| Solution Number | Source of Solution | Fabian Krampe Prediction | Stefan Bente Prediction | Natasha's Notes | Fabian Krampe Justification | Stefan Bente Justification | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | In Favour of Student | In Favour of AI | Confidence in Prediction |
| 1 | student | student | student | •The interface name "goAble" was provided by the repo!<br>•I think use of "System.out.println" is (usually) a good student indicator<br>•Another clue is the shortened variable names "vBorder" "yPos" AI doesn't tend to do that | I guess the AI wouldn't call the interface "goAble" | •Borders are represented in a weird way (3-dim int tuple, origin + length) – I just don't think an AI would do it that way<br>•Use of "System.out.println" | •compact code<br>•relatively clean | relatively strong |
| 2 | student | AI | student | •I thought this student looked a lot like an AI wrt formatting - however the code is quite long, and they get to the answer in what seems to me like a very roundabout way<br>•Single letter/short variable names like "p" "c" "p2" are not very AI like | Advanced pattern matching, style of switch / case, naming convention for constants | •The algorithm to split each command into a list of 1-point-move commands doesn't sound "AI-like"<br>•quite lengthy<br>•maybe a bit "over-formalized", trying to be a "good ST2 pupil …?" – corresponds with the somewhat over-fussy algorithm | •clean | weak |
| 3 | AI | student | AI | • I told ChatGPT to put some random empty lines into this solution!<br>• Yet the very compact, "no unnecessary" code still gives it away as AI<br>• Original conversation: https://chat.openai.com/share/314dcec8-10c6-4d43-95c0-e46e8e8a4d73 (later on did extra prompting for formatting) | Repeating double new line pattern | •Sometimes inconsistent newlines directly after start of a method, or 2 newlines in a row | •very compact<br>•a somewhat "no nonsense" style …, consistent and no unnecessary decorations<br>•(really not much to use as criterium here …) | weak |
| 4 | student | AI | student | •The inconsistent spacing around operators is a good indicator for a student - it's very hard to get an AI to do anything inconsistently - it tends to go all one way or another<br>•Students tend to use more unusual/varied approaches - I have never seen ChatGPT return a Character in code either<br>•Again short, not meaningful variable names - "mt" "st" "p" | getAxis returning a character – most students would use a string or enum | •inconsistent spacing before / after "==" (sometimes with blank, sometimes without)<br>•algorithm is a bit messy, a lot of methods and formalisms | •looks somewhat consistent;<br>•uses IllegalArgumentException and IllegalStateException – I mean to have seen this before, that AI loves these exceptions<br>•uses RegEx, also sth that AI likes | weak |
| 5 | student | student | student | •Commented out print statements are an obvious student indicator - there is no reason an AI would ever add that | commented out debugging-prints | •commented-out System.out.println statements (I guess both atypical for AI …?)<br>•hardcoded obstacles into the for loops<br>•relatively dumb code duplications for ea, no, … | •relatively short | weak |

| Solution Number | Source of Solution | Fabian Krampe Prediction | Stefan Bente Prediction | Natasha's Notes | Fabian Krampe Justification | Stefan Bente Justification | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | In Favour of Student | In Favour of AI | Confidence in Prediction |
| 6 | AI | student | student | •I told ChatGPT to make some of the variables be single characters, to make it look more like a student - "a" "b".<br>•A very clean, elegant solution with perfect formatting is very AI like though<br>• actually showed this code and said that was AI-written during the project presentation!<br>•Original conversation: https://chat.openai.com/share/2a262196-659f-4149-92ad-56129295cc96 | Using position-object, managing barriers in a hashset | •the "barrier intersection" and the "if barrier in path" logic doesn't look like AI, more like a from a human mind (a bit too "twisted" yet elegant) | •clean, relatively compact | medium |
| 7 | AI | student | AI | •Inspired by solution 5, I told ChatGPT to add a commented out print statement to this solution!<br>•The use of variable names "dx" and "dy" was a (lucky) unprompted choice by ChatGPT<br>•Original conversation: https://chat.openai.com/share/51d5aa38-ba81-45ad-82a5-606933f93d19 | Variable names – dx, dy… | •quite long | •looks clean and consistent | weak |
| 8 | student | student | AI | •Very messy formatting, ChatGPT never removes access modifiers<br>•Long lists of if/else is very un-AI | Missing access modifiers, sometimes missing newlines, naming | •…? | •very compact code<br>•very uniform layout | strong |
| 9 | Partially AI, partially Dennis | student | student | •This was a tricky one - parts of the code are written by ChatGPT, other parts by Dennis. I am marking these predictions as incorrect, because the prediction justifications did not really recognise the involvement of AI in writing this solution<br>•I have never seen ChatGPT add JavaDoc comments<br>•But the extensive commenting in the Exercise0 class is an obvious AI indicator<br>•There is a clear style change between the classes Exercise0 (ChatGPT) and Barrier (Dennis) | Variable naming – coords, selective Javadoc | •uses Lombok<br>•the Barrier enum implementation uses too many Booleans (one would have been sufficient – I don't think AI would have done this) | •the JavaDoc comments – how many students do that?? | |
| 10 | Student | AI | student | •The code is very short and it uses a similar approach/logic that an AI would<br>•The inconsistent use of spaces and the shortened variable names "elem" "dest" is very student like though | Looks too clean, works on a very basic level | •Not very elegant code, no dedicated data structures / objects, instead using String or int arrays for tuples (see (1))<br>•inconsistent use of spaces after commas and declarations etc. | •very compact | relatively strong |