
ECNUCLAW: A LEARNER-PROFILED INTELLIGENT STUDY COMPANION FRAMEWORK FOR K-12 PERSONALIZED EDUCATION

A PREPRINT

Yizhou Zhou^{1,2}, Jiayin Li^{1,3}, and Zhi Zhang^{*1,2}

¹Shanghai Institute of AI Education, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062, China

²AI Education Laboratory, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062, China

³Institute of Higher Education, Faculty of Education, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062, China

ABSTRACT

We introduce ECNUClaw, an open-source framework for building learner-profiled intelligent study companions in K-12 education. The system constructs and maintains a five-dimension learner profile—covering cognitive, behavioral, emotional, metacognitive, and contextual dimensions—by extracting signals from student-companion dialogues at each turn. Profile updates feed directly into an adaptive strategy engine that adjusts the companion’s guidance intensity, encouragement frequency, and Bloom’s taxonomy scaffolding in real time. The framework design draws on three theoretical strands from the Chinese educational technology literature: Zhang’s Digital Portrait Three-Layer Framework for learner assessment, the Education Brain model for educational system architecture, and the Human-AI Collaborative IQ concept for companion design philosophy. ECNUClaw is implemented in Python and supports seven Chinese LLM providers through a unified OpenAI-compatible adapter layer. We describe the system architecture, the profiling and adaptation mechanisms, and discuss limitations and next steps. The source code is available at <https://github.com/bushushu2333/ECNUClaw>.

Keywords Learner Profiling · Intelligent Tutoring Systems · K-12 Education · Personalized Learning · Education Brain · Agent Framework

1 Introduction

Large language models have made conversational AI tutoring technically feasible, but building a system that actually adapts to a specific learner—that remembers what the learner struggles with, notices when frustration builds, and adjusts its teaching approach accordingly—remains difficult. Most current LLM-based tutoring tools are stateless in practice: they respond to the current input well but carry little structured memory of who the learner is and how they learn.

This is not a new problem. Intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) have long recognized the importance of learner modeling. Early systems like Cognitive Tutors [Anderson et al., 1995] and AutoTutor [Graesser et al., 2005] demonstrated that adaptive feedback and dialogue-based tutoring can significantly improve learning outcomes. Meta-analyses confirm that well-designed ITS produce learning gains comparable to human tutors [Kulik and Fletcher, 2016, Mousavinasab et al., 2021], and decades of educational psychology research have identified the cognitive, metacognitive, and affective dimensions that matter for personalization [Bloom, 1956, Winne, 1995, Dweck, 2006, Bransford et al., 2000].

The emergence of large language models has dramatically expanded the possibilities. Recent work has explored how LLMs can serve as personalized tutors [Kasneci et al., 2023, Baidoo-Anu and Owusu Ansah, 2023], and systems like Khanmigo [Khan Academy, 2024] and SocratiQ [Jabbour et al., 2025] have brought conversational tutoring into practice. Multi-agent frameworks have also been applied to educational contexts [Wu et al., 2023, Wang et al., 2024, Zhao et al., 2026, Liu et al., 2025]. However, the learner models in these systems tend to be shallow—a grade level and a few preferences, rather than the multi-dimensional profiles that educational research calls for. As Luckin et al. [2016]

*Corresponding author. Email: zhangzhi@ai.ecnu.edu.cn

argues, the value of AI in education depends critically on the quality of the learner model, not just the quality of the language model.

In Chinese educational technology research, a line of work led by Zhang and colleagues at East China Normal University has developed theoretical frameworks that are particularly relevant here. Their Digital Portrait Three-Layer Framework [Zhang et al., 2021a] proposes moving from static, test-score-driven student assessment to dynamic, multi-source profiling across multiple dimensions. Their Education Brain model [Zhang and Xu, 2022] offers a bio-inspired architecture for educational AI systems, structured around sensory, central, and motor nervous system analogues. And their Human-AI Collaborative IQ concept [Zhang, 2023] argues that AI in education should enhance rather than replace learner thinking—that the goal is cultivating the learner’s ability to *collaborate with AI to solve problems*, not to receive answers from AI.

These are rich theoretical ideas, but they have not yet been operationalized in a working, deployable system. ECNUClaw attempts to fill this gap. It is an open-source Python framework that translates the three frameworks above into a concrete software architecture: a five-dimension learner profile that updates automatically from dialogue, a profile-driven adaptive strategy engine, and a set of pedagogical prompt templates (called HEADS) that enforce a Socratic, non-answer-giving interaction paradigm.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the three theoretical foundations. Section 3 describes the system architecture. Sections 4 and 5 detail the learner profiling system and adaptive strategies. Section 6 covers safety mechanisms. Section 7 gives implementation details. Section 8 presents five usage scenarios, and Section 9 discusses limitations and future work.

2 Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Digital Portrait Three-Layer Framework

Zhang et al. [Zhang et al., 2021a] proposed a framework for comprehensive learner assessment based on digital portraits. The core argument is that traditional evaluation methods—primarily standardized test scores—capture only a narrow slice of learner ability. Their framework has three layers: an *indicator system layer* that defines what to measure (drawing on educational research and policy), a *data practice layer* that collects and fuses multi-source behavioral and academic data, and a *digital portrait layer* that constructs a dynamic, visualized learner profile for educational decision-making. Related work on multi-source evaluation models [Zhang and Qi, 2017] and learning analytics for student portrait construction [Yu et al., 2020] further developed the data collection and fusion methodology.

The framework suggests that effective learner modeling requires capturing multiple dimensions beyond academic performance—including learning behaviors, emotional states, and metacognitive patterns. This directly motivated the design of ECNUClaw’s five-dimension profile structure. The framework also aligns with broader research on self-regulated learning [Zimmerman, 2002, Pintrich, 2000] and self-efficacy [Bandura, 1997], which emphasize the importance of tracking learners’ beliefs about their own capabilities alongside their actual performance.

2.2 Education Brain Model

Zhang and Xu [Zhang and Xu, 2022] proposed the Education Brain model, a computing architecture for educational AI systems modeled after the human nervous system. The model divides an educational AI system into three functional layers analogous to the sensory, central, and motor nervous systems. The sensory layer captures multi-modal educational data (interaction logs, dialogue signals, assessment results). The central layer processes this data through AI, knowledge graphs, and learner models to generate pedagogical decisions. The motor layer outputs the actual interventions—personalized recommendations, adaptive content, and management dashboards. Zhang’s work on intelligent digital textbooks [Zhang et al., 2021b] explored how such architectures could support adaptive content delivery at the classroom level.

This model provided the high-level architectural pattern for ECNUClaw, which also separates its components into signal extraction (sensory), profile construction and strategy generation (central), and adaptive prompt output (motor) layers.

2.3 Human-AI Collaborative IQ

Zhang [Zhang, 2023] articulated the concept of Human-AI Collaborative IQ—the idea that a new form of intelligence emerges when humans and AI systems collaborate effectively, and that education should cultivate this collaborative capacity. Under this view, AI should not serve as an answer-delivery mechanism; rather, it should enhance the learner’s




Figure 1: ECNUClaw system architecture. The three functional layers map to the Education Brain model: sensory (signal extraction from dialogues), central (profile maintenance and strategy generation), and motor (adaptive pedagogical output).

own thinking and metacognitive abilities. Knowledge becomes a dynamic, co-created resource rather than static information to be transmitted.

This principle has a direct design implication for study companion systems: the companion should guide the learner toward self-discovery through questioning, not provide answers directly. ECNUClaw encodes this principle in its HEADS prompt templates, which explicitly prohibit direct answer-giving and prescribe Socratic questioning as the primary interaction mode [Toppino, 2020, Abercrombie et al., 2023]. The approach is grounded in Vygotsky’s concept of the zone of proximal development [Vygotsky, 1978]—the companion operates in the space just beyond what the learner can do independently, providing scaffolding that is gradually withdrawn as competence grows.

3 System Architecture

ECNUClaw follows the Education Brain three-layer architecture (Figure 1). The system processes each student message through three stages: signal extraction, profile-based decision-making, and adaptive output generation.

3.1 Sensory Layer

The sensory layer has two responsibilities: routing the student’s input to the appropriate subject companion, and extracting profiling signals from the dialogue content.

Intent routing. The intent router classifies each student message into one of seven categories (math, chinese, science, writing, reading, emotional, general) using keyword-based classification. Each category maps to a specialized companion agent with its own HEADS prompt template and subject-specific tools. Messages that do not match any category route to the general companion, which steers the conversation back to learning topics.

Signal extraction. Alongside routing, the sensory layer scans each user message for signals relevant to the five profile dimensions. Table 1 summarizes the extraction approach. The current implementation uses keyword dictionaries for all signal types, which we discuss further in Section 9.

Table 1: Signal extraction from student messages

Dimension	What is detected	Method
Cognitive	Bloom’s taxonomy level of questions Weak knowledge points	Keywords: “what is” → remember, “why” → understand, “how to solve” → apply Error markers: “wrong”, “don’t understand”, “confused about”
Behavioral	Question frequency, session count	Turn counting from conversation history
Emotional	Mood (confident, curious, frustrated, etc.) Self-efficacy	Sentiment keyword dictionaries Frustration markers decrement; engagement markers increment
Metacognitive	Reflection, strategy preference	“let me think”, “I found that”, “can you guide me”
Contextual	Grade, subject, learning goal	Migrated from setup wizard input

3.2 Central Layer

The central layer maintains the learner profile and generates the adaptive strategy on each interaction. The processing pipeline for a single turn is:

1. Load the current profile from the `learner_profile` SQLite table.
2. Run signal extraction on the accumulated dialogue (sensory layer output).
3. Update each profile dimension based on the extracted signals.
4. Generate an adaptive strategy instruction block from the updated profile.
5. Inject the profile summary and the strategy block into the system prompt.

All subject companions share a single memory store, so the learner profile persists across subject switches. A student who shows frustration during a math session will encounter a more encouraging tone when they switch to the science companion, because both agents read from the same profile.

3.3 Motor Layer: HEADS Templates

The motor layer produces the final system prompt by composing three elements: the HEADS base template, the profile summary, and the adaptive strategy block.

The HEADS base template establishes the companion’s behavioral rules. It encodes the Human-AI Collaborative IQ principle through seven constraints:

1. Never give direct answers. Use Socratic questioning to guide self-discovery.
2. Proceed step by step, confirming understanding at each stage.
3. Praise specific efforts, not generic traits. Respond to mistakes with effort validation.
4. Adjust language and examples based on the learner’s grade and profile.
5. Only discuss learning-related topics.
6. Prompt reflection on the learner’s own thinking processes.
7. Help the learner develop skills for collaborating with AI, not dependency on AI.

Subject-specific templates (mathematics, Chinese language, science, general) extend the base with domain-appropriate guidance—for example, the math template includes instructions for using concrete manipulatives and visual representations, while the Chinese language template emphasizes reading comprehension strategies.

To illustrate the composed output, Figure 2 shows a shortened example of a student-companion dialogue with profile-driven adaptation active.

Turn	Content
Student	I keep getting these fraction problems wrong. I don't think I'll ever get it. [Profile update: frustration detected, self-efficacy -0.1 , weak topic "fractions" added]
Companion	I can see fractions are giving you a hard time right now, and that's completely normal—they trip up a lot of people at first. Let's not worry about getting it right immediately. Can you tell me what you understand about what a fraction actually <i>is</i> ? Like, what does $\frac{3}{4}$ mean to you? [Strategy: low self-efficacy \rightarrow increase encouragement, reduce difficulty, step back to basics]
Student	It's like 3 parts out of 4? [Profile update: engagement detected, Bloom level = remember]
Companion	Exactly! Three parts out of four equal parts. That's the core idea. Now here's a question to think about: if you have $\frac{1}{4}$ of a pizza and I give you $\frac{2}{4}$ more, how much pizza do you have? You don't need to calculate—just picture it. [Strategy: Bloom = remember \rightarrow scaffold toward understand with concrete example]

Figure 2: Example student-companion dialogue showing profile-driven adaptation. Bracketed text shows internal profile updates and strategy decisions, not visible to the student.

Table 2: Five-dimension learner profile fields

Dimension	Key fields	Primary data source
Cognitive	bloom_level, knowledge_state, weak_topics, knowledge_tracing	Question patterns, error analysis
Behavioral	session_count, question_frequency, tool_usage	Conversation logs, tool call records
Emotional	current_mood, self_efficacy, motivation, frustration_count	Sentiment keywords, engagement markers
Metacognitive	self_regulation, preferred_strategy, reflection_ability	Strategy-choice and reflection markers
Contextual	grade, subject_focus, learning_goal	Setup wizard, profile migration

4 Learner Profiling System

4.1 Profile Structure

The learner profile is stored in a dedicated SQLite table (`learner_profile`), with each of the five dimensions serialized as a JSON blob. Table 2 shows the key fields per dimension.

Storing each dimension as JSON rather than as fixed columns allows the profile schema to evolve without database migrations—new fields can be added to the JSON structure without altering the table definition.

4.2 Profile Update Mechanism

After each interaction, the system calls `update_profile_from_interaction(messages)`, which processes all user messages in the conversation to extract and apply signals. The update logic for each dimension is:

Cognitive. The Bloom's taxonomy level is updated to the highest level detected in the conversation (e.g., if the student asks both "what is" and "how to solve" questions, the level is set to *apply*). Weak knowledge topics are flagged when error markers appear alongside subject-specific keywords, and their knowledge tracing scores (a 0–1 float) are decremented by a fixed step.

Behavioral. The session counter is incremented once per session. Question frequency is maintained as a running average across sessions.

Table 3: Profile signals and adaptive strategy rules

Profile signal	Strategy rule
Self-efficacy < 0.3 or frustration count > 5	Increase encouragement. Lower difficulty. Validate effort. Avoid direct error correction.
Motivation > 0.8	Raise challenge level. Encourage independent exploration.
More than 3 weak knowledge topics	Prioritize foundation building. Use analogies and concrete examples.
Bloom’s level = <i>remember</i>	Build knowledge connections. Scaffold toward <i>understand</i> .
Bloom’s level = <i>apply</i>	Provide varied practice. Scaffold toward <i>analyze</i> .
Preferred strategy = <i>guided</i>	Use more Socratic questioning. Proceed in structured steps.
Preferred strategy = <i>exploratory</i>	Pose open-ended problems. Reduce direct guidance.

Emotional. Mood is classified from the dominant sentiment keyword detected in the conversation. Self-efficacy (0–1) is decremented when frustration markers (“can’t”, “wrong”, “stupid”) appear and incremented when engagement markers (“got it”, “I see”, “interesting”) are detected. Motivation is adjusted similarly.

Metacognitive. Reflection ability is incremented when reflection markers (“let me think”, “I realized”) appear. The preferred learning strategy is updated when strategy-choice keywords (“guide me”, “let me try”, “help me think”) are detected.

Contextual. Grade level, subject focus, and learning goals are migrated from the student profile entries collected during the initial setup wizard. These are relatively stable but can be updated through the CLI configuration.

4.3 Profile Reporting

The system provides two output formats. `get_learner_summary()` returns a human-readable multi-line text suitable for injection into the system prompt. `assess_profile()` produces a structured assessment with per-dimension scores (0–1) and a weighted overall score, which can be displayed as a learning report for teachers or parents.

5 Adaptive Pedagogical Strategies

The adaptive strategy engine generates a block of natural-language instructions that is appended to the system prompt. This block tells the LLM how to adjust its pedagogical behavior based on the current learner profile. The strategy is not a fixed template—it is composed dynamically from a set of conditional rules, and multiple rules can be active simultaneously.

Table 3 shows the mapping between profile signals and adaptive responses.

When multiple rules fire, the engine composes them into a single instruction block. For example, a student with low self-efficacy who is at Bloom’s *apply* level and prefers guided learning would receive:

```
[Adaptive Teaching Strategy]
- The learner has low self-efficacy.
  Increase encouragement, lower difficulty.
- Bloom’s level: apply. Provide varied exercises,
  scaffold toward analysis.
- Guided strategy preferred. More Socratic
  questioning, structured steps.
```

This composed block is injected into the system prompt alongside the profile summary and the HEADS template. The LLM then uses all three inputs to generate its response. The key design decision here is that adaptation happens entirely through *prompt engineering*—no model fine-tuning is involved. The strategy instructions are interpretable and auditable: an educator can read the injected block and understand why the companion is behaving a certain way.

Table 4: Package structure

Package	Contents	Modules
<code>core</code>	Agent, router, memory, planner, skills, CLI	6
<code>tools</code>	Base classes, tool registry, four built-in tools	6
<code>adapters</code>	Seven model adapters (OpenAI-compatible)	8
<code>education</code>	HEADS templates, assessment, subject companions	5
	Total	25

6 Safety Mechanisms

Safety in K-12 AI systems needs to be layered [Holmes et al., 2023]. ECNUClaw addresses this at three levels.

At the prompt level, the HEADS template restricts all conversation to learning-related topics. The Socratic questioning approach itself limits the companion’s tendency to generate unstructured or off-topic content, because the companion is trained (via prompt) to always respond with a guiding question rather than free-form text.

At the router level, the intent router filters inputs that do not match any of the seven educational categories. Emotional support queries are routed to a specially configured companion with appropriate response patterns. Messages that cannot be classified are handled by the general companion, which redirects to learning topics.

At the architecture level, the tool framework restricts available tools to education-specific instruments with bounded outputs. The calculator uses Python’s AST parsing rather than `eval()`, preventing code injection. The knowledge base is a static, curated collection of age-appropriate content. No arbitrary code execution or web browsing is permitted. All student data is stored in a local SQLite database, not transmitted to external services beyond the LLM API call.

7 Implementation

ECNUClaw is written in Python 3.9+ with the following key dependencies: `openai` for model communication (all adapters use the OpenAI-compatible API pattern), `prompt-toolkit` for the CLI interface, `rich` for formatted terminal output, and `sqlite3` for persistence.

The framework has 25 Python modules across five packages (Table 4).

Seven LLM providers are supported: DeepSeek, GLM (Zhipu AI), Kimi (Moonshot), Doubao (ByteDance), Qwen (Alibaba Cloud), Seed (Volcano Engine), and InnoSpark (education-specific model). All adapters share a common interface based on the OpenAI chat completion API, so adding a new provider requires only a configuration entry, not a new adapter class.

The persistence layer uses two SQLite tables. The `memories` table stores the four-category education memory (student profile, learning progress, session summary, skill memory). The `learner_profile` table stores the five-dimension profile with per-dimension JSON fields, one row per student.

The CLI provides a four-step setup wizard on first run: select LLM provider, select teaching style, select detail level, and enter student information (name, grade, subjects). Subsequent sessions load the saved configuration and the existing learner profile automatically.

The test suite contains 67 unit tests covering agent lifecycle, intent routing, tool execution, memory operations, and learner profile updates. Tests run against a local mock LLM server to avoid API costs.

8 Usage Cases

To illustrate how ECNUClaw behaves in different learning situations, we present five scenarios covering different grade levels, subjects, and profile states. Each case demonstrates a different adaptive mechanism in action.

8.1 Case 1: Mathematics—Fraction Progress with Memory (3 Turns)

A third-grade student has been working on fractions for two weeks. The learner profile records that on the first session the student could not identify halves; five sessions later, accuracy has improved to 60%. The companion references



Figure 3: Case 1: The companion recalls the student’s progress history (“Two weeks ago you didn’t know what a denominator was”) and uses it as motivation rather than generic praise.

this growth history to encourage the student and then guides them to discover the concept of common denominators independently (Figure 3).

Turn	Content
Student	I keep getting fraction addition wrong... [Frustration marker detected, self-efficacy 0.25, weak topic “fractions”]
Companion	Actually, last Tuesday you couldn’t identify halves yet—now you got 3 out of 5 right! That’s real progress. Which one felt the hardest? [Strategy: memory recall of past performance + encouragement based on growth data]
Student	The ones with different denominators, like $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}$. [Bloom updated: understand → apply]
Companion	Good—that’s the next natural step. You’ve nailed same-denominator addition. For different ones, we need a common denominator first. Think of it like this: if $\frac{1}{3}$ is “one out of three slices” and $\frac{1}{4}$ is “one out of four slices”—how could we cut both pies into the same number of equal pieces? [Strategy: Bloom scaffolding + Socratic questioning, no direct answer]
Student	12? Because $3 \times 4 = 12$?
Companion	Exactly! That’s the common denominator. See—you figured it out yourself. Two weeks ago, you didn’t know what a denominator was. Look how far you’ve come! [Strategy: growth evidence from memory + effort validation]

8.2 Case 2: Chinese Language—Bloom’s Taxonomy Scaffolding (2 Turns)

A fifth-grade student can recite a classical poem but cannot explain its meaning. The profile records Bloom’s level as *remember* for this topic. The companion explicitly names the Bloom’s level, frames understanding as an achievable next step, and scaffolds toward *understand* by connecting imagery to personal experience (Figure 4).




Figure 4: Case 2: The companion identifies the student’s Bloom’s level (Remember) and explicitly scaffolds toward Understanding, then references the student’s growth across the month.

Turn	Content
Student	I memorized the whole poem but I don’t know what it means. [Bloom = remember, no comprehension markers]
Companion	You’ve mastered Level 1—Remember! That’s the foundation. Now let’s climb to Level 2: Understanding. Close your eyes—if YOU were the poet, far from home on a cold night, what would the moonlight feel like to you? [Strategy: Bloom scaffolding remember → understand, Socratic imagery prompt]
Student	Lonely? Like I want to go home but I can’t. [Reflection marker detected, Bloom updated: remember → understand]
Companion	Now you understand the poem better than if you’d just memorized it a hundred times. That feeling of loneliness IS the poem. Last month you were only at Level 1 for all three poems we studied. Now you’re reaching Level 2 on your own—that’s a big jump. [Strategy: growth evidence from memory + Bloom level milestone]

8.3 Case 3: Science—Emotion-First Teaching After Failure (3 Turns)

A sixth-grade student comes to a science session right after failing a math quiz. The companion detects the frustration, acknowledges the emotion first, recalls a similar past experience where the student recovered, and replaces the planned numerical lesson with a hands-on experiment that requires no calculation (Figure 5).



Figure 5: Case 3: The companion detects emotional distress from an earlier math quiz, comforts the student by recalling past resilience, and replaces the planned numerical lesson with a hands-on experiment.

Turn	Content
Student	I just failed my math quiz... I don't want to study anything. [Frustration detected, motivation low, routed: emotional support]
Companion	I'm sorry about the quiz. That feeling really stings. You know what—last month you felt the same way after the decimal test, and you bounced back with an 82%. For now, no pressure. How about we do something fun instead? [Strategy: emotion validation + memory of past resilience + lower difficulty]
Student	Like what? I don't want more numbers.
Companion	No numbers today. Let's do an experiment: drop an egg in a glass of plain water. Then add a lot of salt and try again. Just watch what happens—no writing, no calculating. Tell me what you see. [Strategy: hands-on experiment replacing numerical approach, entirely visual]
Student	Whoa it floats with salt! Why? [Engagement detected, motivation increment]
Companion	That's density! The salt makes the water "heavier" so the egg doesn't sink. You just discovered the concept yourself—through observation, not a textbook. That's how real scientists learn. [Strategy: student-led discovery + identity reinforcement as scientist]

8.4 Case 4: Emotional Support—Exam Anxiety with Precise Weak Spots (2 Turns)

A student expresses anxiety about an upcoming exam. The companion recalls a specific past instance of similar anxiety (including the test subject and the actual score), uses it as evidence of resilience, and then identifies two specific weak knowledge areas from the learner profile for targeted review (Figure 6).




Figure 6: Case 4: The companion recalls the student’s past test anxiety and outcome (“You scored 82%”), then targets two specific weak areas from the profile for efficient review.

Turn	Content
Student	The big test is tomorrow and my mind is blank! [Routed: emotional, anxiety detected]
Companion	You said the exact same thing before the decimal test last month—and scored 82%. Your profile shows two weak spots: fraction addition and comparing sizes. Let’s just do three practice problems on each. That’s it—15 minutes. [Strategy: memory recall of past anxiety → evidence of success + precise weak spots from profile]
Student	OK... but what if I blank out during the test?
Companion	Here’s a trick: when you freeze, write down what you DO know on the side of the paper. Even just “the denominator is the bottom number”—that gets your brain moving again. You used this strategy last month and it worked. Trust yourself—your data says you’re improving. [Strategy: metacognitive strategy from memory + growth evidence from data]

8.5 Case 5: Cross-Subject Profile Continuity (1 Turn)

A student switches from a math session (where fractions caused frustration) to a science session about density. Because both companions share the same learner profile, the science companion is already aware of the earlier frustration and proactively adjusts its approach—reducing numerical content and referencing a past success to maintain confidence (Figure 7).



Figure 7: Case 5: When the student switches subjects, the companion carries the profile forward—adjusting strategy based on the earlier math frustration and referencing a past science success for encouragement.

Turn	Content
Student	OK science time! We're learning density today. [Subject switch: math → science, profile loaded with frustration on fractions]
Companion	I noticed fractions were frustrating earlier this afternoon, so I'll keep the numbers light today. Density is just how packed something is—which is more packed, a rock or a sponge? Your intuition is enough here, no math needed. By the way, you did great on the last science topic about water cycles. Let's keep that momentum going! [Strategy: cross-subject profile continuity + difficulty adjustment + past success recall]

9 Discussion

9.1 What this system does and does not do

ECNUClaw is a framework for building learner-profiled study companions, not a finished product. It demonstrates that multi-dimensional learner profiling, as described in the Digital Portrait literature, can be implemented in a working system using current LLM technology and prompt engineering. The profile updates and adaptive strategies are functional, but they are based on heuristic rules and keyword matching, not on trained models. This is both a strength (interpretable, no training data required) and a limitation (fragile to paraphrase, limited nuance). As Hattie [2009] demonstrates through extensive meta-analysis, the effect size of any educational intervention depends heavily on implementation fidelity—whether ECNUClaw's heuristics achieve sufficient fidelity to produce measurable learning gains remains an open empirical question.

9.2 Prompt engineering vs. fine-tuning for adaptation

A deliberate design choice was to achieve adaptation through prompt injection rather than model fine-tuning. This means the system works with any OpenAI-compatible LLM without requiring GPU resources or training data. It also means the adaptation logic is transparent—educators can inspect the strategy block in the system prompt and understand what the companion is doing and why. The trade-off is that the LLM may not always follow the injected instructions

faithfully, especially under adversarial or unusual inputs. We see this as an acceptable trade-off for a first-generation system targeting deployment in resource-constrained educational settings.

9.3 Limitations

The keyword-based signal extraction is the most significant limitation. A student who expresses frustration without using any of the predefined keywords will not have their profile updated accordingly. Similarly, the Bloom’s taxonomy classification relies on surface-level question patterns (“what is”, “why”, “how to solve”) rather than semantic understanding of the question content. Moving to embedding-based semantic analysis for these tasks is a clear next step.

Profile accuracy has not been formally evaluated against human expert assessments. The heuristic rules for self-efficacy and motivation adjustment (fixed increment/decrement steps) are coarse. We do not yet have evidence that the profile converges to an accurate representation of the learner over time.

The CLI-only interface limits accessibility for younger students who may not be comfortable with a terminal. A graphical interface would be needed for real classroom deployment.

Finally, this paper describes the system design without presenting empirical results. Formal evaluation with K-12 students—measuring learning outcomes, engagement, and profile accuracy—is planned.

9.4 Future directions

Several extensions are straightforward given the modular architecture. Embedding-based signal extraction (replacing keyword dictionaries with sentence embeddings) would improve robustness. A teacher dashboard that displays learner profiles and progress reports is a natural addition to the assessment module. Multi-modal input (handwritten math, voice) would expand the range of interaction types. Longitudinal studies tracking profile evolution and learning outcomes across multiple weeks or months would provide the empirical evidence that the current design lacks.

10 Conclusion

ECNUClaw is a learner-profiled intelligent study companion framework that translates three theoretical frameworks from the Chinese educational technology literature—the Digital Portrait Three-Layer Framework, the Education Brain model, and Human-AI Collaborative IQ—into a working software system. The framework constructs and maintains a five-dimension learner profile from dialogue signals, uses the profile to generate adaptive pedagogical strategies, and injects both into the system prompt at each turn to guide the LLM’s behavior. The adaptation mechanism operates entirely through prompt engineering, making it compatible with any OpenAI-compatible model without fine-tuning. The source code is released to support further research on theory-driven, learner-adaptive educational AI.

References

- John R. Anderson, Albert T. Corbett, Kenneth R. Koedinger, and Ray Pelletier. Cognitive tutors: Lessons learned. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 4(2):167–207, 1995.
- Arthur C. Graesser, Peter Chipman, Brian C. Haynes, and Andrew Olney. Autotutor: An intelligent tutoring system with mixed-initiative dialogue. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 48(4):612–618, 2005.
- James A. Kulik and J. D. Fletcher. Effectiveness of intelligent tutoring systems: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1):42–78, 2016.
- Ebrahim Mousavinasab et al. Intelligent tutoring systems: A systematic review. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37:30–51, 2021.
- Benjamin S. Bloom. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*. David McKay Company, New York, 1956.
- Philip H. Winne. Self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3):349–353, 1995.
- Carol S. Dweck. *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. Random House, New York, 2006.
- John D. Bransford, Ann L. Brown, and Rodney R. Cocking. *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. National Academy Press, 2000.
- Enkelejda Kasneci, Kathrin Sessler, Sarah Kuchemann, Maria Bannert, Daryna Dementieva, Frank Fischer, Atanas Gligorov, Anne Heberle, Lena Heindl, Gregor Kohl, et al. Chatgpt for good? on opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103:102274, 2023.

- Daniel Baidoo-Anu and Leticia Owusu Ansah. Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT and its limitations. *Education and Information Technologies*, pages 1–16, 2023.
- Khan Academy. Khanmigo: An AI-powered tutor for personalized learning. <https://www.khanmigo.ai/>, 2024.
- Jason Jabbour, Kai Kleinbard, Olivia Miller, Robert Haussman, and Vijay Janapa Reddi. Socratiq: A generative AI-powered learning companion for personalized education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.00341*, 2025.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Er kang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, et al. Autogen: Enabling next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.
- Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Wayne Xin Zhao, Zhewei Wei, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 2024.
- Bingxi Zhao, Jiahao Zhang, Xubin Ren, et al. Deeptutor: A deep reinforcement learning framework for full lifecycle personalized tutoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.26962*, 2026.
- Yuxin Liu, Zeqing Song, Jiong Lou, Chentao Wu, and Jie Li. Agenttutor: Intelligent tutoring with autonomous pedagogical agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.04219*, 2025.
- Rose Luckin, Wayne Holmes, Mark Griffiths, and Laurie Burch Forcier. Intelligence unleashed: An argument for the value of AI in education. *Pearson Education*, 2016.
- Zhi Zhang et al. Comprehensive quality assessment based on digital portraits: Framework, indicators, model, and application. *China Educational Technology*, (8):25–33, 2021a.
- Zhi Zhang and Bingbing Xu. Ecological architecture and application scenarios of artificial intelligence education brain. *Open Education Research*, (02):64–72, 2022.
- Zhi Zhang. The underlying logic and possible paths of ChatGPT/generative AI reshaping education. *Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences)*, 41(7):131–142, 2023.
- Zhi Zhang and Yeguo Qi. Construction of multi-source and multi-dimensional comprehensive quality evaluation model based on big data. *China Educational Technology*, (09):69–77, 2017.
- Minghua Yu, Zhi Zhang, and Zhiting Zhu. Construction of research learning student portrait based on visualized learning analytics. *China Educational Technology*, (12):36–43, 2020.
- Barry J. Zimmerman. Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2):64–70, 2002.
- Paul R. Pintrich. The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. *Handbook of Self-Regulation*, pages 451–502, 2000.
- Albert Bandura. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. W.H. Freeman, 1997.
- Zhi Zhang, Dejian Liu, and Bingbing Xu. Core concepts and technical implementation of intelligent digital textbook system. *Open Education Research*, (01):44–54, 2021b.
- Thomas C. Toppino. The socratic method as an approach to teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2020(1):19–30, 2020.
- Gavin Abercrombie, Nicole LaViolette, Arthur Spirling, and Chenhao Tan. Socratic questioning by AI: Towards a pedagogical framework. *Computers & Education*, 207:104925, 2023.
- Lev S. Vygotsky. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1978.
- Wayne Holmes, Maya Bialik, and Charles Fadel. Safety considerations for AI in education. *AI in Education*, 2023.
- John Hattie. *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge, 2009.