

Is Passive Expertise-Based Personalization Enough? A Case Study in AI-Assisted Test-Taking

Li Siyan¹*, Jason Zhang²*, Akash Maharaj³, Yuanming Shi³, Yunyao Li³

¹ Columbia University, ² Georgia Institute of Technology, ³ Adobe

* Work done during internship at Adobe

Abstract

Novice and expert users have different systematic preferences in task-oriented dialogues. However, whether catering to these preferences actually improves user experience and task performance remains understudied. To investigate the effects of expertise-based personalization, we first built a version of an enterprise AI assistant with passive personalization. We then conducted a user study where participants completed timed exams, aided by the two versions of the AI assistant. Preliminary results indicate that passive personalization helps reduce task load and improve assistant perception, but reveal task-specific limitations that can be addressed through providing more user agency. These findings underscore the importance of combining active and passive personalization to optimize user experience and effectiveness in enterprise task-oriented environments.

1 Introduction

Personalization has been heralded as a silver bullet for improving conversational agents (Kocaballi et al., 2019; Ait Baha et al., 2023). Tailoring responses to user preferences have been shown to improve user engagement (Ha et al., 2024), foster positive attitude (Rhee and Choi, 2020), and enhance task efficiency (Joshi et al., 2017). In terms of relevant user information, prior personalized systems have leveraged dimensions such as personality (Ait Baha et al., 2023), conversation history (Li et al., 2024b), demographics (Zheng et al., 2019; Joshi et al., 2017), medical information (Abbasian et al., 2023), writing style (Salemi et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024a), and task-specific preferences (Joko et al., 2024; Luo et al., 2019).

One crucial personalization factor often under-discussed is **user expertise** in task-oriented settings. Users with different expertise levels require different accommodations from task-oriented conversational assistants (Jokinen and Kanto, 2004).




Figure 1: Example responses to the query “What is a schema” for a novice (top) and an expert (bottom).

Novice users may prefer a response that is easier to understand and contains more step-by-step instructions, whereas expert users may opt for concise explanations with more jargon (Janarthanam and Lemon, 2014). Figure 1 illustrates example responses for a novice and an expert: the response for the novice is more comprehensible and augmented with an example, while that for the expert is succinct and jargon-dense.

Personalizing on user expertise may not only address user preferences, but may additionally narrow the novice-expert gap in human-AI collaborative tasks. Experts can often benefit more from AI explanations as experts are more capable of disregarding hallucinations (Inkpen et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024). Early work suggests that adapting responses to user expertise can reduce novice users’ acclimation time (Komatani et al., 2003), improve task efficiency (Janarthanam and Lemon, 2014), and increase user engagement (Palta et al., 2025). However, how expertise-based personalization interplays with the success of *knowledge-intensive tasks* has not been systematically studied.

With the recent advancements in Large Lan-

guage Models (LLMs), personalization can be easily incorporated through prompt adjustments (Zhang et al., 2024). We see this as a unique opportunity to study the effects of expertise-based personalization in knowledge-intensive tasks through designing interpretable personalization guidelines through principled prompting.

As an initial exploration, we target the task of question-answering from product documentation in an enterprise AI assistant on a customer data management platform, which we will refer to as Platform A for anonymity. We augment this AI assistant with the capability of passive expertise-based personalization, leveraging detected and predefined user expertise. Due to the diversity of users on this platform, relevant product knowledge spans an extensive set of domains, and one user can easily be an expert in one domain but a novice in another. As a result, in addition to utilizing the overall user knowledge, we utilize domain-level expertise in personalization, consistent with previous systems (Jokinen and Kanto, 2004; Jokinen et al., 2004).

We conducted a pilot user study to investigate whether catering to expertise-specific user preferences improves user task performance and conversational experience. Participants completed two sets of **timed** exam questions under AI assistance, with the assistant being personalized to their self-reported expertise for only one of the question sets.

We find that expertise-based personalization *improves aspects of task load*, such as subjective task success and temporal demand, and *enhances assistant helpfulness and relevance*. However, under time pressure, non-experts do not always benefit from the personalized, more informative responses, even if they would prefer them in less-pressured contexts. This accentuates the value of active personalization, allowing users to adjust assistant responses in a task-dependent manner.

Our contributions include the following:

1. We design an extensible framework for passive expertise-based personalization.
2. We examine the effect of such personalization using a small-scale, within-subject user study, where we identify task-specific limitations of our passive personalization approach.
3. We explore qualitative and quantitative differences in expert and non-expert behaviors.

2 Related Work

Prior expertise-based personalization work primarily adopts passive personalization, where users are granted little steering power besides self-reporting expertise. Jokinen and Kanto (2004) adapts a speech-based email system, AthosMail, using timeouts, the number of help requests, and interruptions. The follow-up work (Jokinen et al., 2004) suggests that the types of user errors can be indicative of expertise level. Maloor and Chai (2000) develops a help-desk system that maintains local and accumulated expertise levels through system metrics including response complexity, goal complexity, and accomplishment time. Komatani et al. (2003) uses acoustic cues to categorize user skill level and knowledge levels of an interactive bus information system. Wilensky (1987) assesses user expertise by assuming a knowledge-expertise mapping, illustrating responses with examples when the user is a novice. In all of these systems, responses to novices tend to have more detail, while those for experts are more technical. One notably different adaptation approach is a reinforcement learning-based method in Janarthanam and Lemon (2014), where the authors study a human-assistant collaborative assembly task. The assistant’s use of technical jargon is kept consistent with the user’s. Results indicate that adapting responses to user technical jargon knowledge improves user task success. There remains limited literature examining the *effects* of expertise-based personalization in knowledge-intensive tasks, highlighting the need to revisit such approaches in the era of LLMs.

Recent work has explored implicit expertise classification using conversational data, including an LLM-driven framework trained using self-reported expertise and assessment responses (David et al., 2025), a vocabulary-centered deep-learning model (Ferrod et al., 2021), and prompting strategies to classify perceived expertise of both the user and the AI assistants (Palta et al., 2025). Given the scale of our user study and limited ground-truth data, we prioritize data-efficient methods and leave advanced classification approaches for future work. Additional approaches for inferring user expertise include student knowledge tracing (Neshaei et al., 2024; Scarlatos et al., 2025; Jung et al., 2024), as well as through search behavior (Zhang et al., 2015; Kiseleva et al., 2015). We do not discuss these approaches as they are not inherently conversational.




Figure 2: The overview of our system, capable of fine-grained passive personalization.

3 Expertise-based Personalization Implementation

The enterprise AI assistant we leverage for this work follows an agentic design. Our specific focus is to perform expertise-based personalization for both (1) a product knowledge agent and (2) the primary agent.

Figure 2 describes the overall flow of our system. When a user submits a product-knowledge query, the primary agent starts by estimating the user’s overall expertise level (Section 3.2) and then dispatches a slightly reworded query to the product-knowledge (PK) agent. Within the PK agent’s workflow, a domain classifier determines the query domain (Section 3.1), and the user’s domain-level expertise is retrieved. Using this information, the PK agent both personalizes and includes the *domain-specific* expertise level in its response. The primary agent would then incorporate stylistic constraints using *overall* expertise (Section 3.3) to craft the final response.

In the following sections, we mainly utilize a collection of 1,785 internal user queries for the AI assistant, collected during 2024 - 2025. For LLM usage, unless otherwise specified, we used GPT-4o.

3.1 Domain Classification

Currently, the product knowledge agent is implemented using Retrieval-Augmented Generation (Lewis et al., 2020). A noisy mapping between the query and its domain(s) can be achieved through the domains of the retrieved documents.

We constructed an LLM-based classifier for query domains. The input of the classifier includes the query and high-level domain descriptions, and the output consists of a single prediction. To obtain a good classification prompt without ad hoc

engineering, we experimented with the SIMBA optimizer¹ from the DSPy prompt optimization framework (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024). The optimization process aims to maximize classification accuracy (i.e. is the predicted domain among one of the silver-truth document domains). We randomly selected 300 queries as the training set and used the rest as the validation set, according to DSPy official recommendations. Using this noisy data, we achieved validation top-1 accuracy of 82.2%.

3.2 Expertise Classification Dimensions

Prior work has often relied on self-reported expertise levels to adapt interactive system responses. We are interested in exploring on-the-fly options for accurate expertise classification to remove the burden of self-reporting, focusing on the following classification dimensions:

LLM Judgment: Palta et al. (2025) created a prompt to classify user utterances in Bing Chat conversations into five tiers of user expertise. For our purposes, we reduce these tiers to only include Novice (0), Intermediate (1), and Expert (2), and modified the prompt accordingly (Appendix A).

Words-per-sentence Ratio: Kim et al. (2011) finds that words-per-sentence ratios are significantly different between cultural event evaluations written by domain experts and novices. This generally aligns with our intuition that experts are capable of more nuanced reasoning of domain knowledge, which requires more verbiage to articulate.

Jargon Usage: Jargon expressions can be indicative of user technical expertise (Janarthanam and Lemon, 2014; Ferrod et al., 2021). To estimate this, we reference an official dictionary for Platform A terminologies, and compute the number

¹<https://dspy.ai/api/optimizers/SIMBA/>

of terms present for each utterance through fuzzy string matching².

Readability: Prior work, such as Toma and D’Angelo (2015), notes that the length of words affects the perceived expertise of messages, with longer words being associated with more expertise. The length of words (can be approximated as the number of syllables per word) and the length of utterances together inform readability (Flesch, 2007; Dale and Chall, 1948). We use an existing readability calculator library to obtain a set of nine readability scores³.

We analyzed a dataset containing 1,198 internal, use-case-specific queries, each labeled as originating from intermediate (781 queries) or expert users (417 queries). To assess the discriminative power of these dimensions, we performed independent t-tests to contrast the two groups (Table 1). The results reveal statistically significant differences along multiple dimensions, suggesting that our classification scheme effectively distinguishes between intermediate and expert queries. As expected, expert users produce longer utterances and more jargon, and are classified by the LLM judge to exhibit more expertise. Notably, their queries are also more readable. Extrapolating from this, we assume that novice queries would have lower word-per-sentence ratios, less jargon usage, and novice-level LLM-judged expertise.

Dimension	Intermediate	Expert
LLM Judgment	0.431*	0.528*
Word Ratio	9.66**	11.0**
Jargon	0.104**	0.194**
Readability	79.3**	86.0**

Table 1: Mean values along each classification dimension of our intermediate and advanced queries. For readability, we select the Flesch Reading Ease score (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$).

These dimensions will be employed to analyze queries from our user study. If similar trends persist, we can more reliably utilize these dimensions for passive expertise-based personalization.

3.3 Response Adaptation

Balancing explainability against resource and implementation constraints, we choose prompt modification over fine-tuning to shape assistant responses.

²<https://github.com/seatgeek/thefuzz>

³<https://pypi.org/project/readability/>

3.3.1 Content Control

We reference an established framework for different instruction strategies as students gain domain expertise (Persky and Robinson, 2017), as well as observations from Wilensky (1987) and Janarthanam and Lemon (2014). See more details of the framework in Appendix B.

A paraphrase of the following directive is roughly incorporated into both the primary agent’s system prompt and a new developer prompt used for PK agent post-processing:

1. If the user has Novice expertise level:
 - Provide basic and straightforward explanations, avoid using advanced jargon
 - Be more detailed in your explanations
 - Give step-by-step directions
 - Help the user organize knowledge through tables, if and when appropriate
2. If the user has Expert expertise level:
 - Provide more domain-specific, deeper knowledge
 - You can use more jargon when appropriate
 - Be succinct and direct in your descriptions
3. If the user has Intermediate expertise level:
 - Balance your response between the Novice and the Expert specifications

3.3.2 Stylistic Control

During initial testing, we noticed that the personalized AI assistant can still not comply with specified stylistic preferences in the prompts. Consequently, we devise stylistic control developer prompts for the primary agent. We focus on the following dimensions: *Readability*, as novices should receive more readable responses (Joshi et al., 2025); *Jargon density*; and *Message Length*. The developer prompt is injected in the following manner:

```
[Original System Prompt]
---
[Developer Prompt]
---
User Preferences: [User Preferences]
```

We assume that novices prefer responses to be *more readable and have less jargon*, while experts would have the opposite preferences. We additionally assume that experts prefer *shorter* responses (Jokinen and Kanto, 2004).

To create a sufficiently robust developer prompt, we leverage DSPy’s MIPROv2 optimizer and GPT-4o-mini to propose 15 prompts and evaluate them on 150 internal queries. We additionally sample from our assumed expert and novice preferences to pair with the queries.

We use **compliance** of preferences as our metric. Specifically, for a given user query, we would generate two responses, the original personalized

response R_{OG} and the response with the developer prompt R_D . Then, we contrast their values for the stylistic dimensions. For example, if the preference is *more readable*, and $\text{Readability}(R_D) > \text{Readability}(R_{OG})$, then we mark this response as compliant. If the preference is *no preference*, compliance is always satisfied.

The best prompt is a Pareto-optimal prompt with the highest averaged percentage compliance, as this is a multi-objective optimization problem. We document the compliance scores in Table 2.

Prompt	Read.	Jargon	Length
Original	53.1	78.1	100.0
Best Proposed	75.8	75.8	100.0

Table 2: Percentage compliance scores for the two developer prompts along the stylistic control dimensions.

We see that compliance for *Readability* and *Jargon Density* is lower than for *Length*, likely because increasing jargon and reducing readability is challenging in shorter responses, as Flesch reading ease depends on both word and sentence length.

4 User Study

We recruit 16 users of Platform A through internal channels. Participants indicated their roles and experience with the platform in a pre-survey. To enable finer-grained adaptation without excessively questioning our participants, we develop a role-expertise mapping by consulting experts to help us infer the domain-level expertise level of an average person with a specific role. We assume that the expertise level is known and static throughout the interaction to reduce cascading errors from our expertise classifiers. Our study aims to answer these research questions:

RQ1: Does passive expertise-based personalization improve task performance?

RQ2: Does passive expertise-based personalization improve conversational experience?

RQ3: Do the expertise classification dimensions remain successful in distinguishing between expert and novice user queries in our task?

4.1 Material Preparation

For our specific task, participants are asked to complete two sets of eight product knowledge questions about Platform A. These questions are sampled

Q: How did you answer this question?

- A. I knew the answer
- B. I guessed the answer
- C. The AI Assistant gave me the answer directly
- D. I was able to extrapolate the answer from assistant response

Table 3: Follow-up question after each exam question.

from 24 manually-curated questions from publicly available certification exams.

To ensure the evenness of question difficulty among the two sets of questions, we recruited two expert Platform A users to rate their difficulty. These experts resolved disagreements through discussion. After removing questions where significant disagreements remain, the resulting difficulty ratings exhibit a Krippendorff’s α value of 0.899. See more details of the selection and annotation process in Appendix C. Stratified sampling is then performed to ensure that both sets contain the same number of questions for each difficulty level.

4.2 Experimental Procedure

A version of the AI assistant and a test interface are presented to the participant side by side, with the window containing the AI assistant placed on the left. To avoid order effects, a researcher flips a coin to decide if the personalized or baseline assistant is presented first. Participants were allowed 10 minutes to complete each set of certification questions. For each question, the participant must answer a quick follow-up (Table 3). These additional instructions were provided:

Ask the AI assistant about anything you are not certain about. Avoid copying the questions directly into the AI assistant.

Note that while the two sets of problems are fixed, the individual question sets are shuffled. Upon completion of every set of eight questions, the participants completed a brief post-survey to indicate their experience. In addition to the **NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX)** (Hart and Staveland, 1988), the post-survey contains 5-point Likert scale questions about **response quality**:

1. How helpful are the assistant responses? (1 - Not helpful at all; 5 - Very helpful)
2. Are you able to understand all of the assistant responses? (1 - I had some difficulty under-

standing all of the assistant responses; 5 - I had no difficulty)

3. How relevant are the assistant responses? (1 - Not relevant; 5 - Very relevant)
4. How well do you think the assistant’s responses reflect your expertise level on the areas you asked about? (1 - Severely misaligned; 5 - Very well-aligned)

5 Results and Discussion

Three experts completed the exams unaided, and we remove their data from our analyses. This results in a total of 13 participants in our final analyses, comprising of **five novices, four intermediates, and four experts**. For the specific user roles, one person is in administration, one in product, and the rest are in engineering.

5.1 Exam Performance

Exam Scores: We are interested in *how personalization affects exam scores*. As previously noted, the exam question sets are matched in difficulty according to expert annotations. Furthermore, since the personalized assistant is built upon the baseline version, the core response content should be similar. We thus can attribute exam performance difference to the effects of personalization with reasonable confidence. In our analysis, we target questions where participants consulted the AI assistant. The percentage score for each participant is computed:

$$\%Score = \frac{\#(Correct\ Answers)}{\#(Questions\ with\ AI\ Assistance)}$$

Table 4 documents the average exam percentage scores across expertise levels and personalization conditions. Personalization may improve scores for novices and experts, but not intermediate users. Our preliminary finding is consistent with [Inkpen et al. \(2023\)](#): intermediate users have high variance when receiving AI recommendations, while novices and experts improve more consistently.

Cond.	Novice	Inter.	Expert	Overall
B	49.2	56.3	68.3	58.1
P	56.0	51.3	74.2	62.0

Table 4: The average exam percentage scores for questions where the AI assistant is used.

Assistant Response Usage: Participants sent the baseline assistant a total of 88 inquiries, and personalized assistant 89 inquiries. We intend to examine

how participants used the AI assistant responses. During our task, participants indicated how they leveraged the responses through follow-up questions. We compute the percentages for each of the options except “I knew the answer” (Table 5).

Cond.	%Guess	%Direct	%Extrapolate
B	34.5	47.3	18.2
P	42.3	23.1	34.6

Table 5: Proportions per condition (baseline and personalized) for each of the follow-up response options: Guessed the answer (%Guess), directly given the answer (%Direct), and extrapolated the answer (%Extrapolate).

We observe that participants are able to extrapolate responses from AI assistant responses more with passive personalization. Additionally, we find that non-expert participants guess slightly less with personalization (28.2% versus 29.5%). This *potentially* indicates that expertise-based personalization can foster deeper thinking, as participants can comprehend the personalized responses sufficiently to extrapolate. However, it is not clear whether encouraging more mental processing of assistant responses would always be desirable, since users may sometimes prefer more straightforward answers.

5.2 Task Load

Figure 3 documents the NASA-TLX metrics results. We note that, in general, the personalized assistant *reduces* physical and temporal demand, *improves* subjective task success assessment, and *decreases* perceived effort. However, participants indicate higher mental load with the personalized assistant, as well as higher frustration. We include NASA-TLX results for non-experts in Appendix D.2, which indicate similar patterns, with even more significant increase in mental demand (a gap of 0.44 compared to 0.31).

A plausible explanation for the personalized assistant’s worse performance in alleviating mental load and frustration is its response verbosity and latency for novices, which can be more overwhelming in our time-constrained setting. The latency stems from the additional LLM calls and longer prompts in our system design, and novice-oriented responses are more verbose as the assistant aims to incorporate more examples and explanations.




Figure 3: NASA-TLX results for baseline (B) and our personalized system (P) for all 13 included participants. We report the average ratings in the table.

5.3 Conversational Experience

We record the average ratings of assistant response quality in Table 6. Although the personalized assistant is rated as more helpful and relevant overall, participants report greater difficulty in understanding all of its responses and perceive the personalized responses as less accurately aligned with their own expertise levels. The lower understandability scores may again be explained by the verbosity of the personalized assistant.

Cond.	Help.	Understand.	Rel.	Expert.
B	2.84	3.61	3.00	3.00
P	3.08	3.46	3.07	2.92

Table 6: The average response quality ratings for the baseline (B) and personalized (P) assistants: Helpfulness, Understandability, Relevance, and Expertise Alignment Accuracy.

For expertise alignment accuracy, expert users in fact consider the personalized assistant better aligned (Table 9), while non-experts prefer the baseline. We hypothesize that, despite reducing jargon, the personalized responses for non-experts may still contain advanced terms. Without an official taxonomy of jargon difficulty for Platform A, we currently lack the means to further simplify these personalized responses.

We attempt to address the confounding factor of response verbosity in a time-constrained task setting through our follow-up study (Section 5.4).

5.4 Follow-up Novice Preference Study

To investigate novice preferences under more stress-free conditions, we asked four of our novice participants to indicate pairwise preferences when comparing the baseline and the personalized AI assistant responses for the same queries. For each novice user, we randomly sampled three to four of their context-independent queries during the user study where the AI assistant was helpful, and asked them to select the better response along the same assistant response quality axes. We selected a small query sample set to keep the annotation task manageable, and because it is difficult for either version of the AI assistant to answer certain novice queries due to the ambiguous nature of these queries. We include the preference rates of the responses in this setting in Table 8.

The results indicate that **novices significantly prefer the personalized responses under a more relaxed setting**. Novice participants mentioned that the personalized responses provide helpful examples and step-by-step directions, and highlight the “why” about selecting the correct multiple-choice options. They additionally enjoy that the personalized assistant provides more context and explanations in an easily digestible manner, catered to their expertise.

Our results here suggest an interaction between the nature of the task and user preference outcomes. When the novice users are not as time-constrained, they are able to read through the lengthier personalized responses and reap the benefits; in contrast,

Expertise	# Queries	Partial Sim.	Sem. Sim.	LLM Judge	Length	Jargon	Read.
Novice	17.6	74.7*	0.720	0.670*	20.1**	1.97*	63.8
Intermediate	12.0	72.8*	0.674	0.312*	9.31**	1.60*	55.7
Expert	10.3	67.5*	0.673	0.439*	10.8**	1.22*	70.5

Table 7: The average metric values for queries corresponding to different expertise levels. Statistical significance established through one-way ANOVA (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$).

Cond.	Help.	Understand.	Rel.	Expert.
B	21.4	14.3	21.4	14.3
P	78.6	85.7	78.6	85.7

Table 8: Preference rates of the personalized assistant (P) against the baseline assistant (B) in our follow-up novice preference study.

when they are pressed for time, novices may gravitate toward more concise responses, even when those are not as informative. These findings emphasize the importance of considering task-related factors when designing personalized experiences, and a need to offer users active control over stylistic aspects of assistant responses, such as toggling for response lengths.

5.5 Differences between Novices and Experts

We identify quantitative and qualitative differences in how experts and non-experts interact with the assistant, and document results in Table 7.

Qualitative Differences: In terms of purposes of using the assistant, *novices and intermediates* use it mainly as an *educational resource* when unsure about answers or questions, while *experts* primarily use it as a *sanity check*. Experts are more likely to recognize and ignore AI assistant hallucinations, whereas non-expert users often do not. These observations align with existing literature.

Quantitative Differences: To begin with, *novices asked more questions*, likely since novices often require more support from the assistant, while experts relied on their own domain knowledge.

Novice queries are more *similar to the exam questions*, often verbatim (despite being instructed to not copy-paste). To quantify this similarity, we measure the fuzzy string match partial ratios (Partial Sim.) between user queries and the questions they asked about. Additionally, we compute the maximum cosine similarities between sentences in the question and the query (Sem. Sim.). We assume that novice users do not know how to break

down the problem to begin with due to the lack of domain knowledge. Consequently, their queries closely mirror the original exam question wording, signaling more surface-level engagement.

As a result of the similarity between non-expert queries and exam questions, novice queries now resemble the characteristics previously associated with expert queries (Section 3.2), opposite from our initial assumptions. Novice queries from our user study are longer, judged to exhibit higher expertise, and include more jargon. Our findings here again highlights a key limitation of passive personalization in our task context: if user expertise were inferred dynamically from query characteristics, novice queries could be misclassified as expert ones, leading to novices receiving overly concise and jargon-dense responses.

6 Conclusion

We investigate passive expertise-based personalization using an enterprise AI assistant for Platform A. We created a personalized assistant through prompt optimization and compared it to a standard version in a timed user study where participants completed Platform A certification exam questions with AI assistance. Our results show that personalization can moderately reduce task load, improve exam performance, and enhance perceived assistant response quality. However, in time-constrained tasks, features of expertise-oriented personalized responses like detailed examples and explanations were less helpful for non-experts, despite being preferred in less pressured settings. This suggests passive personalization using existing user expertise may not be preferable when the task is time-constrained. Therefore, it would be beneficial to *combine* active and passive personalization to accommodate diverse needs and contexts for AI assistants. Overall, our work demonstrates the potential of expertise-based personalization to improve task outcomes, while highlighting the importance of user agency in interactive, task-oriented systems.

Limitations

There are a few limitations with our work due to its exploratory nature. We aim to acknowledge and discuss these limitations here.

First, despite having a reasonable total participant pool for the user study, there are not enough participants per expertise level for us to draw stronger conclusions regarding how effective our expertise-level personalization is. One other consequence of our limited pool size is the lack of role diversity, as many individuals reported the same role (engineering). Thus, it is possible our conclusions only apply to the particular roles studied, rather than the population at large. For future work, we hope to conduct a larger-scale study with higher role diversity to better support any conclusions made.

Second, our results only pertain to the effect of passive personalization. As discussed earlier, under time constraints, user preference actually shifts towards more concise explanations despite preferring the opposite when under no time constraints. Thus, there is a need to conduct further studies on how active personalization, where users are afforded a level of control over their expertise level or other stylistic personalization dimensions, can further enhance both task performance and conversational experience.

Finally, the use of preset expertise profiles where we map roles to domain expertise does not account for potential differences in domain expertise between individuals, with the same role and level of platform experience. Because the roles are broad categories applicable to a wide range of individuals, the mapping we create does not represent the true domain expertise of everyone under a role with the same level of experience. Thus, even though two individuals may report the same role and experience level, their actual expertise in various domains may vary resulting in a better or worse experience. Again, active personalization is a potential way to address this issue. By allowing users to control their level of expertise in domains, after the mapping has been applied, responses can be further personalized to users' true domain expertise.

References

Mahyar Abbasian, Iman Azimi, Amir M Rahmani, and Ramesh Jain. 2023. Conversational health agents: A personalized llm-powered agent framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02374*.

Tarek Ait Baha, Mohamed El Hajji, Youssef Es-Saady, and Hammou Fadili. 2023. The power of personalization: A systematic review of personality-adaptive chatbots. *SN Computer Science*, 4(5):661.

John Chen, Xi Lu, Yuzhou Du, Michael Rejtig, Ruth Bagley, Mike Horn, and Uri Wilensky. 2024. Learning agent-based modeling with llm companions: Experiences of novices and experts using chatgpt & netlogo chat. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–18.

Edgar Dale and Jeanne S Chall. 1948. A formula for predicting readability: Instructions. *Educational research bulletin*, pages 37–54.

Shahaf David, Yair Meidan, Ido Hersko, Daniel Varnovitzky, Dudu Mimran, Yuval Elovici, and Asaf Shabtai. 2025. [Profillm: An llm-based framework for implicit profiling of chatbot users](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2506.13980.

Roger Ferrod, Federica Cena, Luigi Di Caro, Dario Mana, and Rossana Grazia Simeoni. 2021. Identifying users' domain expertise from dialogues. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 29th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*, pages 29–34.

Rudolf Flesch. 2007. Flesch-kincaid readability test. *Retrieved October*, 26(3):2007.

Juhye Ha, Hyeon Jeon, Daeun Han, Jinwook Seo, and Changhoon Oh. 2024. Clochat: Understanding how people customize, interact, and experience personas in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–24.

Sandra G Hart and Lowell E Staveland. 1988. Development of nasa-tlx (task load index): Results of empirical and theoretical research. In *Advances in psychology*, volume 52, pages 139–183. Elsevier.

Kori Inkpen, Shreya Chappidi, Keri Mallari, Besmira Nushi, Divya Ramesh, Pietro Michelucci, Vani Mandava, Libuše Hannah Vepřek, and Gabrielle Quinn. 2023. Advancing human-ai complementarity: The impact of user expertise and algorithmic tuning on joint decision making. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 30(5):1–29.

Srinivasan Janarthanam and Oliver Lemon. 2014. [Adaptive generation in dialogue systems using dynamic user modeling](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 40(4):883–920.

Kristiina Jokinen and Kari Kanto. 2004. [User expertise modeling and adaptivity in a speech-based E-mail system](#). In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL-04)*, pages 87–94, Barcelona, Spain.

- Kristiina Jokinen, Kari Kanto, Antti Kerminen, and Jyrki Rissanen. 2004. Evaluation of adaptivity and user expertise in a speech-based e-mail system. *Robust and Adaptive Information Processing for Mobile Speech Interfaces*, page 44.
- Hideaki Joko, Shubham Chatterjee, Andrew Ramsay, Arjen P De Vries, Jeff Dalton, and Faegheh Hasibi. 2024. Doing personal laps: Llm-augmented dialogue construction for personalized multi-session conversational search. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 796–806.
- Brihi Joshi, Keyu He, Sahana Ramnath, Sadra Sabouri, Kaitlyn Zhou, Souti Chattopadhyay, Swabha Swayamdipta, and Xiang Ren. 2025. Eli-why: Evaluating the pedagogical utility of language model explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.14200*.
- Chaitanya K Joshi, Fei Mi, and Boi Faltings. 2017. Personalization in goal-oriented dialog. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07503*.
- Heeseok Jung, Jaesang Yoo, Yohaun Yoon, and Yeonju Jang. 2024. Clst: Cold-start mitigation in knowledge tracing by aligning a generative language model as a students’ knowledge tracer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10296*.
- Kyungil Kim, Jinhee Bae, Myung-Woo Nho, and Chang Hwan Lee. 2011. How do experts and novices differ? relation versus attribute and thinking versus feeling in language use. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 5(4):379.
- Julia Kiseleva, Alejandro Montes García, Jaap Kamps, and Nikita Spirin. 2015. The impact of technical domain expertise on search behavior and task outcome. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.07051*.
- Ahmet Baki Kocaballi, Shlomo Berkovsky, Juan C Quiroz, Liliana Laranjo, Huong Ly Tong, Dana Reza-zadegan, Agustina Briatore, and Enrico Coiera. 2019. The personalization of conversational agents in health care: systematic review. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 21(11):e15360.
- Kazunori Komatani, Shinichi Ueno, Tatsuya Kawahara, and Hiroshi G Okuno. 2003. Flexible guidance generation using user model in spoken dialogue systems. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 256–263.
- Klaus Krippendorff. 2011. Computing krippendorff’s alpha-reliability.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Cheng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, Weize Kong, and Michael Bendersky. 2024a. Learning to rewrite prompts for personalized text generation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, pages 3367–3378.
- Hao Li, Chenghao Yang, An Zhang, Yang Deng, Xiang Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024b. Hello again! llm-powered personalized agent for long-term dialogue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05925*.
- Liangchen Luo, Wenhao Huang, Qi Zeng, Zaiqing Nie, and Xu Sun. 2019. Learning personalized end-to-end goal-oriented dialog. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6794–6801.
- Preetam Maloor and Joyce Chai. 2000. Dynamic user level and utility measurement for adaptive dialog in a help-desk system. In *1st SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 94–101.
- Seyed Parsa Neshaei, Richard Lee Davis, Adam Hazimeh, Bojan Lazarevski, Pierre Dillenbourg, and Tanja Käser. 2024. Towards modeling learner performance with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14661*.
- Krista Opsahl-Ong, Michael J Ryan, Josh Purtell, David Broman, Christopher Potts, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. 2024. [Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model programs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9340–9366, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shramay Palta, Nirupama Chandrasekaran, Rachel Rudinger, and Scott Counts. 2025. Speaking the right language: The impact of expertise alignment in user-ai interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18685*.
- Adam M Persky and Jennifer D Robinson. 2017. Moving from novice to expertise and its implications for instruction. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, 81(9):6065.
- Zhaopeng Qiu, Xian Wu, and Wei Fan. 2019. Question difficulty prediction for multiple choice problems in medical exams. In *Proceedings of the 28th acm international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 139–148.
- Chong Eun Rhee and Junho Choi. 2020. Effects of personalization and social role in voice shopping: An experimental study on product recommendation by a conversational voice agent. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 109:106359.
- Alireza Salemi, Sheshera Mysore, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2023. Lamp: When large language models meet personalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11406*.

Alexander Scarlatos, Ryan S Baker, and Andrew Lan. 2025. Exploring knowledge tracing in tutor-student dialogues using llms. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*, pages 249–259.

Catalina L Toma and Jonathan D D’Angelo. 2015. Tell-tale words: Linguistic cues used to infer the expertise of online medical advice. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 34(1):25–45.

Robert Wilensky. 1987. The berkeley unix consultant project. In *Wissensbasierte Systeme: 2. Internationaler GI-Kongreß München, 20./21. Oktober 1987*, pages 286–296. Springer.

Xiangmin Zhang, Jingjing Liu, Michael Cole, and Nicholas Belkin. 2015. Predicting users’ domain knowledge in information retrieval using multiple regression analysis of search behaviors. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(5):980–1000.

Zhehao Zhang, Ryan A Rossi, Branislav Kveton, Yijia Shao, Diyi Yang, Hamed Zamani, Franck Dernoncourt, Joe Barrow, Tong Yu, Sungchul Kim, et al. 2024. Personalization of large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00027*.

Yinhe Zheng, Guanyi Chen, Minlie Huang, Song Liu, and Xuan Zhu. 2019. Personalized dialogue generation with diversified traits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09672*.

A Modified Expertise Classification Prompt

You will be given some sentences (taken from a conversation) from a user. Your task is to determine the user’s expertise based on the provided sentences.

User expertise of the topic of the conversation falls into one of the following 3 categories, which are ordered from lowest to highest level of expertise: Novice is the lowest level of expertise, followed by Intermediate, and then Expert is the highest level of expertise.

Novice: A subject novice is a person who has little or no familiarity with the topic or domain of the conversation. A subject novice may ask questions that are vague, general, irrelevant, or based on incorrect assumptions. A subject novice may also have difficulty understanding the terminology, concepts, or arguments of experts or more knowledgeable people in the subject.

Intermediate: A subject intermediate is someone who has some basic knowledge or familiarity with the topic of the conversation, but not enough to be considered an expert or even proficient. A subject intermediate can ask general questions that reflect their curiosity or interest in the topic, but not

very specific or complex ones that require deeper understanding or analysis. A subject intermediate might have learned some terms or concepts related to the topic, but not how to apply them in different contexts or situations.

Expert: A subject expert is someone who can apply relevant concepts and terminology from the conversation to different scenarios and problems. They can analyze and interpret data, compare and contrast different methods or approaches, and justify their reasoning with evidence. The user also demonstrates curiosity and interest in the subject by asking questions that go beyond the surface level and explore the deeper implications and connections of the topic.

TASK:

Q1. Classify the user expertise level based on the sentences into one of the 3 categories: Novice, Intermediate, Expert. Your answer should be a single expertise level from the provided list of expertise categories.

ANSWER FORMAT

Provide your answers in XML format between the tags <Q1>{Answer to Q1}</Q1>.

TIPS

- Provide all answers in **English**.

B Instruction Framework for Different Student Expertise

We copy the following instructional strategies directly from [Persky and Robinson \(2017\)](#). Please refer to Figures 4 for strategies for novice students and 5 for expert students.

C Question Preparation Process

To select the specific 24 questions, one of the authors used the baseline assistant as the knowledge source to answer the test questions. This author removed any questions that (1) they were not able to answer correctly with AI assistance (2) only require general common sense when answering. Essentially, this step removes overly easy questions and reduces the probability of the AI assistant being imprecise or incorrect, therefore making user performance more indicative of the effect of expertise-based personalization.

We also needed to ensure the evenness of question difficulty among the two sets of certification questions. [Qiu et al. \(2019\)](#) utilized a two-dimensional model for multiple choice question difficulty, **Recall Difficulty** (how difficult is it to recall the relevant facts) and **Confusion Difficulty**

Table 1. Characteristics of the Novice Stage and Related Instructional Strategies^{10,41}

Characteristics	Instructional Strategies
Follows the rules and plans. Acquires information as a prerequisite to learning; Does not feel responsible except for following the rules; Has no discretionary judgment; Spends time remembering information; Attempts to conform behavior to the rules; Learning is context dependent.	Provide basic and straightforward cases with no extraneous information; Provide appropriate feedback; Balance freedom with step-by-step directions; Emphasize basic science knowledge that underpins the clinical situation; Help learners organize their knowledge (tables, concept maps); Help learners prioritize information importance; Put learning in context; Help learners discriminate features of situations.

Carl is beginning his first introductory pharmacy experience. He interviews his patient, performing a medication history using a set of rules or templates he learned from course work this previous year. Carl methodically goes through each item on his template regardless of the chief complaint. Each sign and symptom the patient states is weighed equally. Using learned rules, he links the patient's information to a growing database of knowledge of the pathophysiology of disease, pharmacology, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacotherapy. When preparing his SOAP note, both pertinent and non-pertinent information remain scattered throughout the note because of Carl's inability to filter relevant from irrelevant. Carl is unable to synthesize the information into a comprehensive, patient-specific summary

Figure 4: Instruction strategies for novice students.

Table 5. Characteristics of the Expert Stage and Related Instructional Strategies^{10,41}

Characteristics	Instructional Strategies
Thinks intuitively; No longer relies on rules, guidelines or principles; Analytical approaches used only in novel situations or when problems occur; Has responsibility for self, others, and the environment.	Continual domain specific development; Focus on teaching others or discovery of new knowledge; Improvement comes from sharing, seeking a deep understanding and being challenged by others.

Gary is an associate professor. He uses his intuition to solve problems unless it is a problem he has not encountered. His years of clinical experience has resulted in an extensive collection of "illness scripts" which he regularly uses to solve clinical problems efficiently; he can act quickly because most clinical encounters fit into his previous experiences and these developed "scripts." While his intuition helps him solve most patient scenarios, he favors the unique and complicated cases because he enjoys the learning opportunity. In these challenging situations, he is mindful of his limits and works slowly, looking up information and relying on the foundational sciences to inform his decisions

Figure 5: Instruction strategies for expert students.

(how difficult is it to differentiate between the correct answer and the distractor answers). The average of these two ratings would be the difficulty scores. We employ this framework to recruit two expert Platform A users to rate each of the questions on both dimensions on a scale of 1-5.

Given a multiple choice question and its possible choices with the correct response(s) **bolded**, expert users are asked to rate the question on a five-point Likert scale:

1. Very Easy - anyone with basic Platform A knowledge can do it
2. Easy - anyone with limited Platform A experience can do it with minimal guidance
3. Moderate - a competent user can do it without major difficulty, though it may take some effort
4. Challenging - requires substantial experience

5. Very challenging - only Platform A experts can do it

After the first round of expert ratings, the Krippendorff's α (Krippendorff, 2011) was low (0.137). Further inspection of our ratings indicates that the primary disagreements originate from recall difficulty (Krippendorff's $\alpha = -0.118$). We surmise this is again due to the highly diverse user population of Platform A; expert users with different professional roles differ in types of information they can recall. The two experts then resolved disagreements through discussions. We discarded questions that they still had significant disagreements on. This leaves a total of 18 questions, and the resulting Krippendorff's α is 0.899.

Finally, to select questions for each condition's question set, we take the averages of the difficulty ratings from both experts, and then evenly distributed questions of similar difficulty ratings between the two sets to the best of our ability. Here

are the difficulty scores for all questions in each set:

1. **Question Set 1:** 1, 1.5, 1.75, 2, 2.25, 3, 3.25, 3.75
2. **Question Set 2:** 1, 1.5, 1.75, 2, 2.25, 3.25, 3.25, 3.75

D User Study Results by Expertise Level


D.1 Conversational Experience

Cond.	Novice	Intermediate	Expert
B	3.60	3.00	2.25
P	3.00	2.75	3.00

Table 9: The average expertise alignment ratings for the baseline (B) and personalized (P) assistants, across different user expertise levels.

D.2 Task Performance

We record the NASA-TLX results for non-experts in Figure 6. We notice similar trends compared to the results when including all participants.



Condition	Mental ↓	Physical ↓	Temporal ↓	Performance ↓	Effort ↓	Frustration ↓
Baseline	5.22	2.11	5.00	4.56	4.78	4.11
Personalized	5.66	2.00	4.78	3.89	4.78	4.33

Figure 6: NASA-TLX results for baseline (B) and our personalized system (P) for the nine non-experts participants. We report the average ratings in the table.