

Which interactivity matters in TSLL? Agency, engagement and negotiation in Conversational AI

Serge Bibauw

UCLouvain • Universidad Central del Ecuador

TSLL 2023 Conference Iowa State University October 20, 2023







Interactivity in Conversational Al

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL **Methods**: dialogue sys. +/-interactive **Results** Perceptions Engagement Discussion Which interactivity matters?



Interactivity in Conversational AI

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL

Methods: dialogue sys. +/-interactive

Results Perceptions Engagement

Discussion Which interactivity matters?

Interactivity in SLA and CALL/TSLL

- Interactivity = intuitive, but underdefined concept (Rafaeli, 1988)
- SLA/AL research:
 - Interaction as **negotiation of meaning** (Long, 1981; Swain, 1995)
 - Interactivity as **dialogic** communicative activities ("two-way exchange of information") (Ellis et al., 1994)
- CALL/TSLL research:
 - Interactiveness linked to authenticity, engagement and "ability to express and interpret meaning" for the learners (Chapelle, 2001, p. 164)
- Game design:
 - User agency and control (Salen & Zimmerman, 2004)

Conversational AI / Dialogue-based CALL

- Chatbots, dialogue systems, conversational agents, talking robots, smart speakers... (Bibauw et al, 2019)
- Large potential: meaningful spontaneous practice (spoken/written)
- Low-anxiety, fully controllable environment



Model of interactivity in dialogue-based CALL (Bibauw, 2022)



Adapted from McMillan, 2002

S = system, U = user, \rightarrow = intervention influencing the interlocutor's turn, = intervention having no/limited influence on interlocutor



Interactivity in Conversational Al

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL

Methods: dialogue sys. +/-interactive

Results Perceptions Engagement

Discussion Which interactivity matters?



Intervention: Dialogue-based CALL game

- Interactive practice of L2 **French** with a dialogue system
 - *LanguageHero*, dialogue-based game for young learners : <u>www.languagehero.app</u>
 - sponteanous written interaction (chat) + multimodal input
 - guided by microtask prompts



Intervention: Dialogue system

- LanguageHero, dialogue-based game for young learners : <u>www.languagehero.app</u>
- Developed in 4 BC (before ChatGPT)
- Sponteanous written interaction (chat) + multimodal input
- Guided by microtask prompts
- Full logging of all messages read/written (577 494 words)
- Alternate condition: Static dialogue completion task



Conversation: Na de storm - Ontmoet Sensei, zoek uit wat er gebeurd is en waar je bent.



Participants

- Multisite: 4 Flemish schools, with 2-3 classes each
 - \circ *N* = 215 $N_{\text{classes}} = 11$
 - $_\circ\,$ Focus on active conditions: $n_{
 m ds}=83+n_{
 m dc}=80$
- Teenagers: 12-13 y.o. (2nd grade of sec. school, ~8th grade)

• L1 = 95% Dutch

- L2 = French (first L2 learned at school) M = 3.1 years of French instruction Mostly at A1 level (beginners)
- In "classroom" (school computer lab)



Instrument: Perceptions questionnaire (post)

Construct	Subdimensions	Items	α	Source/Theoretical framework	
Perceived ease-of-use	Corrective feedback, Comprehensibility, Interface, Tasks	5 (7)	.67	Technology Acceptance Model (Davis 1989), partially from	
Perceived usefulness	General usefulness, Corrective feedback, Hints, Tasks	11	.89	Cornillie et al (2013)'s translation (adapted)	
Perceived interactivity	Immediacy, Control, Mutuality	11 (13)	.79	New scale developed	
Perceived authenticity	General Academic Personal	6 (7)	.84	Perceived Authenticity of Writing Scale (Behizadeh & Engelhard 2014) (adapted)	

e.g., PERCEIVED INTERACTIVITY: "Through my answers, I could really have an impact on the game." PERCEIVED USEFULNESS: "I am less afraid to speak French now than I was before playing the game."

Instrument: Full in-game logging

- Full logging of all messages read and written in the system
 - 48 353 messages
 577 494 words
- Keylogging (keystrokes + timestamps)

Instrument: Target vocabulary test

- Target words: selected because of (expected) occurrence, but no focus of instruction
 → Incidental learning only
- At pre- & posttest, randomized, identical tests
- 50 target items
- Receptive part: meaning recognition
 25 isolated words *potager*
- 2. Productive part: form recall25 'formulaic sequences' in gap-fillingbeaucoup d'imagination

	le membre
	⊖ lid
	() vlies
	() gebouw
	() hetzelfde
	O Ik weet het niet.
	\leftarrow
Allô oien	? Jean ? Il est 22h00 et tu n'es toujours pas à la maison. J' <mark>es</mark> que tout va
esp	bère



Interactivity in Conversational AI

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL Methods: dialogue sys. +/-interactive Results: Perceptions & Engagement Discussion Which interactivity matters?

No difference in perceptions



But very different perception of the pilot app

RESULTS



0 60

0

N = 32

Pilot version of the Dialogue Completion condition

	Lui: Bonjour mon petit. Je vois que tu te réveilles enfin.				
	Ecris ta réponse ici	Greet the old owl.			
	Lui: Comment vas-tu ?				
	Écris ta réponse ici	← Say how it is going.			
	Lui: Ah, je suis soulagé ! Ton aile avait l'air très mal-en-point quand je t'ai amené ici.				
	Écris ta réponse ici	← Ask where you are.			
	Lui: Tu es dans le Grand Monastère des Montagnes éternelles, mon petit.				
	Écris ta réponse ici	← Ask who he is.			
one 8 endddy left. Acquaintance	Lui: Je suis Sensei, le moine. Et toi, comment t'appelles-tu ?				
	Écris ta réponse ici	+- Tell your name.			
	Lui: Enchanté !				
	Écris ta réponse ici	+ Ask what happened.			
	Terminer				
		V			
5					

- No feedback, no scaffolding (for input comprehension or help for output)
- Visible frustration among users of the Dialogue Completion condition (*n* = 16)



Interactivity in Conversational AI

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL Methods: dialogue sys. +/-interactive Results: Perceptions & Engagement Discussion Which interactivity matters?

Behavioural task engagement: Quantity





Behavioural task engagement: Intensity



Cognitive task engagement: Syntactic complexity





-

Cognitive task engagement: Lexical complexity [distinguishing attempts]









Interactivity in Conversational Al

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL Methods: dialogue sys. +/-interactive Results: Perceptions, Engagement, Vocabulary learning

Discussion Which interactivity matters?



Evolution of group means



Interactivity in Conversational AI

Interactivity in SLA, CALL/TSLL Methods: dialogue sys. +/-interactive Results Perceptions Engagement Conclusion

Which interactivity matters?

Limitations

System: story-first design

- \rightarrow explicit microtask prompts
- \rightarrow reduced user control

 \rightarrow limited difference across conditions (exp. condition less interactive than foreseen)

Instruments:

too limited number of items for Perceived ease-of-use

excessive difficulty of target vocabulary test (form recall)

many vocabulary items with too limited/no exposure in the end

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION



Conclusion: Which interactivity matters?

- Perceptions and learning more affected by **instructional interactivity** (feedback, scaffolding) than game-like user agency on the dialogue.
 - Interactivity as user agency may *not* change perceptions or technology acceptance.
 - Interactivity as **negotiation of form and meaning**: retries, self-repair...
 - → For effective dialogue-based CALL:
 feedback, scaffolding, adaptivity
 ability to process anything
- Interactive/Dynamic interface ⇒ **Engagement**
 - More focus on fluency and meaning
 - More output \Rightarrow More productive vocabulary use \Rightarrow Reinforced learning

Thanks! Questions & suggestions?

Serge Bibauw serge.bibauw@uclouvain.be Tw: @SergeBibauw







