T_{i,j}$. Outliers are then noted O_p . (See Figure 2).

To classify students of the 4 sub-datasets (*withdrawn*, *fail*, *pass*, *distinction*) into homogeneous groups, we used the *k*-means algorithm (Likas et al., 2003), which is well described and adapted to learning dataset (Navarro and Ger, 2018). The performances were evaluated with two metrics:

Table 1: Definition of each learning indicator and associated features selected in OULAD.

Indicator	Definition	Associated features in OULAD (DDD - 2013B)
Performance	Students' learning outcomes in the module	Scores obtained in the 14 assessments of the module [0-100]
Reactivity	Responsiveness to course-related events	Delay between submission data and deadline, for each assessment
Engagement	Students' activity on the VLE	Number of clicks (in total and for each activity)
Regularity	Behavioral patterns	Number of active days and daily behavior (in total and for each activity)
Curiosity	Students' intrinsic motivation	Number of different types of resources consulted

Figure 2: Identification of subsets S_k and outliers O_p .

- **Silhouette Analysis** (Rousseeuw, 1987): measures the distance between each point of a cluster with the points of other clusters. It has a range of $[-1; 1]$, with values closer to 1 indicating a better classification.
- **Davies-Bouldin Criterion** (Davies and Bouldin, 1979): computes the ratio of within-cluster distances to between-cluster distances of each cluster with its most similar cluster. It has a range of $[0; +\infty]$, with values closer to 0 indicating a better classification.

3.2.5 Learner Profiles Description

Firstly, the k -means algorithm has been launched with various values of k (from 2 to 15) and the quality of the partition was evaluated with the Davies-Bouldin Index and Silhouette Analysis, which made it possible to determine the optimal value of k . Silhouette plots (Rousseeuw, 1987) were displayed to visually identify what partitions perform better (See an example in Figure 3). With the optimal value of k , the index values obtained are relatively good (Davies-Bouldin Index close to 0 and Average Silhouette Index close to 1). This indicates a quality partition: it means that the different learners are clustered in the right groups, which are sufficiently separated from each other.

The described methodology allowed the identification of a varying number of homogeneous groups depending on the sub-dataset considered. However, for each of them, there is always a group representing a larger proportion of the dataset, some groups representing a smaller number of students but whose

size are still quite representative, and, finally, some groups representing only a very small number of students. Thus, we fixed a threshold $\epsilon = 10$, under which identified subsets are considered as outliers and then treated as the outliers identified in the pre-processing phase (with *IsolationForest* algorithm).

The larger subset corresponds to the **prime persona**: it represents the larger proportion of the students described in the considered dataset. The associated indicators describe then the online behavior adopted by the majority of learners. Smaller groups (size $> \epsilon$) were defined as **under-represented personas**: they are associated with a considerable number of students, who exhibit a particular behavior, different from the one commonly shared in the studied dataset, and therefore required adapted support. In addition, algorithms processing the dataset containing information about these atypical learners and outliers must be able to recognize them and treat them with the same quality as students in the prime group. The global information about the results is resumed in Table 2.

4 CONCEPTION OF LEARNER PERSONAS

The homogeneous groups of students identified in the previous section give useful information about the various online learning behaviors, to which the LA systems must adapt. However, LA actors (developers, researchers, users...) need to understand these




Figure 3: Silhouette analysis for k -means clustering on pass subdataset with $k=8$.

Table 2: Summary of number of inliers and outliers, optimal value of k and values of Davies-Bouldin and Silhouette indexes for each subdatasets.

Subdataset	Number of Inliers	Number of Outliers (IsolationForest algorithm)	Optimal value of k	Davies-Bouldin Index	Silhouette Index
Withdrawn	427	5	4	0,82	0,83
Fail	357	4	8	0,16	0,91
Pass	451	5	10	0,70	0,78
Distinction	53	1	6	0,05	0,88

behaviors, and especially what they mean according to the different learning indicators. To help them in this task, the identified groups were, in a second step, translated into learner personas. These latter were defined as "narrative descriptions of typical learners that can be identified through centroids of machine learning classification processes" by (Brooks and Greer, 2014).

Personas are commonly used during the development phase of numerical services, especially in UX design (Lallemand and Gronier, 2016): they represent typical users, to which the service must respond. In our case, the goal of the learner personas is different: they help to enhance the explicability of LA outputs to potential users (teachers, learners), and also to study the representativeness of a corpus.

Thus, each group identified through the presented methodology has been translated into the form of a persona representing a narrative description of a fictitious student: it contains some demographic information (name, gender, and age), associated with a textual description giving essential clues about the learning behavior, according to the learning indicators. This description allows embodying the results returned by the classification process: anyone who might read it can understand it.

In the rest of the paper, prime persona, an example of an under-represented persona, and an outlier are detailed for each sub-dataset.

4.1 Withdrawn Dataset

To begin, we observe that the majority of students who dropped out (76% of the dataset, 326 students) have very low activity (351 clicks), are very irregular (22 active days), and access very few resources (45). This behavior causes poor results from the beginning of the course. These students dropped out quickly, and do not turn in any more assignments. Other under-represented subgroups are more active (number of clicks > 1000), more regular (between 66 and 86 active days), and more curious (> 100 resources consulted), but give up progressively, with some groups withdrawing more quickly than others. Finally, a surprising outlier of this dataset shows a very active and regular behavior at the beginning of the course (4267 clicks, 178 active days), and he seems to be curious (188 consulted resources). Unfortunately, he gives up on the last assignment, which is not handed in, and therefore does not pass the course despite his seemingly ideal behavior (See Figure 4).




Figure 4: Personas of withdrawn dataset.

4.2 Fail Dataset

The majority of students who failed (53% of the dataset, 190 students) are not very active (620 clicks), whatever the type of activity considered. This low activity is associated with a reduced number of resources consulted (73) and less active days (43). These students who are inactive, irregular, and not very curious about the course, obtain low results that do not allow them to succeed, especially since they are not very reactive and do not return all the assignments. Interestingly, some under-represented students were much more active and regular (1871 clicks, 110 active days), and thus consulted a greater number of resources (145 resources). These students turned in all the assignments on time but obtained low scores (grades < 40) and therefore did not pass the module. Their learning behavior does not seem to be efficient

to allow them to succeed. Interestingly, we observe that a specific outlier have an intense activity, with an impressive number of clicks (7155), many days of activity (201), and a wide variety of resources consulted (240), but obtained scores are too low to pass the module (See Figure 5).




Figure 5: Personas of fail dataset.

4.3 Pass Dataset

For successful students, the primary persona represents 69% of the dataset (312 learners). The associated students adopt a very active behavior (2240 clicks), especially on the forums (522 clicks). They also connect on the platform regularly (130 active days), and consult numerous resources (167). This active, regular, and curious learning behavior allows them to succeed at the module, by obtaining good results (grades > 60). Other students, less represented,

are less active with half the number of clicks (1113) and far fewer active days (77). These students, less active and less regular, do not turn in all the assignments but their correct results nevertheless allow them to validate the module. Finally, the outliers include students with frenetic activity (19196 clicks) spread over 259 active days during which 439 different resources are consulted. We can easily understand why this type of student is considered as an outlier given the adopted behavior (See Figure 6).




Figure 6: Personas of pass dataset.

4.4 Distinction Dataset

Finally, the majority of students earning a distinction (87%, 46 students) are very active (2577 clicks) and regular (146 active days) in the course. In particular, they show high activity on the forums (627 clicks). This behavior allows them to obtain excellent grades

(> 80). For this dataset, we do not observe any under-represented personas: the 5 identified clusters correspond to only one or two students, which are therefore considered as outliers. The most striking one is an outlier showing a very increased activity (17957 clicks) throughout the entire course (260 days of activity) and a high curiosity (361 resources consulted). This student also seems to be very active on the forums since he makes almost 7050 clicks on it. All of his assignments are handed in on time and his results are brilliant (See Fig 7).




Figure 7: Personas of distinction dataset.

The presented personas are particularly interesting since they allow to describe the different learner profiles described in the selected dataset, and that in a narrative way, understandable to all. The diverse identified profiles are based on the selected indicators, which thus seem to be relevant from the point of view of learning. They allow identifying homogeneous groups of students, different enough from each other, who express interesting behaviors in accordance with their final result. Furthermore, the high diversity of the profiles is interesting and translates, once again, the necessity to adapt LA systems to all users, who express specific needs. The defined personas contain information about online adopted behaviors, but the associated methodology also allows us to describe the corpus in terms of group sizes, i.e. frequency of the described behaviors. In that sense, personas pretend to help developers ensure that their algorithms are adapted to all students and do not in-

roduce bias, by privileging students who adopt the most common behavior, for example.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

Broadly, the selected classification method (k -means algorithm) was appropriate to identify groups in which students share similar behaviors according to the selected indicators. The different steps described, from the selection of the dataset to the conception of personas, allow us to answer the **RQ1**. In parallel, the unprecedented conception of personas based on these identified groups is then effective to describe these learning behaviors semantically and thus completes the numerical results returned by the algorithm. These personas can then be shared with all the LA actors who will be able to understand them, whether they are technophiles or not, and then respond to the **RQ2**. Altogether, these elements introduce some interesting insights about how to characterize LA datasets more completely and understandably. This new description of corpus, based on learner personas, seems to be able to become a powerful tool in the LA field, participating in learning improvement for the entire student population.

Nevertheless, some aspects were pointed out and deserve to be studied and evaluated. First of all, we wonder if the embodiment of the personas, by giving a name, a gender, and an age to the fictive student, is relevant in some contexts and does not introduce other bias in the people who have to use them. Cognitive bias can appear and affect the way LA actors interpret the personas and use them. A study focusing on this aspect seems to be needed to answer this question.

The automation of personas conception can also be discussed: we ask ourselves if the redaction of the learning behaviors could be automated with specific models. It seems to be essential when dealing with very large datasets, in which the description of hundred of personas implies a large workload. In another way, having a human intervention can reassure users and participate in the enhancement of systems' explainability. These aspects thus deserve an in-depth analysis to determine the ideal comprise between complete automation and human contribution.

Finally, the presented methodology looks promising and offers interesting results but was only applied to a unique dataset in the paper. Now, we must study how the methodology applies to multiple datasets, like those shared on the LOLA platform, and from which different learning indicators can be computed. Application to a private dataset has started and is ex-

pected to be completed in the near future. This work contributes to the affirmation of the robustness of our method and could allow us to impose learner personas as a privileged tool for LA dataset characterization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been done in the framework of the LOLA project, with the support of the French Ministry of Higher Education, Research, and Innovation.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, K. E. and Pistilli, M. D. (2012). Course signals at purdue: Using learning analytics to increase student success. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on learning analytics and knowledge*, pages 267–270.
- Ben Soussia, A., Roussanaly, A., and Boyer, A. (2021). An in-depth methodology to predict at-risk learners. In *European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning*, pages 193–206. Springer.
- Boroujeni, M. S., Sharma, K., Kidziński, Ł., Lucignano, L., and Dillenbourg, P. (2016). How to quantify student's regularity? In *European conference on technology enhanced learning*, pages 277–291. Springer.
- Brooks, C. and Greer, J. (2014). Explaining predictive models to learning specialists using personas. In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on learning analytics and knowledge*, pages 26–30.
- Chi, M. T. and Wylie, R. (2014). The icap framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. *Educational psychologist*, 49(4):219–243.
- Davies, D. L. and Bouldin, D. W. (1979). A cluster separation measure. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, (2):224–227.
- Dehaene, S. (2013). Les quatre piliers de l'apprentissage, ou ce que nous disent les neurosciences.
- El-Bishouty, M. M., Aldraiweesh, A., Alturki, U., Tortorella, R., Yang, J., Chang, T.-W., Graf, S., et al. (2019). Use of felder and silverman learning style model for online course design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 67(1):161–177.
- Felder, R. M., Silverman, L. K., et al. (1988). Learning and teaching styles in engineering education. *Engineering education*, 78(7):674–681.
- Hussain, M., Zhu, W., Zhang, W., and Abidi, S. M. R. (2018). Student engagement predictions in an e-learning system and their impact on student course assessment scores. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*, 2018.
- Iksal, S. (2012). *Ingénierie de l'observation basée sur la prescription en EIAH*. PhD thesis, Université du Maine.

- Kuzilek, J., Hlosta, M., and Zdrahal, Z. (2017). Open university learning analytics dataset. *Scientific data*, 4(1):1–8.
- Lallemand, C. and Gronier, G. (2016). *Méthodes de design UX: 30 méthodes fondamentales pour concevoir et évaluer les systèmes interactifs*. Eyrolles.
- Likas, A., Vlassis, N., and Verbeek, J. J. (2003). The global k-means clustering algorithm. *Pattern recognition*, 36(2):451–461.
- Liu, F. T., Ting, K. M., and Zhou, Z.-H. (2008). Isolation forest. In *2008 eighth ieee international conference on data mining*, pages 413–422. IEEE.
- Lotsari, E., Verykios, V. S., Panagiotakopoulos, C., and Kalles, D. (2014). A learning analytics methodology for student profiling. In *Hellenic Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 300–312. Springer.
- Mojarad, S., Essa, A., Mojarad, S., and Baker, R. S. (2018). Data-driven learner profiling based on clustering student behaviors: learning consistency, pace and effort. In *International conference on intelligent tutoring systems*, pages 130–139. Springer.
- Mupinga, D. M., Nora, R. T., and Yaw, D. C. (2006). The learning styles, expectations, and needs of online students. *College teaching*, 54(1):185–189.
- Navarro, Á. A. M. and Ger, P. M. (2018). Comparison of clustering algorithms for learning analytics with educational datasets. *IJIMAI*, 5(2):9–16.
- Nijhavan, H. and Brusilovsky, P. (2002). A framework for adaptive e-learning based on distributed re-usable learning activities. In *E-learn: World conference on e-learning in corporate, government, healthcare, and higher education*, pages 154–161. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Paiva, R. O. A., Bittencourt, I. I., da Silva, A. P., Isotani, S., and Jaques, P. (2015). Improving pedagogical recommendations by classifying students according to their interactional behavior in a gamified learning environment. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 233–238.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., et al. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python. *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 12:2825–2830.
- Pluck, G. and Johnson, H. (2011). Stimulating curiosity to enhance learning. *GESJ: Education Sciences and Psychology*, 2.
- Ripley, B. D. et al. (2001). The r project in statistical computing. *MSOR Connections. The newsletter of the LTSN Maths, Stats & OR Network*, 1(1):23–25.
- Rousseeuw, P. J. (1987). Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 20:53–65.
- Sadler-Smith, E. (1997). ‘learning style’: frameworks and instruments. *Educational psychology*, 17(1-2):51–63.
- Siemens, G. and Long, P. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. *EDUCAUSE review*, 46(5):30.
- Slade, S. and Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10):1510–1529.
- Xu, D. and Jaggars, S. S. (2014). Performance gaps between online and face-to-face courses: Differences across types of students and academic subject areas. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(5):633–659.