How to Reduce Unproductive and Undesirable Behavior in Online Courses

Gerd Kortemeyer Michigan State University

> AAPT Summer Meeting 2014 Minneapolis

Online (for-credit) physics at MSU



Faculty Concerns

All these newfangled methods undermine academic integrity.

Maybe you should take a more differentiated view.



A More Differentiated View

- Cramming
 - Not interacting with the online materials until the "last minute"
- Guessing
 - Submitting "random" guesses to online homework, etc.
- Cheating
 - Submitting other people's work to online homework, etc.



- Courses with online textbooks (e-texts)
- Can actually track use



- Two midterms + final (left graph), weekly exams (right graph)
- Guess when these exams took place





- So, not surprisingly, more frequent exams lead to more frequent access of the electronic textbook
 - More distributed over time
 - More pages total

ONE DOES NOT SIMPLY LEARN MECHANICS IN



Fraction of class (%)

• More exams, unhappy students?



James T. Laverty, Wolfgang Bauer, Gerd Kortemeyer, and Gary Westfall, Want to Reduce Guessing and Cheating While Making Students Happier? Give More Exams!, The Physics Teacher **50**, 540-543 (2012)



- Submitting "random" guesses to online homework
- Numerical problems

A car (mass of 990 kg) is sitting on a car lift in a shop (neglect the mass of the lift itself). While the car is being lowered, it is speeding up with 3.3 m/s^2 . What is the magnitude of the lifting force?

JUST ABOUT TO SUBMIT 57TH ATTEMPT IN THREE MINUTES



SERVER SLOWS





Self-reported: what do students do?

Initial Action on Homework: Female







 More frequent exams?



- Maybe just give students less tries?
- Balance:
 - Enough tries so students can succeed in this formative assessment (mastery based learning)
 - Not so many tries that they are not taken seriously





- Comparing three classes:
 10 tries, 12 tries, and 20 tries max.
- Surprisingly, for all classes, both success and giving up follow

 $\Delta N_s(n) = N_{s,0} \exp(-\lambda_s n)$ $\Delta N_a(n) = N_{a,0} \exp(-\lambda_a n)$

- Tries are independent of each other!
- Lambdas are like probabilities





- Students do not really profit from earlier tries
- Giving more tries reduces the probability of success on a particular try
- Also: total amount of successfully solved homework remains about the same
- Seems like 10 tries are a good idea



Cheating

 Now the most unpleasant unproductive behavior: cheating



Cheating

- Need to distinguish
 - Cheating on homework: leads to
 - Learning failure
 - Demoralization
 - Cheating on exams: leads to course failure
- But also:
 - Cheating has always been there
 - Unproductive collaboration increasing in general
 - What is really new in online settings?









- One class of off-the-scale cheating:
 - "The dog ate my homework"
 - Student claims to have done homework, but "the system did not register it."

Home computers are being called upon to perform many new functions, including the consumption of homework formerly eaten by the dog.

Doug Larson



- How do you prove that the student actually did **not** do the homework?
- Detailed logs:
 - Every access
 - Every submission
 - Every grading decision
 - Essentially every mouse click
- But burden of proof still on us



- Computed receipt number
 - Based on student, course, and problem instance
 - Not stored, but algorithmically determined
 - If the student had this number, it would be unique proof
- Have student write down number, do not accept any complaint without number

Solving for Variables

You have

$$I_1 = \frac{V}{\sqrt{R^2 + \frac{1}{\omega^2 C^2}}}$$

and

$$I_2 = \frac{V}{\sqrt{R^2 + \omega^2 L^2}}$$

where L , C and ω are all positive.

For what value of ω is $I_1\!=\!I_{2?}$

Hint: do not bother to solve the whole equation $I_1 = I_2$. Can you "read off" the value of ω by only comparing the parts of the expressions that are different? You can save a lot of time by doing so.

sqrt(1/(L*C))





But you still might get something like this:

Screenshot as "proof"





- But be careful with accusations
 - What happens more often: student accidently solves homework for roommate
 - Walks up to an open session and does work
 - only it's not their own session
 - Student is genuinely confused
 - Easy to see from the logs



- Another blatant class of cheating: subscription-based cheat sites
 - pay money for subscription
 - enter random problem values in order
 - site calculates the solution





- Job for the General Counsel
- Only defense: copyright
 - Company got own copyright lawyer to claim fair use
 - No way!

Server not found

Firefox can't find the server at www.capasolver.com.





• Or this great stuff

Home	Submit yo	bur book 👘 D	MCA : F	Privacy	Contact u	is : L	ast 500 tre	ends :	
	or le lo Bool	bee	AL	THE U L THE B	ILTIMATE BOOKS, DO	WEB DCUME	BASEL ENTS & L	D LIBRAR MANUALS	Y EVER! You ne
Arts	Business	Computers	Family	Food	Gadgets	Health	Law	Medicine	Professi



Ion capa answers physics





🞗 +1 🖪 Like 🍠 Tweet 🕒 Share

Yes, continue

Go to credit card verification

lon capa answers physics.pdf

Attention, you need to make free Credit Card verification to start download this document



- But this kind of blatant cheating is the exception!!!
- Do not worry about this so much
- Much more common is unproductive behavior on the "continuum of cheating"




 First reaction: simplistic view, just do nothing





- But is this even true?
- Study at MSU: sanctioned versus nonsanctioned discussion forums

Kashy, D.A., Albertelli, G., Bauer, W., Kashy, E., Thoennessen, T., *Influence Of Non-Moderated And Moderated Discussion Sites On Student Success*, Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, Vol.7, No. 1 (2003)





Sanctioned Discussions

Encouraged, since all students have different versions. Feedback and peerinstruction. The plot shows the trajectory (height versus distance) of an object launched at an angle of 75.6 degrees. What was the initial speed of the object? **4.0 m/s** Computer's answer now shown above. Tries 0/12

Threaded View Chronological View Sorting/Filtering options Export?

Anonymous 1 (Fri Sep 22 01:26:29 2006 (EDT))

any hints to start?

Re: Anonymous 2 (Fri Sep 22 01:56:48 2006 (EDT))

You need to find the Y component of velocity... you can do this by finding the height traveled (notice it does not start on the ground) and combining that with acceleration in a kinematics equation. From there use trig to get the original velocity.

Re: Re: Anonymous 1 (Fri Sep 22 12:10:37 2006 (EDT))

how can we find the height traveled and how can we get the acceleration if we don't have the time?

Anonymous 3 (Fri Sep 22 16:41:27 2006 (EDT))

i'm lost on this one ... can anyone help?

Re: Anonymous 4 (Fri Sep 22 20:02:45 2006 (EDT))

Use the squared kinematics equation - so $Vf^2 = Vi^2 + 2a$ (Xf-Xi).



Welcome to allMSU!

allMSU is an online community designed exclusively for Michigan State University students.

If you are not an MSU student, or you are a professor, staff, or faculty member of MSU, you are not welcome here. allMSU is a private community for MSU students only.

If you're an MSU student, allMSU can help make your life a lot less tedious. Think of us as the help you need when you need it.

Unsanctioned Discussions Professors not welcome

	H
	• i
Correlat coefficie and	tion nts
P-values Homewor Final Exa Midterm	rk m Exams

- The course had sanctioned discussion site (with instructors present) and 3rd-party "cheat" site
 - For usage of non-sanctioned site, relied on student self-reporting
 - For usage of sanctioned site, data was available about "looking" and "posting"
- Result: 3rd party: bad; Sanctioned: good

ana p-values	3 rd Party Percent	Post-sanctioned	Look-sanctione
lomework	0.041 (0.655)	0.118 (0.016)	-0.109 (0.026)
inal Exam	-0.348 (0.001)	0.147 (0.003)	0.129 (0.008)
lidterm Exan	ns -0.352 (0.001)	0.166 (0.001)	0.160 (0.001)
uizzes	-0.302 (0.001)	0.098 (0.044)	0.069 (0.157)
CI Improven	nent -0.151 (0.162)	0.121 (0.034)	0.152 (0.008)

Correlation coefficients	
and p-values	
Homey	W
Final H	Ex
Midtor	yn

- Just the not-so-academically inclined students?
- Effect controlled for ACT scores
- Still: significant negative correlation with Midterm and Final exams.

p-values		3 rd Party Percent	Post-sanctioned	Look-sanctioned	
Home	work	.024(.804)	.121(.018)	115(.024)	
Final	Exam	327(.001)	.126(.014)	.098(.056)	
Midte	rm Exams	314(.001)	.116(.023)	.111(.030)	
Quizz	es	247(.009)	.045(.376)	.023(.654)	
FCI Ir	nprovement	149(.192)	.081(.172)	.115(053)	



- So, yes, it's true, mostly
- But apart from "revenge" and "higher justice"
 - not really doing the students a service
 - frustrating to honest students
 - course morale suffers





- Second reaction: Let's hunt them down!
- Should be easy, since we have a lot of data:
 - Access times of pages and problems
 - Submission times of attempts
 - Entered answers
 - Online discussions



So: find signature patterns of cheating

19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1	144034 1444 1444 1444 1444 1444 1444 144	41 4 4276 6 2 7 79 2 9792 6 5 6 4 40 15071 1 3 7 6 7 84 582465 1 514 4 84 5826691 5 5151	8 90% 4 98 980 4 98 843 9 611 947 4 611 947	9000 9000
1040 1040	**************************************	AS 844 0 40 1 776	9 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1	1 2 4 4 × 10 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
014 + >>> + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	7 664 9 21 + 000 2 11 5 70 1 7X 6 8 9 9 6 8	24 100 23 24 100 20 24 100 20 25 100 25 100 20 25 100 20 25	449404 449404 14688 14688 14688 14688 1468888 1468888888888888888	11300110 100010 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000110 1000100 1000100 100000000
	ater	4 71.38 71.88 71.88 6 4.4 8.7 8.4 6 4.4 8.7 8.4 7 7.6 8.4 8.4 6 4.4 8.7 8.4 7 7.6 8.4 8.4 6 7.4 8.4 8.4 7 7.6 8.4 8.4 8 7.6 8.4 8.4 9 9 7.4 9.4 9.4 9 7.6 8.4 8.4 9.4 9 7.7 9.4 9.4 9.4 9 7.7 8.4 9.4 9.4 9 7.5 9.4 9.4 9.4 9 9.4 9.4 9.4 9.4 9 9.4 9.4 9.4 9.4 9.4 9 9.4 9.4 9.4 9.4 9.4		6 1 2 2 4 2 4 2 4 2 4 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
844 844 844 844 844 844 844 844	1 0 444 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	X 8049+09448856661 Y 9 01 4140 019286 X 6 41220 001184 X 6 412262 4 7X8 8 2 29000 1600	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	6 0 / 12+2 76 -7 4 4 4±72 26 -5 7 8 4 50 40 -5 7 8 4 50 40 - 1 7 5 6 17 82 - 1 7 5 6 17 82
897 4 7 2 2 4 812 9 8 2 4 4 821 4 1371 8 8 821 4 1371 8 8 821 5 048244 4 735 5 04824 735 7 0 735 7 7 735 7 745 7 745 7 755 7 7	4 28% 2 4/6 4 28% 2 4/6 4 28% 4 494 1 19 6 247% 8 64 40 866 4 2×428 >66		814684 8146848 8146848 8146848 8146848 8146848 814684848 8146848 8146848 8146848 814684848 8146848 8146848 8146848	★# ●書 「「### ★」 ●書 「#### ★」0 ★# (# 1 = 5 ★ 0 ★# (2 = 5 = 5) ↓ 6 = 9 ★ (★ 0 = 7) ↓ 6 = 9 ★ (★ 0 = 5) ↓ 6 = 9 ★ (★ 0 = 5) ↓ (★ 0 = 7) ↓ (★ 0 = 5) ↓ (↓ 0 = 5)
7.94 8 404 X48 80 1.1.2 10 04 104 84 1.1.2 10 04 104 84 1.1.3 104 104 104 84 1.1.3 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104	9 24 9 9 2 4 8 9 2 4 8 9 2 4 9 6 2 4 9 6 2 4 9 6 6 6 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4	701081 L 7 84 7 988%84 E 6 74 4 988%84 E 6 74 4 04764 E 1 080 4 19465 6 1 066	1 4224 5702 1 4477 8714 1 4477 8714 1 4477 8714 1 4477 8714 1 4477 8714 1 4471 8714 1 4714 1 4714	x172464040 x0254040 x0254040 x0254040 x12404040 x12404040 x12404040 x12404040 x124000 x124000 x124000 x124000 x124000 x124000 x1240000 x124000000 x124000000000000000000000000000000000000
100 + 30 100 x1 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	#0 × # 5	2 9 229 8 9 221 4 272 0 74 90 4 74 0 74 90 4 74 0 74 0 74 0 74 0 74 0 74 0 74 0 74	189762 5004 50075 4007 50075 407 1891	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
本部 本部 本部 本部 本部 本 本 本 本 本 本 本 本 本 本 本 本 本	4400582 2405882 2405882 25105 2510000 25105 2500	01100000000000000000000000000000000000	1200 T0021 1200 T0021 1200 T0021 124 07531 124 07531	244-94 946-98 44-44 44-44 14-8



- In reality this is very hard
- Yes, there is a lot of data, but also a lot of noise:
 - Navigational events
 - Guessing
 - Working with printouts
 - Genuine collaborations
 - etc.
- One can do a lot of good statistics, but in the end one ends up with probabilities and confidence intervals



- Too cumbersome: if you find a signature event, what can you actually prove?
 - Good for research, not for "law enforcement"
- And: do you really want to police your course? What does *that* do to morale?





 Third reaction: let's be proactive instead of reactive!





- Reaction 3.1:
 - Tell them how bad cheating is
- Gave students paper with results on 3rdparty "cheating" site and correlated exam performance
 - Did not tell them about the difference between correlation and causation
- What do you think happened?



- Self-reported use of the 3rd-party site increased
 - Risk was now calculable
- Backfired!





- Reaction 3.2: randomizing problems
- Making doing the homework easier than copying it





Almost counterproductive

If the students do what we tell them to do, this is no randomization at all

Suggests that the values are irrelevant and unrealistic

No Randomization

Different order of options in multiple choice

Different numbers in numerical problems

Different options

Different images, graphs, formulas

Different scenarios with similar physics

Different scenarios with different physics

Completely different problems



No Randomization

Different order of options in multiple choice

Different numbers in numerical problems

Different options

Different images, graphs, formulas

Different scenarios with similar physics

Different scenarios with different physics

Completely different problems



A plate capacitor has been charged. Its plates are then pushed closer together after they had been disconnected from the voltage source.

- The capacitance increases.
- The capacitance stays the same.
- The capacitance decreases.

Submit Answer Tries 0

- The voltage increases.
- The voltage stays the same.
- The voltage decreases.

Submit Answer Tries 0

- The charge increases.
- The charge stays the same.
- The charge decreases.

```
Submit Answer Tries 0
```





- A plate capacitor has been charged. Its plates are then pulled further apart while still connected to the voltage source.
- The capacitance increases.
- The capacitance stays the same.
- The capacitance decreases.

```
Submit Answer Tries 0
```

- The voltage increases.
- The voltage stays the same.
- The voltage decreases.

```
Submit Answer Tries 0
```

- The charge increases.
- The charge stays the same.
- The charge decreases.

```
Submit Answer Tries 0
```



Two ways how the paper could slide off the fridge:

Magnet slides off paper
Paper and magnet
slide off fridge

Depending on values, one or the other decides. A sheet of paper is attached to the door of your refrigerator by a magnet. The coefficient of static friction between the fridge door and the paper is 0.6, and between the paper and the magnet is 1.4. The mass of the paper is 2 gram, the mass of the magnet is 10 gram. What is the magnitude of the minimum force with which the magnet must be attracted to the fridge, so the note sticks?







One problem, sample of two versions

A crate with a mass of 155.5 kg is suspended from the end of a uniform boom with mass of 89.5 kg. The upper end of the boom is supported by a cable attached to the wall and the lower end by a pivot (marked X) on the same wall. Calculate the tension in the cable.

12 11 10 E 9 ŝ 8 Vertical position, 7 6 5 4 З 2 1 Ô 0 3 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 9

A crate with a mass of 177.5 kg is suspended from the end of a uniform boom with mass of 88.5 kg. The upper end of the boom is supported by a cable attached to the wall and the lower end by a pivot (marked X) on the same wall. Calculate the tension in the cable.



At t=0 s, a car cruises at a constant positive velocity. Suddenly, a light switches to red. At t=10 s, the driver is maximum on the brake. The car then stops in front of the red light for over 2 seconds. Eventually, it drives off, and then again cruises at a constant

velocity. The car cannot accelerate with more than 3 m/s². Provide a graph of its acceleration as a function of time.



Based on analysis of student discussions

- Reducing copying: don't use simple problem types
 - Multiple Choice:
 - highest percentage of solution-oriented discussions ("that one is right")
 - least number of physics discussions
 - Ranking and click-on-image problems:
 - Physics discussions highest
 - Problems with representation-translation (reading a graph, etc):
 - slightly less procedural discussions
 - more negative emotional discussion (complaints)
- Use mid-range difficulty problems

Reducing
 copying:
 mid-range
 difficulty

Above
 mid-range:
 more pain,
 no
 (significant)
 gain





 Fourth attempt (again): more frequent exams



Self-reported use of 3rd party cheat sites





Sanctioned internal discussions





- It makes no sense to cheat or guess on homework if the exam is immediately imminent
 - No time to cram later





(2012)

Homework

The proof is in the pudding: Final Exam





 Which brings us to
 exams





- Really nothing new, cheating on exams has always been happening
- Preventing and prosecuting it is one of the most frustrating aspects of our job
 - We are legislative, executive, and judicial branch in one person
 - But even students expect us to do this part of our job!
 - >99% of the kids do not cheat
- But to guarantee exam integrity in the online realm is particularly difficult



- New challenges in online courses:
 - Unauthorized materials
 - Books, notes, ...
 - Internet
 - Unauthorized help
 - Friends
 - Online communications
 - Ringers
 - "On the internet, nobody knows you're a dog"



"On the Internet, nobody knows you're a dog."

Peter Steiner, New Yorker, 1993

- "Normal" in-person proctoring
 - Proctoring on-campus
 - Testing centers on main and satellite campuses
 - University and college networks
 - Commercial proctoring centers
 - For example Pearson VueTesting
 - Informal proctoring
 - Students need to identify proctors, for example
 - commanding officers in military
 - faculty at other institutions
 - librarians, etc
- Mixed modes possible: some students take exams on campus, some with other options

- Special scenario: online exams in proctored computer labs
- Controlled software environment
- IP firewalls
- Example: LON-CAPA
 - Locked screen with student name and photo, proctor password unlock mechanism
 - Randomized problems
 - Different numbers, graphs, scenarios, formulas, etc



Online proctoring




- Using Examity in our courses, but there are several others
 - Webcam
 - Screen sharing
- Check:
 - Identity
 - Desk
- Online proctor keeping eye on student and screen

 If all else fails: write better exams



- Not your typical stupid plug-and-chug
- At least some of the exams could be open-book, take-home style
 - Larger essays, projects, ...
 - Can use TurnItIn for plagiarism check



- Students can turn in derivations and graphs simply by photographing them with their cell
 phones and uploading them to the CMS
 - Maybe we don't know how to do that, but they sure do!





 Of course you can always have an Honor Code

Faculty Concerns

All these newfangled methods undermine academic integrity.

Maybe you should take a more differentiated view.

Caught with cheap excuse!



Thank you!

 Gerd Kortemeyer kortemey@msu.edu