

Week 3 Video 2

Data Synchronization and Grain-Sizes

You have ground truth training labels...

- How do you connect them to your log files?
- The problem of synchronization
- Turns out to be intertwined with the question of what grain-size to use

Grain-size

- What level do you want to detect the construct at?

Orienting Example


- Let's say that you want to detect whether a student is gaming the system, and you have field observations of gaming
- Each observation has an entry time (e.g. when the coder noted the observation), but no start of observation time
- The problem is similar even if you have a time for the start of each observation

Data

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Gaming


Not Gaming

Data

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Notice the gap;
maybe students
were off this day...
or maybe the
observer couldn't
make it

Orienting Example

- What grain-size do you want to detect gaming at?
- Student-level?
- Day-level?
- Lesson-level?
- Problem-level?
- Observation-level?
- Action-level?

Student level


- Average across all of your observations of the student, to get the percent of observations that were gaming

Student level

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Gaming

5 Gaming

10 Not Gaming

This student is
33.33%
Gaming


Not Gaming

Student level

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



5 Gaming

10 Not Gaming

This student is
33.33%
Gaming

Notes

- Seen early in behavior detection work, when synchronization was difficult (cf. Baker et al., 2004)
- Makes sense sometimes
 - When you want to know how much students engage in a behavior
 - To drive overall reporting to teachers, administrators
 - To drive very coarse-level interventions
 - For example, if you want to select six students to receive additional tutoring over the next month

Day level


- Average across all of your observations of the student on a specific day, to get the percent of observations that were gaming

Day level

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Monday 40%

Tuesday 0%

Wednesday 20%

Thursday 0%

Friday 40%

Notes

- Affords finer intervention than student-level
- Still better for coarse-level interactions

Lesson level


- Average across all of your observations of the student within a specific level, to get the percent of observations that were gaming

Lesson level

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Lesson 1: 40% gaming

Lesson 2: 30% gaming

Notes

- Can be used for end-of-lesson interventions
- Can be used for evaluating lesson quality

Problem level


- Average across all of your observations of the student within a specific problem, to get the percent of observations that were gaming

Problem level

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Notes

- Can be used for end-of-problem or between-problem interventions
 - Fairly common type of intervention
- Can be used for evaluating problem quality

Challenge

- Sometimes observations cut across problems
- You can assign observation to
 - problem when observation entered
 - problem which had majority of observation time
 - both problems

Observation level


- Take each observation, and try to predict it

Observation level

Monday 8am

Monday 3pm

Friday 3pm



Gaming

Not Gaming

Notes

- “Most natural” mapping
- Affords close-to-immediate intervention
- Also supports fine-grained discovery with models analyses

Challenge

- Synchronizing observations with log files
- Need to determine time window which observation occurred in
 - Usually only an end-time for field observations; you have to guess start-time
 - Even if you have start-time, exactly where in window did desired behavior occur?
 - How much do you trust your synchronization between observations and logs?
 - If you don't trust it very much, you may want to use a wider window

Challenge

- How do you transform from action-level logs to time-window-level clips?
 - You can conduct careful feature engineering to create meaningful features out of all the actions in a clip
 - Or you can just hack counts, averages, stdev's, min, max from the features of the actions in a clip (cf. Sao Pedro et al., 2012; Baker et al., 2012)

Action level

- You could also apply your observation labels to each action in the time window
- And then fit a model at the level of actions
 - Treating actions from the same clip as independent from one another
- Offers the potential for truly immediate intervention

Action level

- Unfortunately, building detectors at the action-level has not worked particularly well for my group
- We've tried it a few times
- Maybe you'll find a clever way to make it work great
- And then you can make fun of me in a talk at some future academic conference...

Bottom-line

- There are several grain-sizes you can build models at
- Which grain-size you use determines
 - How much work you have to put in (coarser grain-sizes are less work to set up)
 - When you can use your models (more immediate use requires finer grain-sizes)
- It also influences how good your models are, although not in a perfectly deterministic way

Next Lecture

- Feature Engineering