#### Adaptive Technologies for Training and Education

This edited volume provides an overview of the latest advancements in adaptive training technology. Intelligent tutoring has been deployed for well-defined and relatively static educational domains such as algebra and geometry. However, this adaptive approach to computer-based training has yet to come into wider usage for domains that are less well defined or where student-system interactions are less structured, such as during scenario-based simulation and immersive serious games. In order to address how to expand the reach of adaptive training technology to these domains, leading experts in the field present their work in areas such as student modeling, pedagogical strategy, knowledge assessment, natural language processing, and virtual human agents. Several approaches to designing adaptive technology are discussed for both traditional educational settings and professional training domains. This book will appeal to anyone concerned with educational and training technology at a professional level, including researchers, training systems developers, and designers.

Paula J. Durlach is a research psychologist at the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral Social Sciences. After receiving her Ph.D. in experimental psychology from Yale University in 1983, she held fellowship positions at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Cambridge. From 1987 to 1994, she was an assistant professor of psychology at McMaster University and went on to lead the exploratory consumer science team at Unilever Research Colworth Laboratory in the United Kingdom. Dr. Durlach has received recognition for her work in experimental psychology and cognitive science at the Army Science Conference and from the Department of Army Research and Development. She has recently published her research in the *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, Military Psychology, and Human-Computer Interaction.* 

Alan M. Lesgold is professor and dean of the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh and professor of psychology and intelligent systems. He received his Ph.D. in psychology from Stanford University in 1971 and holds an honorary doctorate from the Open University of the Netherlands. In 2001, he received the APA award for distinguished contributions in the application of psychology to education and training and was also awarded the Educom Medal. Dr. Lesgold is a Lifetime National Associate of the National Research Council and was appointed by Pennsylvania Governor Edward Rendell as a member of the Governor's Commission on Preparing America's Teachers. He serves on the boards of A+ Schools and Youthworks and is chair of the National Research Council committee on adolescent and adult literacy.

# Adaptive Technologies for Training and Education



# Edited by PAULA J. DURLACH

U.S. Army Research Institute

ALAN M. LESGOLD University of Pittsburgh



> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521769037

© Cambridge University Press 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data Adaptive technologies for training and education / [edited by] Paula J. Durlach, Alan M. Lesgold. p. cm. Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-0-521-76903-7 1. Computer-assisted instruction. 2. Assistive computer technology. 3. Internet in education. I. Durlach, Paula J. II. Lesgold, Alan M.

LB1028.5.A135 2012 004.67'8071-dc23 2011030487

ISBN 978-0-521-76903-7 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## Contents

List of Figures	<i>page</i> vii
List of Tables	X
Contributors	xi
Preface	xiii
Acknowledgments	xvii
Introduction Paula J. Durlach and Alan M. Lesgold	1
PART I: ADAPTIVE TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	
1. Adaptive Educational Systems Valerie J. Shute and Diego Zapata-Rivera	7
2. Adaptive Expertise as Acceleration of Future Learning: A Case Study <i>Kurt VanLehn and Min Chi</i>	28
3. Adaptive Hypermedia for Education and Training <i>Peter Brusilovsky</i>	46
PART II: STUDENT MODELING BEYOND CONTENT MASTERY	
4. Progress in Assessment and Tutoring of Lifelong Learning Skills: An Intelligent Tutor Agent that Helps Students Become Better Help Seekers <i>Vincent Aleven, Ido Roll, and Kenneth R. Koedinger</i>	69
5. Student Modeling and Intelligent Tutoring Beyond Coached Problem Solving <i>Cristina Conati</i>	96
	v

vi	CONTENTS	
6.	Emotions during Learning with AutoTutor Sidney D'Mello and Art Graesser	117
7.	Lifelong Learner Modeling Judy Kay and Bob Kummerfeld	140
PAR	T III: EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND ILL-DEFINED DOMAINS	
8.	Training Decisions from Experience with Decision-Making Games <i>Cleotilde Gonzalez</i>	167
9.	Adaptive Tutoring Technologies and Ill-Defined Domains Collin Lynch, Kevin D. Ashley, Niels Pinkwart, and Vincent Aleven	179
10.	Individualized Cultural and Social Skills Learning with Virtual Humans <i>H. Chad Lane and Robert E. Wray</i>	204
11.	Emergent Assessment Opportunities: A Foundation for Configuring Adaptive Training Environments Phillip M. Mangos, Gwendolyn Campbell, Matthew Lineberry, and Ami E. Bolton	222
12.	Semantic Adaptive Training John Flynn	236
PAR	T IV: NATURAL LANGUAGE PROCESSING FOR TRAINING	
13.	Speech and Language Processing for Adaptive Training <i>Diane Litman</i>	247
14.	The Art and Science of Developing Intercultural Competence W. Lewis Johnson, LeeEllen Friedland, Aaron M. Watson, and Eric A. Surface	261
PAR	T V: CULMINATIONS	
15.	Practical Issues in the Deployment of New Training Technology <i>Alan M. Lesgold</i>	289
16.	A Model-Driven Instructional Strategy: The Benchmarked Experiential System for Training (BEST) Georgiy Levchuk, Wayne Shebilske, and Jared Freeman	303
17.	Exploring Design-Based Research for Military Training Environments <i>Marie Bienkowski</i>	318
18.	A Road Ahead for Adaptive Training Technology Paula J. Durlach	331
Ind	ex	341

Cambridge University Press 978-0-521-76903-7 - Adaptive Technologies for Training and Education Edited by Paula J. Durlach and Alan M. Lesgold Frontmatter More information

## Figures

1.1.	Four-process adaptive cycle	page 9
1.2.	Communication among agents and learners	11
1.3.	Overview of technologies to support learner modeling	12
2.1.	Performance during the second learning period for three types of transfer	32
2.2.	A taxonomy of assessments of adaptive expertise	33
2.3.	The Pyrenees screen	35
2.4.	Results from the first learning period (probability task domain)	39
2.5.	Results from the second learning period (physics task domain)	40
3.1.	The key to adaptivity in AEH systems is the knowledge layer behind the	
	traditional hyperspace	50
3.2.	Links to topics in QuizGuide interface were annotated with adaptive	
	target-arrow icons displaying educational states of the topics	54
3.3.	A textbook page in InterBook	56
3.4.	A glossary page in InterBook represents a domain concept	56
3.5.	When presenting supporting information for a troubleshooting step,	
	ADAPTS uses the stretchtext approach (right): depending on user goal	
	and knowledge, fragments can be shown or hidden; however, the user can	
	override system's selection	58
4.1.	The Geometry Cognitive Tutor as it looked in 2005	73
4.2.	An example of a hint sequence, with hint levels sequenced from the	
	general (top) to the specific (bottom)	74
4.3.	The preferred metacognitive behavior captured in the model	77
4.4.	Help Tutor message in response to Try Step Abuse and Help Avoidance	
	on an unfamiliar step	80
4.5.	Help Tutor message in response to Help Abuse (clicking through hints)	80

viii	FIGURES	
46	Help Abuse on a familiar step in a later more complex tutor problem	81
47	Help Tutor responses to Help Abuse (using on-demand hints prior	01
1.7.	to trying the step or using the Glossary) when a step is familiar	82
4.8.	Help Avoidance on a familiar step	82
5.1.	A physics example (left) presented with the SE-Coach masking	
0.11	interface (right)	99
5.2.	SE-Coach prompts for specific types of self-explanation	100
5.3.	(a) Selections in the Rule Browser; (b) Template filling	101
5.4.	SE-Coach interventions to elicit further self-explanation	102
5.5.	EA-Coach problem (left) and example (right) interface	104
5.6.	Example-selection process	106
5.7.	ACE's main interaction window	109
5.8.	ACE's arrow unit	110
5.9.	ACE's plot unit	111
5.10.	First version of the SE-Coach's student model	112
5.11.	Version of the ACE's model including eye-tracking information	112
5.12.	Tracked gaze shift from equation to plot panel	112
5.13.	Results on the comparison of different versions of the ACE model	113
0.1.	(a) Auto lutor interface; (b) Sample dialogue from an actual tutorial	110
67	Sensore used in the multiple judge study	110
63	Proportional occurrence of affective states across four studies	122
6.4	Affective trajectory of a student during a learning session with AutoTutor	124
6.5	Observed nattern of transitions between emotions	128
6.6.	Sequence of affective states annotated with the text of student or tutor	120
	dialogue move when the emotions were experienced	129
6.7.	Architecture of affect-sensitive AutoTutor	131
6.8.	Synthesized facial expressions by AutoTutor's animated	
	conversational agent	132
7.1.	Overview of architecture of the lifelong learner model middleware	
	infrastructure	143
7.2.	Overview of a large learner model	150
7.3.	Detail of the preceding screen	151
7.4.	Effect of lowering the standard to 10%	153
/.5.	Example of focus on "Structure of heart and great vessels"	154
/.6.	Visualization of activity by each team member across three media: wiki,	150
77	Subject glessery used to create lightweight entelogy	150
7.7.	Defining a new concept	150
7.0.	Authoring interface for linking concepts from the ontology to learning tasks	160
81	Example of a common problem structure studied in behavioral	100
0.11	decision-making research	168
8.2.	A closed-loop view of decision making	169
8.3.	Instance-based learning	172
8.4.	The IBLT process	172
9.1.	A LARGO screenshot showing a partially completed diagram	194
9.2.	An ICCAT screenshot showing student predictions	197
10.1.	Expressions of skepticism, anger, umbrage, and defensiveness by	
	ICT virtual humans	210
10.2.	Adjustable emotional parameters for virtual humans with	
	emotional models	211

	FIGURES	ix
11.1.	Proposed framework for emergent assessment opportunities	229
11.2.	Effects of scenario elements on prioritization performance by time	232
11.3.	Item-characteristic curves for three test scenarios	233
12.1.	An ontology is a formal logical description of a set of concepts and	
	relationships about a specific domain	238
12.2.	This ontology expands the concepts about a Person to include arbitrary	
	sets of emotions and beliefs	240
12.3.	Action Agents produce actions for specific ontologies in response to game	
	activities	241
12.4.	Action Agents interpret game actions and provide appropriate responses	242
13.1.	The architecture of ITSPOKE	251
13.2.	Screenshot during human-computer spoken tutoring dialogue	251
14.1.	Meeting with the malek in Operational Dari	263
14.2.	A language-instruction exercise on an iPod Touch	264
14.3.	An active dialog from the Operational Dari course	265
14.4.	Dynamic refresher training lessons	266
14.5.	Virtual role-player mission rehearsal scenario	267
14.6.	Situated culture methodology	268
14.7.	Alelo technology architecture	272
14.8.	Conversational virtual human architecture	275
14.9.	Time elapsed since last correct attempt and probability of a correct	
	response	281
14.10.	Length of target utterance and probability of a correct response	282
15.1.	View of simulation environment	291
15.2.	Programming a simulated robotic sequence via the schematic interface	292
15.3.	Illustration of coaching available	293
16.1.	The problem of training and conceptual POMDP solution	305
16.2.	An example of POMDP structure	306
16.3.	Training sequences for control and POMDP conditions	311
16.4.	Pre-test and post-test scores in two experiments	312
16.5.	Difference scores for new experiences between treatments and	
	experiments	313

# Tables

1.1.	Scenarios Represented in the Four-Process Adaptive Cycle	page 10
1.2.	What to Adapt	17
1.3.	How to Adapt	18
2.1.	Procedure for the Experiment	37
2.2.	Numbers of Problems for Each Phase of the Experiment	38
4.1.	Students' Help-Seeking Behavior During the Intervention	84
4.2.	Students' Help-Seeking Behavior Subsequent to the Intervention	85
7.1.	Roles for the Lifelong Learner Model and Technical Challenges	142
10.1.	Dimensions of Pedagogical Experience Manipulation	205
13.1.	Knowledge of Language Needed by NLP Applications	248
13.2.	Excerpt of Dialogue with Adaptive ITSPOKE	252
13.3.	Features per Student Turn	253

## Contributors

Vincent Aleven Human-Computer Interaction Institute Carnegie Mellon University

Kevin D. Ashley University of Pittsburgh

Marie Bienkowski SRI International

**Ami E. Bolton** Office of Naval Research

**Peter Brusilovsky** School of Information Sciences University of Pittsburgh

**Gwendolyn Campbell** Training and Human Performance R&D Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division

Min Chi Machine Learning Department Carnegie Mellon University **Cristina Conati** Department of Computer Science University of British Columbia

**Sidney D'Mello** University of Memphis

**Paula J. Durlach** U.S. Army Research Institute

John Flynn Raytheon BBN Technologies

Jared Freeman Aptima, Inc.

LeeEllen Friedland Alelo Inc.

**Cleotilde Gonzalez** Dynamic Decision Making Laboratory Social and Decision Sciences Department Carnegie Mellon University

**Art Graesser** University of Memphis xii

CONTRIBUTORS

W. Lewis Johnson, Ph.D. Alelo Inc.

**Judy Kay** School of Information Technologies J12 University of Sydney

Kenneth R. Koedinger Human-Computer Interaction Institute Carnegie Mellon University

**Bob Kummerfeld** School of Information Technologies J12 University of Sydney

H. Chad Lane USC Institute for Creative Technologies

Alan M. Lesgold School of Education University of Pittsburgh

Georgiy Levchuk Aptima, Inc.

Matthew Lineberry Training & Human Performance R&D Branch Naval Air Warfare Center, Training Systems Division

Diane Litman Department of Computer Science and Learning Research and Development Center University of Pittsburgh

**Collin Lynch** University of Pittsburgh Phillip M. Mangos Kronos Incorporated

Niels Pinkwart Department of Informatics Clausthal University of Technology

Ido Roll Carl Wieman Science Education Initiative University of British Columbia

Wayne Shebilske Psychology Department Wright State University

Valerie J. Shute Educational Psychology & Learning Systems Department Florida State University

**Eric A. Surface** SWA Consulting Inc.

Diana Tierney Army Research Institute Scientific Coordination Office, HQs TRADOC

Kurt VanLehn School of Computing, Informatics and Decision Systems Engineering

Aaron M. Watson SWA Consulting Inc.

**Robert E. Wray** Soar Technology

**Diego Zapata-Rivera** Educational Testing Service

### Preface

Adaptive instruction is instruction that can change to suit the needs of individual learners, with the potential to alter aspects like time on task, content, practice examples, and pedagogical strategy. One-on-one human tutoring is the epitome of adaptive instruction and is the gold standard against which developers of adaptive training technology measure the success of their systems; however, it is unclear which aspects of expert human tutoring are necessary to embed in technology to approximate this benchmark. There are many different ways in which technology could deliver instruction adaptively, but at present, it is not entirely clear (based on empirical evidence) which ways are the most effective in terms of learning outcomes. If we take the example of a television documentary as completely nonadaptive instruction, there are many ways in which adaptation could be added. For example, we could give the student control over the presentation, allowing them to replay or skip parts of the film; or we could allow the student to request subtitles in a different language; or we could follow

up the presentation with a question-andanswer period; or we could decide to assign different documentaries to different students, based on an assessment of what they already know. So, an important question is: Which methods of adaptation can be realized in technology, and which are effective at enhancing learning outcomes such that they are worth the extra effort and expense of designing into technology-based training systems?

The purpose of this book is to make a serious examination of what we know and what we do not know with respect to this question. The book is based on a 2009 workshop sponsored by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. It may be surprising to some that this is a critical question for the U.S. Army; however, many factors have converged to foster an interest by the U.S. Army (as well as other military services) in tailored training enabled by technology. These factors include the nature of the current operational environment and its demand for repeated deployments, which limit time for

xiv

PREFACE

formal training; the breadth and diversity of the skills and knowledge soldiers and leaders require, fed by the continual introduction of new equipment and rapidly changing tactics and procedures; a shift in the training paradigm to provide on-demand training; and the size and diversity of the soldier trainee population.

Of these factors, the most compelling is the operational environment. The scope and unpredictable nature of the operational demands on the U.S. military underlie many of the other factors that will shape future training. The U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) Capstone Concept for Joint Operations Version 3 (2009) states that "The future operating environment will be characterized by uncertainty, complexity, rapid change, and persistent conflict" (p. 2). Joint forces will face a range of national security challenges (p. 7) that will require a weighted mix of military actions including combat aimed at defeating armed enemies, security activities to protect and manage civil populations, engagement to improve capabilities of or cooperation with other governments, and relief and reconstruction (pp. 14-18).

Making training more adaptive is a current aspiration within the U.S. Army training community; however, it is important to distinguish three different ways in which the term "adaptive training" is used. One way refers to training people to be adaptable; that is, to train people so that they can respond creatively to unexpected or unfamiliar challenges (Fletcher, 2004; see VanLehn & Chi, Chapter 2, this volume). A second sense in which adaptive training is used concerns the nature of the training bureaucracy and its systems. Traditionally, Army institutional training is based on career tracks, in which, over time, the individual participates in a set of predefined courses linked to promotion steps; however, converting this linear model of training to one allowing more spontaneity and responsiveness to immediate needs makes sense given the unpredictability of future Army missions. The future Army training system aims to become a "learner-centric system of education"(Training and Doctrine Command [TRADOC], 2008). Soldier proficiency and developmental needs, as well as specific operational circumstances and requirements, will be used to shape the content, timing, delivery, and duration of training. This type of instructional adaptability is similar to what Lee and Park (2008) refer to as "macro-adaptive," and what Hannafin and Hill (2008) call "resource-based learning."

The third meaning of adaptive training is the one on which the chapters in this book concentrate primarily. This meaning refers to the ability of training to mold itself to the learner, within a training episode or event. It is thus analogous to what Lee and Park (2008) refer to as "micro-adaptive," or what VanLehn (2006) refers to as the "inner loop." From the Army's point of view, less time for training and constraints on resources will necessitate greater reliance on technologybased training. Not only is there less time, but there is a wider skill set to train. The Army is faced with the need to maintain a steady stream of soldiers and leaders trained and ready to perform an ever-increasing set of complex tasks, now including such things as cultural competence, adaptability (both of training environments to individual trainee needs and of trainees to environments they will face in their work), critical and creative thinking, effective team leadership, and effective use of new equipment and information technologies. The vision for micro-adaptive technology-based training is that it will be responsive to time constraints by tailoring training to the learner's current level of knowledge or skill and by applying principles of learning science, thus making training more efficient. The intent is to accelerate learning compared to more traditional modes of training and/or to increase the percentage of trainees achieving standards-based mastery. It is also to enhance the availability of training for the entire training audience, by reducing reliance on face-to-face training and increasing it on technology-based techniques. The aim is to ensure that the best methods are used to give the military learner just what

#### PREFACE

is needed, when it is needed, and where it is needed (Scales, 2006).

With regard to the provision of training on-demand, it is intended that "embedded" training and performance support will provide much of the needed deployed capability for technical and tactical training involving equipment systems. The DOD defines embedded training as "[c]apabilities built into, strapped onto, or plugged into operational materiel systems to train, sustain, and enhance individual and crew skill proficiencies necessary to operate and maintain the equipment" (Pilgrim, 2008, chart 4). However, advances in training technology that adapt coaching, feedback, and content to a soldier's or unit's proficiency level are required to help realize the full potential of embedded training. In addition to embedding training in equipment, distributing learning to a soldier's computer and/or mobile device can greatly increase their access to needed training while at home station or deployed. The Army continues to push in this direction as time for instructor-led classroom training shrinks and the need to optimize the efficiency of training delivered to units grows. The Army envisions that in the future, "[i] n lieu of the subject matter and instructional expertise of trainers, artificially intelligent tutors, coaches and mentors will monitor and track soldier learning needs, assessing and diagnosing problems and providing other assistance, as appropriate" (TRADOC, 2008, p. 118).

Finally, it is important to consider how characteristics of the Army's trainee population drive the need for adaptive training technologies. In fiscal year 2008, the TRADOC's 5 Army Training Centers and 33 schools conducted about 1,500 courses for more than 500,000 trainees. In addition, TRADOC reaches about 90,000 trainees annually via distributed learning. TRADOC faces many challenges to delivery of effective and efficient training across this vast enterprise. In particular, with a trainee population as large and dispersed as the Army's, it is not possible to make on-site, expert human tutors or coaches available to every trainee. Automated intelligent tutors and coaches, integrated into the delivery of distributed learning courses, could cover at least some of this need. Similarly, the characteristics of soldiers, their training and task proficiency inside and outside of their specialty, their operational and leadership experiences, and the skills needed by any given individual soldier or team for a specific mission vary tremendously across individuals across the force. Thus, a one-size-fits-all approach to training may be ineffective and inefficient in meeting individual or team training needs in a timely manner. For this reason, and for the many reasons mentioned previously, TRADOC has made tailored training enabled by adaptive training technology a high priority for science and technology research.

In summary, many factors intersect to make each trainee and their training requirements unique. Adaptive training technologies could respond to this diversity of experience and learning needs by providing dynamic learning environments that adjust to the requirement of the individual soldier. These technologies can help meet the demands created by the current operational tempo to accelerate learning and help keep training current. In lieu of human tutors, intelligent technology-based tutors can help guide trainees and provide assessment of and feedback on their performance.

The U.S. Army training system is at an important crossroads. Fundamental changes, such as those enabled by adaptive training technologies, will be needed to gain the most out of every training opportunity (U.S. Army Memorandum, 2009). The new U.S. Army Training Concept 2012-2020 (U.S. Army, 2009, p.7), drawing on lessons learned from recent persistent and complex operations, concludes that increasing innovation in training will be essential to "develop the versatile units and agile leaders required for the future" (emphasis in the original). Advances in adaptive training technologies will make a critical contribution to realization of that concept. Where do those advances need to be to meet these ambitious goals? The purpose of this book is to "plant

#### xvi

PREFACE

a flag in the ground," indicating where the cutting edge of adaptive training technology is today, and determining in which directions it will need to be pushed to meet the Army vision for tomorrow.

> Drs. Paula J. Durlach and Diana Tierney

#### References

- Fletcher, J. D. (2004). Cognitive Readiness: Preparing for the Unexpected. Institute for Defense Analysis document D-3061, Log 06–000702. Alexandria, VA. Downloaded on January 13, 2010, from http://www.dtic.mil/ cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA458683&Locat ion=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf.
- Hannafin, M. J. and Hill, J. R. (2008). Resourcebased learning. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. V. Merrienboer, and M. P. Driscoll (Eds.) Handbook of Research on Educational Communication and Technology, third edition (pp. 525–536). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lee, J. and Park, O. (2008). Adaptive instructional systems. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. V. Merrienboer, and M. P. Driscoll (Eds.) Handbook of Research on Educational Communication and Technology, third edition (pp. 469–484). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Pilgrim, Kevin H. (2008). Value of Embedded Training – Future Combat Systems Example. Briefing to Military Operations Research Society Symposium, June 10–12, 2008. Retrieved January 15, 2010, from http:// www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA 490129&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf.
- Scales, R. H. (2006). The Second Learning Revolution, Military Review, 86 (January– February), 37–44. http://www.au.af.mil/au/ awc/awcgate/milreview/scales2.pdf.
- TRADOC (2008). U.S. Army Study of the Human Dimension in the Future 2015–2024. TRADOC PAM 525–3-7–01. Retrieved January 15, 2010, from http://www. TRADOC.Army.mil/tpubs/pams/p525-3-7-01.pdf.
- U.S. Army (2009). U.S. Army Training Concept 2012–2020, Coordinating Draft (December 9, 2009). Available from HQs Combined Arms Command, executive offices, Fort Leavenworth, KS.
- U.S. Army Memorandum (2009). Army Training and Leader Development Guidance FY10–11. Available from Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Staff, Pentagon.
- U.S. Department of Defense (2009). Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (version 3.0). Retrieved January 15, 2010, from http:// www.jfcom.mil/newslink/storyarchive/2009/ CCJO\_2009.pdf.
- VanLehn, K. (2006). The behavior of tutoring systems. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 16 (3), 227–265.

# Acknowledgments

The editors wish to thank the U.S. Army Research Institute for supporting both the workshop on which this volume is based and subsequent efforts to bring this book to publication. We wish to thank all the workshop participants. Although not all are represented here by name as contributors, they all made valuable contributions and supported lively, thoughtful discussion. We also wish to thank Pamela Wells of Alion Science and Technology for conducting the myriad administrative tasks required for the workshop. Finally, our thanks to Cambridge University Press editors and staff who provided assistance and patience throughout the publication process.