

---

# Disentangling Heterogeneous Knowledge Concept Embedding for Cognitive Diagnosis on Untested Knowledge

---

Kui Xiao<sup>1</sup>, Runtian Xing<sup>1</sup>, Miao Zhang<sup>1,\*</sup>, Shunfeng Tan<sup>1</sup>,  
Ziming Wang<sup>2</sup>, Xiaolian Zhu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science and Information Engineering, Hubei University

<sup>2</sup>Key Laboratory of Intelligent Sensing System and Security

<sup>3</sup>Hubei Key Laboratory of Big Data Intelligent Analysis and Application

{xiaokui, zhangmiao}@hubu.edu.cn,  
{xrt, tsf, wzm, zx1}@stu.hubu.edu.cn,

## Abstract

Cognitive diagnosis is a fundamental and critical task in learning assessment, which aims to infer students' proficiency on knowledge concepts from their response logs. Current works assume each knowledge concept will certainly be tested and covered by multiple exercises. However, whether online or offline courses, it's hardly feasible to completely cover all knowledge concepts in several exercises. Restricted tests lead to undiscovered knowledge deficits, especially untested knowledge concepts(UKCs). In this paper, we propose a novel Disentangling Heterogeneous Knowledge Cognitive Diagnosis framework on untested knowledge(DisKCD). Specifically, we leverage course grades, exercise questions, and resources to learn the potential representations of students, exercises, and knowledge concepts. In particular, knowledge concepts are disentangled into tested and untested based on the limiting actual exercises. We construct a heterogeneous relation graph network via students, exercises, tested knowledge concepts(TKCs), and UKCs. Then, through a hierarchical heterogeneous message-passing mechanism, the fine-grained relations are incorporated into the embeddings of the entities. Finally, the embeddings will be applied to multiple existing cognitive diagnosis models to infer students' proficiency on UKCs. Experimental results on real-world datasets show that the proposed model can effectively improve the performance of the task of diagnosing students' proficiency on UKCs. Our anonymous code is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/DiKCD>.

## 1 Introduction

Cognitive diagnosis is an important component of intelligent tutoring systems[1, 2, 3], which aims to assess students' proficiency on specific knowledge concepts. Cognitive diagnosis models (CDMs) analyze students' interaction history, including correct and incorrect responses in exercise logs, to infer their cognitive states. Presently, cognitive diagnosis outcomes are integrated into various facets of intelligent tutoring, such as exercise recommendation [4, 5] and adaptive testing [6]. As the array of learning materials expands and students' learning preferences vary more widely, cognitive diagnosis models are becoming increasingly important. They furnish instructors with potent psychometric instruments for educational appraisal, enhancing teaching and learning support.

---

\*the corresponding author.




Figure 1: Examples of cognitive diagnosis. Students’ mastery of tested knowledge components is often emphasized, while their grasp of untested knowledge components is usually overlooked.

In cognitive diagnosis, researchers propose various CDMs, such as Item Response Theory (IRT) [7], Multidimensional IRT (MIRT) [8], and Deterministic Inputs, Noisy-And gate model (DINA) [9]. These models employ artificially designed linear functions to simulate student-practice interactions. However, in recent years, due to the proliferation of neural networks and deep learning technologies, researchers have introduced novel cognitive diagnosis models leveraging neural networks, such as Neural Cognitive Diagnosis (NeuralCD) [10], and models based on graph convolutional networks like Relation map driven Cognitive Diagnosis (RCD) [11]. These state-of-the-art models have yielded cutting-edge outcomes in cognitive diagnosis.

Researchers typically assume that each knowledge concept is contained in multiple exercises. In other words, these works focus on students’ mastery of the tested knowledge concepts (TKCs). However, whether online or offline courses, it’s hardly feasible to completely cover all knowledge concepts in several exercises. The scope of exams is limited, which makes it challenging for assessments to cover all course concepts comprehensively. Moreover, issues like plagiarism further complicate the evaluation process, which hinders instructors’ ability to accurately gauge students’ understanding of each concept and provide timely guidance. Thus, effectively diagnosing students’ mastery of untested knowledge concepts (UKCs) is a critical concern within cognitive diagnosis.

As shown In Figure 1, a course’s final exam contains a limited number of exercises, covering only a fraction of the knowledge concepts of the course, such as sections 1.3, 2.2 and 5.1. Instructors can assess student understanding of TKCs in the final exam [12]. However, gauging students’ mastery of the UKCs, which are not assessed in the final exam, is impossible. In this paper, we introduce a cognitive diagnosis framework to assess students’ mastery of UKCs in exams. Specifically, knowledge concepts are disentangled into TKCs and UKCs. Next, we construct a heterogeneous relation graph network using entities like students, exercises, TKCs, and UKCs. Through a hierarchical heterogeneous message-passing mechanism, the fine-grained relations are incorporated into the entity embeddings. Finally, the entity embeddings will be applied to multiple existing cognitive diagnosis models to infer students’ proficiency on UKCs.

Our key contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel cognitive diagnosis framework to assess students’ proficiency on UKCs, which effectively addresses the challenge of difficulty in comprehensively examining traditional cognitive diagnosis.
- We present a heterogeneous relation aware network for students, exercises, TKCs and UKCs to ensure that the embeddings are highly sensitive to students’ proficiency and the diagnostic orientation of UKCs.
- We create an authentic dataset from two university courses, facilitating cognitive diagnosis research on UKCs. Diverging from previous datasets, our dataset is meticulously curated from genuine data extracted from final exams of university courses, which are better poised to address the complexities of evaluating students’ proficiency.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Cognitive Diagnosis

Cognitive diagnosis is a comprehensive approach to education assessment, which involves two main tasks: cognitive diagnosis [13][14][15] and knowledge tracking[16, 17, 18]. Knowledge tracking

focuses on monitoring changes in student performance to predict their responses to future questions. However, it does not directly consider how well students grasp concepts throughout their learning process. On the other hand, Cognitive diagnosis is designed to evaluate students' understanding of each knowledge concept, assuming that their cognitive abilities remain consistent during tests [19, 20].

Researchers focus on evaluating students' knowledge levels through their past responses. IRT is a pivotal advancement [7], which predicts students' answer accuracy through manually crafted functions. MIRT then incorporates multidimensional features of students [8]. However, the effectiveness of traditional models hinges on the well-designed functions [21, 22]. To address this issue, NeuralCD employs neural networks to simulate student-exercise interactions [10, 23, 24]. RCD [11], explores the relation between students, exercises, and knowledge concepts. Another widely used approach is DINA, which uses discrete numerical values to assess knowledge mastery and consider errors like slipping and guessing in the diagnosis process [9]. An improved model of DINA is FuzzyCDM [25], which introduces fuzzy logic control and realizes that the knowledge mastery state can be kept constant.

## 2.2 Knowledge Coverage Problem

The insufficient coverage of knowledge in exercises presents a significant obstacle in cognitive assessment tasks [26, 27]. CDMs primarily focus on tests structured around fixed exercises, where the number of knowledge concepts is limited. Student responses about multiple related exercises are extremely important in assessing mastery of each knowledge concept. However, in modern education, there's a vast array of knowledge concepts, yet student responses are sparse, highlighting the challenge of ensuring comprehensive knowledge coverage. Leighton [28] uses the hierarchical relations between knowledge concepts for cognitive diagnosis assessment (AHM). De La Torre and Douglas [29] propose HO-DINA, which incorporates low-dimensional high-order latent features influencing students' mastery of each knowledge concept to enhance cognitive diagnosis tasks.

In addition, zero-shot cognitive diagnosis at the domain level is also a recent hot topic, such as newly TechCD [30] and Zero-1-to-3 [31]. Unlike these works that explore cognitive diagnosis across different domains, our cognitive diagnosis tasks focus on UKCs in the examination. We aim to deduce students' proficiency on these UKCs by examining their proficiency in TKCs and the relation between them. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to evaluate students' proficiency on UKCs.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Cognitive Diagnosis Model

We first outline the general form of CDMs, which typically consist of three fundamental components: students, exercises, and knowledge concepts. Most CDMs predict how well students will perform in practicing exercises, indirectly quantifying students' mastery of knowledge. The diagnosis core essentially involves modeling student-exercise-concept interactions by predicting students' performance during practice sessions, as illustrated below:

$$\hat{y}_{uv} = F_{CDM}(u, v, K), \quad (1)$$

Here,  $u$  denotes the traits of a student,  $v$  represents the traits of exercise, and  $K$  is the knowledge concept space of a domain. The primary aim of CDMs is to minimize the disparity between the anticipated outcome  $\hat{y}_{uv}$  and the actual score  $y_{uv}$  of the student's response.  $F_{CDM}(\cdot)$  is a diagnostic tool for predicting the response outcome.

Interpretability is significantly important for cognitive diagnosis for improving teaching and learning [32]. CDMs typically follow the monotonicity assumption in the literature [8]: "The probability of correct response to the exercise is monotonically increasing at any dimension of the student's knowledge proficiency." In pursuit of the assumption, CDMs enforce  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial u} > 0$  throughout the training phase.

### 3.2 Problem Setup

In the cognitive diagnosis task involving UKCs, we define several terms. Let  $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$  represent the set of students, and  $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_M\}$  denote the exercises within a course

exam.  $K_{tested}$  signifies the knowledge concepts corresponding to these exercises, and  $K_{untested}$  denote the knowledge concepts not covered in the exam. The union  $K = K_{tested} \cup K_{untested}$  encompasses all knowledge concepts in the course, with the constraint  $K_{tested} \cap K_{untested} = \Phi$ . Let  $R_{ht} = \{(k_h, k_t, r_{ht}) | k_h, k_t \in K, r_{ht} \in R_k\}$  denotes the set of triples of knowledge concepts, where  $R_k$  contains all forms of relations among knowledge concepts. This study specifically employs two types of relations: similarity and prerequisite relations.

On the other hand, the observed interaction logs are a triple set  $R_{se} = \{(s_u, e_v, y_{uv}) | s_u \in S, e_v \in E, y_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ , where  $y_{uv}$  indicates the response of student  $s_u$  to exercise  $e_v$ . A correct response is denoted by  $y_{uv} = 1$ , while an incorrect response is indicated by  $y_{uv} = 0$ . Additionally, we have an expert-annotated Q-matrix [33], where  $Q_{ij} = 1$  signifies that exercise  $e_i$  is associated with knowledge concept  $k_j$ , otherwise  $Q_{ij} = 0$ .

**PROBLEM DEFINITION.** Given students' exercising response logs  $R_{se}$  on TKCs, the set of triples of knowledge concepts  $R_{ht}$ , as well as the  $Q$ -matrix, our goal is to assess students' proficiency on UKCs.

### 3.3 Heterogeneous Relation Graphs

Depending on dynamic interactions between students, exercises, and knowledge concepts, we define diverse heterogeneous relation subgraph.

**student-exercise interaction subgraph.** The interaction relations between students and exercises listed on the test paper collectively form the student-exercise interaction subgraph. This subgraph is bidirectional and can be represented as  $G_{se}(S \cup E, r_{se})$ , where  $r_{se}$  denotes the set of interactions between students and the exercises. If  $r_{s_u \leftrightarrow e_v} = 1$ , it indicates that student  $s_u$  attempted exercise  $e_v$ .

**exercise-TKC correlation subgraph.** The incorporation connection between TKCs and UKCs collectively forms the Exercise-TKC correlation subgraph, denoted as  $G_{ek}(E \cup K_{tested}, r_{ek})$ . Here, all  $r_{ek}$  derive from the Q-matrix. If  $r_{e_v \leftrightarrow k_w}$  within this set equals 1, it indicates that exercise  $e_v$  encompasses the knowledge concept  $k_w$ .

**TKC-TKC dependency subgraph.** The connections among the TKCs collectively form the TKC-TKC dependency subgraph, denoted as  $G_{kk}(K_{tested}, r_{kk})$ . We solely contemplate the similarity and prerequisite relations. The similarity relation allows the propagation of students' cognitive states between concepts in both directions. Conversely, the prerequisite relation functions unilaterally.

**TKC-UKC dependency subgraph.** The connections among TKCs and UKCs, denoted as  $G_{ku}(K_{tested} \cup K_{untested}, r_{ku})$ . Just like  $r_{kk}, r_{ku}$  encompasses the array of connections between TKCs and UKCs, encompassing similarities and prerequisites. Moreover, the nodes linked by a relation must embody a TKC and a UKC.

**UKC-UKC dependency subgraph.** The connections among all UKCs collectively form the UKC-UKC dependency subgraph, represented as  $G_{uu}(K_{untested}, r_{uu})$ . Much like  $r_{kk}, r_{uu}$  denotes the array of relations among UKCs. Likewise, the connections between concept nodes here solely comprise similarity and prerequisite relations.

## 4 Methodology

To address the challenge of accurately assessing students' proficiency with limited homework and test practice, this paper introduces a DisKCD framework for UKCs. First, in the embedding layer, we disentangle knowledge concepts to TKCs and UKCs. Then, in the heterogeneous relation aware layer, the fine-grained relations are incorporated into the entity embeddings. Finally, embeddings are applied to CDMs to infer students' proficiency on UKCs.

### 4.1 Embedding Layer

The embedding layer traps semantic details to generate representations of students, test questions, and knowledge concepts, providing a robust basis for subsequent cognitive diagnosis tasks.

**Student embedding.** To assess students' initial capabilities accurately, we gather and normalize their grades using the standard score (z-score), which is the number of standard deviations above or below




Figure 2: Overview of DisKCD. The left side shows the disentangling process of decomposing knowledge concepts into TKCs and UTCs. The middle part shows the details of the heterogeneous relation-aware layer where fine-grained relations are merged into entity embeddings. The right part shows the diagnostic process of DisKCD framework.

the mean value of what is being observed or measured [34]. The conversion operation is

$$z_c^{(u)} = \frac{X_c^{(u)} - \mu_c}{\sigma_c}, \quad (2)$$

where  $X_c^{(u)}$  is the grade of student  $s_u$  in course  $c$ ,  $\mu_c$  denotes the average score for  $c$ .  $\sigma_c$  stands for the standard deviation of all scores within the class for this particular course. For each student, we obtain an original embedding via a fully connected neural network:

$$\mathbf{s} = FNN(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_C), \quad (3)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times 1}$  and  $d_k$  is the number of all knowledge concepts.  $C$  represents the number of historical courses.  $\mathbf{s}$  incorporates all the student's historical performance information.

**Exercise embedding.** We gather the text from the final exam exercises to construct embeddings for the exercises based on textual content. Specifically, we feed the word2vec [35] sequence  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_T)$  of exercise into each time step of Bi-LSTM [36]. Subsequently, we concatenate the hidden state by the forward direction  $(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_1, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_2, \dots, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_T)$  and the backward direction  $(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{h}}_1, \overrightarrow{\mathbf{h}}_2, \dots, \overrightarrow{\mathbf{h}}_T)$ , aligning them by position, and then yielding

$$\mathbf{h}_i = [\overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i, \overrightarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i], \quad (4)$$

where  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  denotes the concatenation operation. Finally, the exercise vector  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times 1}$  is updated by averaging operation and a fully connected layer:

$$\mathbf{e} = FNN(AVG(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_T)). \quad (5)$$

**Concept embedding.** The content-relevant pedagogical resources, such as course slides, is employed to enhance the semantic representation of knowledge concepts. The embedding construction process for the knowledge concept is the same as Eq.4 and Eq.5. Specifically, we denote the embedding of TKC and UKC as  $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times 1}$  and  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times 1}$  respectively.

## 4.2 Heterogeneous Relation-aware Layer

DisKCD constructs a heterogeneous relation-aware graph via relations between students, exercises, TKCs, and UKCs, linking four types of entities through a heterogeneous attention mechanism. So

that each entity node can iteratively obtain updated information from neighbor nodes based on the attention weights.

**Heterogeneous Relation Attention.** The heterogeneous relation attention occurs in a heterogeneous graph with five subgraphs,  $G = (G_{se}, G_{ek}, G_{kk}, G_{ku}, G_{uu})$ . For example, in  $G_{uu}$  for UKCs there are prerequisite and similarity relations among them. Under both relations, each node contains different neighbor nodes. Specifically, after the Embedding Layer, we obtain the initial embeddings for four types of entities:  $s$ ,  $e$ ,  $k$  and  $u$ . Within subgraphs  $g \in G$ , we exemplify with entity node  $t \in (S, E, TKCs, UKCs)$ . For entity node  $t$ , we calculate its attention weights with neighbor nodes under various relation contexts. Through weighted summation, we then derive the vector embedding of entity node  $t$  in a subgraph  $G$  after separately fusing different relations (In the subgraphs  $G_{kk}, G_{ku}$ , and  $G_{uu}$ , each one encompasses multiple types of relations). The implementation of heterogeneous relation attention is executed as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{n}}^{(l+1)} = \sum_{r \in R_g} \sum_{n \in N_t^r} \alpha_n^{(l+1)} \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{n}^{(l)}, \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_n^{(l+1)} = FNN([\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{t}^{(l)}, \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{n}^{(l)}]), \quad (7)$$

$$\alpha_n^{(l+1)} = \frac{\exp(\hat{\alpha}_n^{(l+1)})}{\sum_{j \in N_t^r} \exp(\hat{\alpha}_j^{(l+1)})}, \quad (8)$$

where  $r \in R_g$  denotes the relation between node  $t$  and neighbor node  $n$  in heterogeneous subgraph  $g$ .  $\alpha_n^{(l+1)}$  refers to the attention weights assigned to node  $t$ 's neighbors, reflecting the significance of each relation type  $r$  in the heterogeneous subgraph.  $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$  is the trainable matrix.  $\mathbf{n}^{(l)}$  is the embeddings of node  $t$  neighbor nodes after the initial iteration. In the Heterogeneous Relation Attention section, we obtain the embedding vector representations of the four types of entities ( $S, E, TKCs, UKCs$ ) under various relations within a specific subgraph.

**Heterogeneous Relation Aggregation.** An entity node may appear in multiple subgraphs. For example, node  $u$  is present in both  $G_{ku}$  and  $G_{uu}$ , serving as distinct roles. Since the entity acquires different embeddings in each subgraph, we aggregate these embeddings in the Heterogeneous Relation Aggregation subsection according to attention weights. Specifically, for an entity node  $t \in (S, E, TKCs, UKCs)$ , the embeddings from different subgraphs are spliced with the original embedding of node  $t$ . Softmax normalization is then applied to determine the respective weights, followed by a weighted summation to perform the aggregation update. This process results in an integrated embedding representation that encapsulates the diverse relations and subgraphs. The  $l + 1$  aggregation iteration is as follows:

$$\mathbf{t}^{(l+1)} = \mathbf{t}^{(l)} + \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g^{(l+1)} \tilde{\mathbf{n}}^{(l+1)}, \quad (9)$$

$$\mu_g^{(l+1)} = FNN([\mathbf{t}^{(l)}, \tilde{\mathbf{n}}^{(l+1)}]), \quad (10)$$

Here,  $\mu_g^{(l+1)}$  represents the attention of the entity node  $t$  in different subgraphs. After aggregating from different subgraphs, we obtain the final embedding representations of four types of entities:  $\mathbf{s}^{(l+1)}, \mathbf{e}^{(l+1)}, \mathbf{k}^{(l+1)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(l+1)}$ . Next, we feed embeddings generated through the DisKCD framework into a general CDM for cognitive diagnosis.

### 4.3 Diagnosis Layer

In this section, we integrate DisKCD with popular CDMs to assess students' mastery on UKCs and predict their outcomes on exercises unrelated to the TKCs.

Given that distinct CDM employ varying formats of student, exercise, and knowledge concept features as input, transform functions to convert the embeddings into the formats suitable for each CDM are necessary. Hence, we redefine Eq.1 as follows:

$$\hat{y}_{uv} = F_{CDM}(\phi_s(\mathbf{u}), \phi_e(\mathbf{v}), \phi_c(\mathbf{K})). \quad (11)$$

Here,  $\phi_s(\cdot)$ ,  $\phi_e(\cdot)$ , and  $\phi_c(\cdot)$  represent transform functions. We utilize cross-entropy loss function to calculate the difference between the predicted probability  $\hat{y}_{uv}$  and the actual response  $y_{uv}$ .

$$L = - \sum_{(s_u, e_v, y_{uv}) \in R_{se}} (y_{uv} \log \hat{y}_{uv} + (1 - y_{uv}) \log(1 - \hat{y}_{uv})). \quad (12)$$

## 5 Experiments

We conduct comprehensive experiments to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1:** Does DisKCD enhance the performance of CDMs in assessing students’ mastery of UKCs?

**RQ2:** Is DisKCD beneficial for CDMs in evaluating students’ mastery of TKCs?

**RQ3:** How well does DisKCD model entities like students, exercises, and knowledge concepts?

**RQ4:** Are the cognitive diagnosis results produced by DisKCD interpretable?

### 5.1 Datasets

We evaluate our approach on three real-world datasets: one from an online learning platform and the other from the final exams of two offline university courses. Details are shown in Table 1.

**JAD** and **SDP** consist of student response data extracted from the final exams of two courses, "Java Application Development" and "Software Design Patterns", offered during the 2021-2022 academic year in the software engineering major at a Chinese university. Note that the exercises in these exams are open questions rather than fill-in-the-blank questions or multiple-choice questions.

**Junyi** is sourced from the Chinese e-learning platform Junyi Academy [37], which is widely applied in CDM. To more effectively differentiate between TKCs and UKCs, we extracted response logs of 10,000 students in the Junyi dataset for our experiments.

Table 1: The statistics of three datasets.

Dataset	# Student	# Tested Exercise	# Untested Exercise	# TKCs	# UKCs	# Record	# Record per student
JAD	275	14	4	14	4	4950	18
SDP	128	12	3	10	3	1920	15
Junyi	10000	589	246	589	246	353835	35.38

### 5.2 Experiment Settings

**Baselines.** To evaluate the validity and generalizability, we employ DisKCD to five widely adopted CDMs: 1)DINA [9]: DINA assesses the knowledge or skills by answer specific test questions, 2)IRT [7]: IRT diagnoses a student’s cognitive status by analyzing questions’ parameters (difficulty, discrimination, and guessing parameters), 3)MIRT [8]: MIRT extends the parameters of student learning abilities and exercises to multiple dimensions, 4)NeuralCD [10]: NCD utilizes multilayer perceptrons to model complex higher-order interactions between student and exercises, and 5)RCD [11]: RCD constructs multi-layer maps of relations between students, exercises, and concepts.

**Metrics.** Following previous studies, we use various metrics from regression and classification perspectives. From the regression perspective, we select Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) [38] to measure the difference between predicted and actual scores. From the classification perspective, we use prediction Accuracy (ACC) [10] and Area Under an ROC Curve (AUC) [39] for model evaluation.

**Implementation Details.** We set the dimensions of the student and exercise vectors to the number of all concepts in the course. All network parameters are initialized using Xavier. In addition, the upper batch was set to 8 for JAD and SDP and 128 for Junyi. the optimizer uses Adam. the code is based on the PyTorch implementation and runs on a Linux server with an RTX 4090(24G) GPU.

### 5.3 Performance Comparison on UKCs (RQ1)

To investigate RQ1, we trained our models using data related to TKCs and made predictions on data related to UKCs. Predictions use vectors from five popular CDMs, including vectors updated through the original CDM and those updated via DisKCD. The results, as presented in Table 2, led to the following observations: (1) In nearly all the CDMs, vectors updated through DisKCD perform better than those updated through the original CDMs. It indicates that DisKCD is capable of diagnosing students’ mastery of UKCs with limited data. (2)On three datasets, DisKCD is significantly better than baseline, suggesting that disentangling TKCs from UKCs positively influences prediction tasks.

(3)The experimental results for RCD and NCD are generally superior to those of DINA, IRT, and MIRT, demonstrating that modeling complex student-exercise-concept relations is more effective.

Table 2: Performance comparison on Untested Knowledge Concept. The best performance prediction is highlighted in bold.

Dataset		JAD			SDP			Junyi		
		ACC	RMSE	AUC	ACC	RMSE	AUC	ACC	RMSE	AUC
DINA	baseline	0.5936	0.5427	0.5944	0.5781	0.5124	0.5679	0.6076	0.4737	0.6523
	DisKCD	<b>0.6409</b>	<b>0.4933</b>	<b>0.6478</b>	<b>0.6432</b>	<b>0.4965</b>	<b>0.6457</b>	<b>0.7504</b>	<b>0.4305</b>	<b>0.8051</b>
IRT	baseline	0.5916	0.5382	0.5979	0.5260	0.5718	0.5119	0.6462	0.5079	0.7235
	DisKCD	<b>0.5932</b>	<b>0.4943</b>	<b>0.7086</b>	<b>0.5683</b>	<b>0.5386</b>	<b>0.6318</b>	<b>0.7545</b>	<b>0.4088</b>	<b>0.8147</b>
MIRT	baseline	0.5336	0.5426	0.6313	0.5495	0.5549	0.6454	0.6545	0.5353	0.7262
	DisKCD	<b>0.5991</b>	<b>0.5148</b>	<b>0.6319</b>	<b>0.5885</b>	<b>0.5061</b>	<b>0.6663</b>	<b>0.7626</b>	<b>0.4071</b>	<b>0.8130</b>
NCD	baseline	0.5903	0.5759	0.6035	0.5260	0.5811	0.5776	0.7054	0.4287	<b>0.7888</b>
	DisKCD	<b>0.6527</b>	<b>0.4702</b>	<b>0.6938</b>	<b>0.6225</b>	<b>0.5603</b>	<b>0.6042</b>	<b>0.7480</b>	<b>0.4115</b>	0.7010
RCD	baseline	0.5909	0.4895	0.6294	0.6068	0.4960	0.6580	0.6284	0.4765	0.6458
	DisKCD	<b>0.6673</b>	<b>0.4606</b>	<b>0.6953</b>	<b>0.6771</b>	<b>0.4501</b>	<b>0.7546</b>	<b>0.7746</b>	<b>0.3936</b>	<b>0.7716</b>

#### 5.4 Performance Comparison on TKCs (RQ2)

In the experiments addressing RQ2, the exercises in training and testing datasets are all related to the TKCs. According to the results shown in Table 3, the following observations were obtained: (1)Across all CDMs, vectors from DisKCD demonstrated outstanding performance compared to the original vectors, indicating that DisKCD can assess students’ mastery of TKCs more accurately. (2)The experiments on Junyi showed generally higher AUC values than those based on our custom datasets, JAD and SDP. This suggests that models trained with the Junyi dataset have stronger predictive capabilities, underscoring the necessity of disentangling the diagnosis tasks between the rich and extensively tested and untested knowledge concepts.

Table 3: Performance comparison on Tested Knowledge Concept.

Dataset		JAD			SDP			Junyi		
		ACC	RMSE	AUC	ACC	RMSE	AUC	ACC	RMSE	AUC
DINA	baseline	0.7091	0.4492	0.7012	0.6172	0.4962	0.6857	0.6414	0.4737	0.7536
	DisKCD	<b>0.7516</b>	<b>0.4371</b>	<b>0.7213</b>	<b>0.6589</b>	<b>0.4814</b>	<b>0.7121</b>	<b>0.6720</b>	<b>0.4582</b>	<b>0.8024</b>
IRT	baseline	0.7503	0.4323	0.6430	0.6823	0.4706	0.7102	0.6462	0.5079	0.7951
	DisKCD	<b>0.7636</b>	<b>0.4077</b>	<b>0.7316</b>	<b>0.7109</b>	<b>0.4643</b>	<b>0.7285</b>	<b>0.7545</b>	<b>0.4089</b>	<b>0.8115</b>
MIRT	baseline	0.7066	0.4473	0.6080	0.6901	0.4689	0.7119	0.7626	0.4071	0.8131
	DisKCD	<b>0.7697</b>	<b>0.4135</b>	<b>0.7562</b>	<b>0.7005</b>	<b>0.4618</b>	<b>0.7407</b>	<b>0.7705</b>	<b>0.3977</b>	<b>0.8273</b>
NCD	baseline	0.7401	0.4150	0.7103	0.6276	0.4790	0.6690	0.7393	0.4166	0.7963
	DisKCD	<b>0.7507</b>	<b>0.4044</b>	<b>0.7526</b>	<b>0.6626</b>	<b>0.4783</b>	<b>0.6976</b>	<b>0.7495</b>	<b>0.4112</b>	<b>0.8031</b>
RCD	baseline	0.7585	0.4050	0.7306	0.6614	0.4589	0.7215	0.7694	0.3981	0.8262
	DisKCD	<b>0.7755</b>	<b>0.4005</b>	<b>0.7387</b>	<b>0.7119</b>	<b>0.4572</b>	<b>0.7402</b>	<b>0.7727</b>	<b>0.3955</b>	<b>0.8302</b>

#### 5.5 Ability of Modeling Entity Embedding (RQ3)

To understand the influence of the embedding layer within DisKCD on overall model performance, we conducted a series of comparative experiments on JAD. We utilize the commonly one-hot vectors as a baseline, replacing the embedding vectors generated by DisKCD. Table 4 indicates that using the embedding vectors produced by DisKCD’s embedding layer improves diagnostic performance. This suggests that refining semantics through a layered heterogeneous message-passing mechanism can enhance the model’s accuracy in predicting students’ proficiency on UKCs.

#### 5.6 Interpretability and Case Study (RQ4)

We assess the interpretability of DisKCD’s diagnostic results using Degree of Agreement (DOA)[40], based on Monotonicity Assumption[8]. The assumption states that a more proficient student on a



Table 4: The performance of entity modeling.

Train/Test	DINA		IRT		MIRT		NCD		RCD	
	-Emb	OURS	-Emb	OURS	-Emb	OURS	-Emb	OURS	-Emb	OURS
ACC	0.5913	<b>0.6409</b>	0.5926	<b>0.5932</b>	0.5433	<b>0.5991</b>	0.5904	<b>0.6527</b>	0.6273	<b>0.6673</b>
RMSE	0.5442	<b>0.4933</b>	0.5386	<b>0.4943</b>	0.5542	<b>0.5148</b>	0.5097	<b>0.4702</b>	0.4772	<b>0.4606</b>
AUC	0.5892	<b>0.6478</b>	0.5340	<b>0.7086</b>	0.5467	<b>0.6319</b>	0.6372	<b>0.6938</b>	0.6647	<b>0.6953</b>

concept should perform better on its exercises. As Figure 3 shows, solid nodes(DisKCD) have higher DOA values than hollow nodes(baseline), suggesting the diagnosed knowledge proficiency levels by DisKCD are reasonable. Notably, the latent vectors in IRT and MIRT lack direct correspondence to concepts, so their DOA is considered to be 0.




Figure 3: The performance of interpretability of DisKCD and baseline in JAD and Junyi.




Figure 4: Case study: responses and diagnostic results of two students.

Figure 4 shows the cognitive status of students in the JAD dataset. Panel (a) displays the relevance between exercises and TKCs, like web.xml and statement, and UKCs, such as MVC and interface. Panel (b) shows the student’s responses. Panel (c) displays the diagnostic results of the DisK-RCD (left) and the original RCD (right) on the knowledge status of two students, with bars representing exercise difficulty and lines depicting proficiency levels. Observations indicate that students answer correctly when their proficiency exceeds exercise difficulty. The analysis reveals that both DisKCD and baseline perform well on TKCs, but only DisKCD effectively diagnoses UKCs, affirming its ability to assess untested knowledge concepts.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a general knowledge diagnosis framework called DisKCD. Specifically, we define four types of entities: students, exercises, TKCs, and UKCs, along with their fine-grained relations. This allows us to disentangle TKCs and UKCs. Then, using a heterogeneous relation-aware network, we generate relation-aware entity embeddings, which can be used in various CDMs to predict students’ performance. Experimental results on real-world datasets show that DisKCD not only effectively predicts students’ proficiency on UKCs but also helps assess their mastery of TKCs, with good interpretability. Future research will explore more diverse educational dependencies to enhance CDMs, infer students’ cognitive states, and customize personalized learning paths. We hope our work will contribute to the field of intelligent education.

## 7 Limitations

Limited by computational resources, we couldn’t compare with additional CDMs. Training a CDM on a server with two 48G GPUs takes about six days on average. Furthermore, we only use similarity and prerequisite relations in our work. In the future, we aim to incorporate more diverse knowledge relations to enhance the model’s performance.

## References

- [1] Qi Liu. Towards a new generation of cognitive diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2021, Virtual Event / Montreal, Canada, 19-27 August 2021*, pages 4961–4964. ijcai.org, 2021.
- [2] Ashton Anderson, Daniel P. Huttenlocher, Jon M. Kleinberg, and Jure Leskovec. Engaging with massive online courses. In *23rd International World Wide Web Conference, WWW '14, Seoul, Republic of Korea, April 7-11, 2014*, pages 687–698. ACM, 2014.
- [3] Yingjie Liu, Tiancheng Zhang, Xuecen Wang, Ge Yu, and Tao Li. New development of cognitive diagnosis models. *Frontiers Comput. Sci.*, 17(1):171604, 2023.
- [4] Fei Liu, Xuegang Hu, Shuochen Liu, Chenyang Bu, and Le Wu. Meta multi-agent exercise recommendation: A game application perspective. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD 2023, Long Beach, CA, USA, August 6-10, 2023*, pages 1441–1452. ACM, 2023.
- [5] Zhi Mao and Mingfang Li. Artificial intelligence and cognitive diagnosis based teaching resource recommendation algorithm. *PeerJ Comput. Sci.*, 9:e1594, 2023.
- [6] Yan Zhuang, Qi Liu, Guan hao Zhao, Zhenya Huang, Weizhe Huang, Zachary A. Pardos, Enhong Chen, Jinze Wu, and Xin Li. A bounded ability estimation for computerized adaptive testing. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [7] Frederic Lord. A theory of test scores. *Psychometric monographs*, 1952.
- [8] Mark D. Reckase. *Multidimensional Item Response Theory Models*, pages 79–112. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2009.
- [9] Jimmy De La Torre. Dina model and parameter estimation: A didactic. *Journal of educational and behavioral statistics*, 34(1):115–130, 2009.
- [10] Fei Wang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Zhenya Huang, Yuying Chen, Yu Yin, Zai Huang, and Shijin Wang. Neural cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education systems. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 6153–6161. AAAI Press, 2020.
- [11] Weibo Gao, Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Haoyang Bi, Mu-Chun Wang, Jianhui Ma, Shijin Wang, and Yu Su. RCD: relation map driven cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education systems. In *SIGIR '21: The 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Virtual Event, Canada, July 11-15, 2021*, pages 501–510. ACM, 2021.
- [12] Xiangzhi Chen, Le Wu, Fei Liu, Lei Chen, Kun Zhang, Richang Hong, and Meng Wang. Disentangling cognitive diagnosis with limited exercise labels. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [13] Shanshan Wang, Zhen Zeng, Xun Yang, Ke Xu, and Xingyi Zhang. Boosting neural cognitive diagnosis with student’s affective state modeling. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 620–627. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [14] Haiping Ma, Changqian Wang, Hengshu Zhu, Shangshang Yang, Xiaoming Zhang, and Xingyi Zhang. Enhancing cognitive diagnosis using un-interacted exercises: A collaboration-aware mixed sampling approach. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 8877–8885. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [15] Yan Zhao, Huifang Ma, Jing Wang, Xiangchun He, and Liang Chang. Question-response representation with dual-level contrastive learning for improving knowledge tracing. *Inf. Sci.*, 658:120032, 2024.
- [16] Aritra Ghosh, Neil T. Heffernan, and Andrew S. Lan. Context-aware attentive knowledge tracing. In *KDD '20: The 26th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Virtual Event, CA, USA, August 23-27, 2020*, pages 2330–2339. ACM, 2020.

- [17] Jianwen Sun, Fenghua Yu, Sannyuya Liu, Yawei Luo, Ruxia Liang, and Xiaoxuan Shen. Adversarial bootstrapped question representation learning for knowledge tracing. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia, MM 2023, Ottawa, ON, Canada, 29 October 2023- 3 November 2023*, pages 8016–8025. ACM, 2023.
- [18] Xinping Wang, Liangyu Chen, and Min Zhang. Deep attentive model for knowledge tracing. In *Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2023, Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2023, Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2023, Washington, DC, USA, February 7-14, 2023*, pages 10192–10199. AAAI Press, 2023.
- [19] Jiatong Li, Fei Wang, Qi Liu, Mengxiao Zhu, Wei Huang, Zhenya Huang, Enhong Chen, Yu Su, and Shijin Wang. Hiercdf: A bayesian network-based hierarchical cognitive diagnosis framework. In *KDD '22: The 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, August 14 - 18, 2022*, pages 904–913. ACM, 2022.
- [20] Shuo Liu, Hong Qian, Mingjia Li, and Aimin Zhou. QCCDM: A q-augmented causal cognitive diagnosis model for student learning. In *ECAI 2023 - 26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (PAIS 2023)*, volume 372 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 1536–1543. IOS Press, 2023.
- [21] Emiko Tsutsumi, Ryo Kinoshita, and Maomi Ueno. Deep-irt with independent student and item networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Educational Data Mining, EDM 2021, virtual, June 29 - July 2, 2021*. International Educational Data Mining Society, 2021.
- [22] Lina Gao, Zhongying Zhao, Chao Li, Jianli Zhao, and Qingtian Zeng. Deep cognitive diagnosis model for predicting students’ performance. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, 126:252–262, 2022.
- [23] Peichao Jiang and Xiaodong Wang. Preference cognitive diagnosis for student performance prediction. *IEEE Access*, 8:219775–219787, 2020.
- [24] Ghodai Abdelrahman and Qing Wang. Deep graph memory networks for forgetting-robust knowledge tracing. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 35(8):7844–7855, 2023.
- [25] Qi Liu, Run-ze Wu, Enhong Chen, Guandong Xu, Yu Su, Zhigang Chen, and Guoping Hu. Fuzzy cognitive diagnosis for modelling examinee performance. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 9(4):48:1–48:26, 2018.
- [26] Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Enhong Chen, Hui Xiong, Yu Su, and Guoping Hu. EKT: exercise-aware knowledge tracing for student performance prediction. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 33(1):100–115, 2021.
- [27] Haiping Ma, Changqian Wang, Hengshu Zhu, Shangshang Yang, Xiaoming Zhang, and Xingyi Zhang. Enhancing cognitive diagnosis using un-interacted exercises: A collaboration-aware mixed sampling approach. *CoRR*, abs/2312.10110, 2023.
- [28] Jacqueline P Leighton, Mark J Gierl, and Stephen M Hunka. The attribute hierarchy method for cognitive assessment: A variation on tatsuoaka’s rule-space approach. *Journal of educational measurement*, 41(3):205–237, 2004.
- [29] Jimmy De La Torre and Jeffrey A Douglas. Higher-order latent trait models for cognitive diagnosis. *Psychometrika*, 69(3):333–353, 2004.
- [30] Weibo Gao, Hao Wang, Qi Liu, Fei Wang, Xin Lin, Linan Yue, Zheng Zhang, Rui Lv, and Shijin Wang. Leveraging transferable knowledge concept graph embedding for cold-start cognitive diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2023, Taipei, Taiwan, July 23-27, 2023*, pages 983–992. ACM, 2023.
- [31] Weibo Gao, Qi Liu, Hao Wang, Linan Yue, Haoyang Bi, Yin Gu, Fangzhou Yao, Zheng Zhang, Xin Li, and Yuanjing He. Zero-1-to-3: Domain-level zero-shot cognitive diagnosis via one batch of early-bird students towards three diagnostic objectives. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 8417–8426. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [32] Blerta Abazi Chaushi, Besnik Selimi, Agron Chaushi, and Marika Apostolova. Explainable artificial intelligence in education: A comprehensive review. In *Explainable Artificial Intelligence - First World Conference, xAI 2023, Lisbon, Portugal, July 26-28, 2023, Proceedings, Part II*,

- volume 1902 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, pages 48–71. Springer, 2023.
- [33] Kikumi K Tatsuoka. Architecture of knowledge structures and cognitive diagnosis: A statistical pattern recognition and classification approach. In *Cognitively diagnostic assessment*, pages 327–359. Routledge, 2012.
  - [34] Alexander E Curtis, Tanya A Smith, Bulat A Ziganshin, and John A Eleftheriades. The mystery of the z-score. *Aorta*, 4(04):124–130, 2016.
  - [35] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Gregory S. Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26: 27th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2013. Proceedings of a meeting held December 5-8, 2013, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States*, pages 3111–3119, 2013.
  - [36] Alex Graves and Jurgen Schmidhuber. Framewise phoneme classification with bidirectional LSTM and other neural network architectures. *Neural Networks*, 18(5-6):602–610, 2005.
  - [37] Haw-Shiuan Chang, Hwai-Jung Hsu, and Kuan-Ta Chen. Modeling exercise relationships in e-learning: A unified approach. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Educational Data Mining, EDM 2015, Madrid, Spain, June 26-29, 2015*, pages 532–535. International Educational Data Mining Society (IEDMS), 2015.
  - [38] Hongbin Pei, Bo Yang, Jiming Liu, and Lei Dong. Group sparse bayesian learning for active surveillance on epidemic dynamics. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, pages 800–807. AAAI Press, 2018.
  - [39] Andrew P. Bradley. The use of the area under the ROC curve in the evaluation of machine learning algorithms. *Pattern Recognit.*, 30(7):1145–1159, 1997.
  - [40] Francois Fouss, Alain Pirotte, Jean-michel Renders, and Marco Saerens. Random-walk computation of similarities between nodes of a graph with application to collaborative recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 19(3):355–369, 2007.