

A Data Mining Approach for Detecting Collusion in Unproctored Online Exams

J. Langerbein⁽¹⁾, T. Massing⁽¹⁾, J. Klenke⁽¹⁾, N. Reckmann⁽¹⁾, M. Striewe⁽¹⁾,
M. Goedicke⁽¹⁾, C. Hanck⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ University of Duisburg-Essen; Germany



Setting

- Data from the *Descriptive Statistics* course at the University Duisburg-Essen, Germany
- Exams consist of arithmetical problems, programming tasks in R, and a short essay task
- Both exams are conducted digitally with the e-assessment system **JACK**
 - Each student receives different randomized numerical values across all tasks
 - Event logs capture students' activities, time stamps, and points during the exams for every subtask
- The test group took the unproctored exam at home during the COVID-19 pandemic
 - The comparison group took a proctored exam in the facilities of the university

Table 1: Overview over the test and comparison group

	Comparison	Test
Year	18/19	20/21
N	109	151
Style	proctored	unproctored
Total points	60	60
Sub tasks	19	17
Duration	70	70

- Data cleaning is conducted, removing students with minimal participation or achievement and students with internet problems

Methodology

- The study utilized an agglomerative (bottom-up) hierarchical clustering algorithm that can be described by following equation:

$$D(s_i, s_{i'}, v_i, v_{i'}) = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1}^h (w_j^P \cdot d_j^P(s_{ij}, s_{i'j}) + w_j^L \cdot d_j^L(v_{ij}, v_{i'j}))$$

- $D(s_i, s_{i'}, v_i, v_{i'})$ the global pairwise dissimilarity
- $d_j^P(s_{ij}, s_{i'j})$ points dissimilarity for each task j
- $d_j^L(v_{ij}, v_{i'j})$ students event patterns dissimilarity for each task j
- $\sum_{j=1}^h w_j^P + w_j^L = 1$ weight of each attribute h
- We reduce the weights for
 - R-tasks, as these tasks have more noise
 - Essay questions, as the comparison on that kind of task are limited
 - Points achieved

- Dissimilarities in points achieved for each task j

$$d_j^P(s_{ij}, s_{i'j}) = |s_{ij} - s_{i'j}|$$

- s_{ij} denotes the points achieved by student i in the j -th subtask

- Manhattan metric

- Dissimilarities in the students event patterns (time of submission) for each task j

$$d_j^L(v_{ij}, v_{i'j}) = \sum_{m=1}^{K=70} |v_{ijm} - v_{i'jm}|$$

- $d_j^L(v_{ij}, v_{i'j})$ students event patterns dissimilarity for each task j
 - Examination is divided into $m = 1, \dots, 70$ time intervals
 - v_{ijm} denotes the number of answers of student i for task j in the m -th interval
 - Manhattan metric

Empirical Results




Figure 1: Dendrogram produced by average linkage clustering of the unproctored test group (2020/21). **A-F** mark the clusters with the lowest dissimilarity.

- Figure 1 shows the dendrogram of the **test** group
 - Overall a lower level of dissimilarity compared to the comparison group
 - Six clusters (**A-F**) standing out noticeably from the rest of the cohort




Figure 2: Event logs and achieved points of the cluster **B** from the test group (2020/21). Above the scatter plot, a bar chart is added to compare the points per subtask.

- Figure 2 illustrates the individual comparison of achieved points and event logs of the student cluster with the highest similarity
 - Similar time path and same points for each task




Figure 3: Comparison of the normalised distance measures.

- Figure 3 compares the normalized distributions of the dissimilarity measures between the comparison and test groups

Discussion

- Three notable clusters (**A**, **B**, and **E**) consisting of two students each
- Collusion in larger groups are not found
- Findings the same with other linkage methods and parameter specifications as weightings
- The approach provides a basis for the examination of clusters based on comparison with a reference group