International Journal of Electrical and Data Communication

E-ISSN: 2708-3977
P-ISSN: 2708-3969
IJEDC 2024; 5(2): 29-32

www.datacomjournal.com
Received: 03-06-2024
Accepted: 11-07-2024

Dr. Anjali Adhikari
Department of Information Systems, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Correspondence
Dr. Anjali Adhikari
Department of Information Systems, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

YOLO-based face recognition for automatic cheating detection in examination environments

Dr. Anjali Adhikari

Abstract
The integrity of examinations is critical to academic and professional success. Traditional methods of monitoring exam halls are often inadequate in detecting and preventing cheating. This paper presents a novel approach for automatic cheating detection in examination environments using the YOLO (You Only Look Once) object detection algorithm combined with face recognition technology. Our system aims to enhance the accuracy and efficiency of surveillance during exams. We evaluate the effectiveness of our approach through a series of experiments and provide insights into its performance, highlighting significant findings and potential implications for academic institutions.

Keywords: Automatic cheating, examination environments, face recognition

Introduction

Cheating during examinations is a longstanding issue that undermines the integrity of academic institutions and the fairness of the evaluation process. As education systems evolve, so too do the methods employed by students to cheat during exams. Traditional exam monitoring methods, which rely heavily on human proctors, have proven inadequate in fully preventing or detecting cheating. These methods are susceptible to human error, limited coverage, and fatigue, especially in large-scale exams where monitoring hundreds or thousands of students can overwhelm proctors. Moreover, such manual surveillance methods are resource-intensive and not scalable, leading to increased operational costs for educational institutions. This growing problem has prompted a search for more effective, scalable, and reliable methods of exam surveillance.

In recent years, advancements in computer vision and machine learning technologies have opened new avenues for automating the detection of cheating during examinations. These technologies offer the potential to significantly enhance the efficiency and accuracy of exam monitoring. Among these advancements, object detection and facial recognition systems have emerged as promising solutions for identifying suspicious behaviors and verifying the identities of students during exams. Studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of using machine learning algorithms, such as deep neural networks, to detect patterns of cheating behavior based on visual inputs. Automated surveillance systems powered by these technologies have been shown to reduce human error and provide consistent monitoring over long periods, making them suitable for high-stakes exams where cheating can have serious consequences.

YOLO (You Only Look Once), a state-of-the-art object detection algorithm, is one such technology that has gained attention in the field of computer vision for its speed and accuracy. Unlike traditional object detection methods, which require multiple stages to process an image, YOLO processes the entire image in a single neural network pass, making it highly efficient for real-time applications. Studies on YOLO have demonstrated its ability to accurately detect objects and activities in various settings, from traffic monitoring to security surveillance. This efficiency and accuracy make YOLO particularly well-suited for exam monitoring, where real-time detection of suspicious behavior is crucial to preventing cheating. By integrating YOLO with facial recognition technology, a system can be developed to not only monitor behaviors but also verify the identity of each exam taker, ensuring that students are who they claim to be.

Facial recognition technology has also advanced significantly in recent years, providing robust methods for verifying identities based on facial features. Research in the field of facial recognition has demonstrated the reliability of modern algorithms in identifying individuals even under challenging conditions such as varying lighting, angles, and occlusions. In the context of exam monitoring, facial recognition serves a dual purpose: it can verify that the correct student is taking the exam and continuously monitor the student's behavior throughout the exam session. Several studies have explored the potential of combining facial recognition with other surveillance technologies, such as object detection and motion tracking, to create comprehensive exam monitoring systems that can detect not only cheating behaviors but also unauthorized individuals or actions.

Despite these advancements, the integration of object detection and facial recognition for exam monitoring has not been widely implemented or rigorously evaluated in academic settings. Most existing research focuses on the performance of these technologies in isolation or in different contexts, such as security or public safety. There is a lack of comprehensive studies specifically exploring how these technologies can be applied to academic environments to address the unique challenges of exam monitoring. For example, while YOLO is effective at detecting objects and actions, its application to the detection of nuanced behaviors typical of cheating, such as unauthorized collaboration or use of prohibited materials, has yet to be fully explored.

The increasing reliance on online and remote examinations, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, has further highlighted the need for robust cheating detection systems. Traditional proctoring methods are often insufficient for remote environments, where students are outside the physical supervision of examiners. The use of automated systems that combine object detection and facial recognition offers a solution that is scalable, adaptable, and capable of maintaining exam integrity even in non-traditional exam settings. By exploring this integration, this paper aims to contribute to the ongoing efforts to modernize exam monitoring and safeguard the fairness of academic assessments.

Main Objective

The main objective of this paper is to develop and evaluate a YOLO-based face recognition system for real-time automatic cheating detection in examination environments, aiming to improve accuracy and efficiency in exam monitoring.

Methodology

Data Collection: A dataset was created consisting of video footage from exam halls under various conditions, such as different lighting and student density levels. The data was labeled for the presence of cheating and non-cheating activities.

Training the YOLO Model: YOLO was trained using a pre-processed dataset, allowing it to detect individuals and activities in real time. YOLO's training focused on identifying human interactions and unusual behaviors typical of cheating, such as multiple individuals interacting closely or unauthorized material exchange.

Face Recognition System: A face recognition model was integrated to ensure that the detected individuals were authorized exam takers. The system used pre-recorded student images for comparison with live footage, verifying identity and monitoring behavior throughout the exam.

Evaluation Metrics: The system was tested for accuracy, precision, recall, F1 score, and latency. These metrics were collected using both simulated and real-world exam scenarios. Additionally, survey data were gathered from proctors and administrators to assess user satisfaction with the system.

Results

Detection Accuracy

Table 1: Confusion matrix

	Predicted Cheating	Predicted Non-heating
Actual Cheating	50	10
Actual Non-Cheating	5	100

Table 1 Confusion Matrix indicates the classification performance of the YOLO-based face recognition system in detecting cheating and non-cheating activities during exams. It shows how well the system correctly identifies actual cheating (true positives) and non-cheating (true negatives) events, as well as where the system makes errors, such as incorrectly flagging non-cheating instances as cheating (false positives) or missing cheating events (false negatives).

True Positives (50): The system correctly identified 50 instances of cheating.

False Positives (5): The system incorrectly classified 5 instances of non-cheating as cheating.

True Negatives (100): The system correctly identified 100 instances of non-cheating behavior.

False Negatives (10): The system missed 10 instances of actual cheating.

Table 2: Performance metrics

Metric	Value
True Positives (TP)	50
False Positives (FP)	5
True Negatives (TN)	100
False Negatives (FN)	10
Accuracy	0.89
Precision	0.91
Recall	0.83
F1 Score	0.87

Table 2 provides key performance metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score. The accuracy of 89% indicates that the system correctly classifies cheating and non-cheating instances the majority of the time. Precision, at 91%, shows the system's strong ability to correctly identify true cheating events while minimizing false positives. The recall, at 83%, reveals that while the system captures most cheating events, some are missed, which is reflected in the balance provided by the F1 score of 87%.

Performance metrics

Table 3: Latency measurements

Condition	Average Latency (ms)
Normal Lighting	200
Low Lighting	220
High Traffic	210
Normal Traffic	190

Table 3 indicates the system's latency under different environmental conditions. In normal lighting and traffic conditions, the system processes video with an average latency of 190-200 milliseconds. However, latency slightly increases to 220 milliseconds under low lighting and 210 milliseconds with high student traffic. This shows that the system performs efficiently in real-time with minimal delays across varied conditions.

Table 4: Precision-recall curve data

Threshold	Precision	Recall
0.1	0.95	0.90
0.2	0.92	0.85
0.3	0.89	0.80
0.4	0.85	0.75

Table 4 illustrates the trade-off between precision and recall at different detection thresholds. At lower thresholds, the system captures more cheating events (higher recall), but with slightly more false positives, reflected in the precision. As the threshold increases, precision improves, but the system becomes less sensitive to detecting cheating events, reducing recall. This data indicates that the system can be tuned for specific performance needs, depending on whether minimizing false positives or maximizing detections is the priority.

User Feedback

Table 5: Survey results

Feedback Aspect	Percentage
Effectiveness	85%
Ease of Use	80%
Overall Satisfaction	78%

Table 5 summarizes user feedback on the system's effectiveness, ease of use, and overall satisfaction. With 85% of users reporting the system as effective, and 80% finding it easy to use, the system is largely considered beneficial. However, overall satisfaction is slightly lower at 78%, indicating room for improvement in user experience or system reliability.

Table 6: Comparison of Manual vs. Automated Monitoring

Monitoring Method	Time Spent (Hours)
Manual Monitoring	30
Automated Monitoring	10

Table 6 shows the comparison between manual and automated monitoring in terms of time spent. Manual monitoring required 30 hours, while automated monitoring reduced the effort significantly to 10 hours, demonstrating the efficiency and time-saving benefits of the YOLO-based system for exam monitoring.

Discussion

The results of the YOLO-based face recognition system for automatic cheating detection in examination environments demonstrate its potential to significantly improve exam integrity and reduce manual monitoring efforts. The system's overall performance, as indicated by an accuracy of 89%, shows that it is effective at distinguishing between cheating and non-cheating activities. The high precision (91%) highlights the system's ability to minimize false positives, meaning that instances flagged as cheating are often correct. However, the recall rate of 83% indicates that some instances of cheating are missed, which is a critical aspect to address for high-stakes examination environments where undetected cheating could have significant consequences.

The balance between precision and recall, reflected in the F1 score of 87%, shows that the system performs well in maintaining a low rate of both false positives and false negatives. However, the false negatives (missed cheating events) need to be minimized to ensure that the system can consistently detect all cheating activities. Adjusting the system's detection threshold, as indicated in Table 4, allows for flexibility in performance, enabling administrators to prioritize either reducing false positives or increasing cheating detection rates depending on the examination's context and sensitivity.

Latency measurements indicate that the system operates efficiently in real-time, even under varied conditions such as low lighting or high student traffic. With average latencies ranging from 190 to 220 milliseconds, the system provides timely feedback and alerts, ensuring that proctors can respond to suspicious activities immediately. While the slight increase in latency under challenging conditions is notable, it remains within acceptable limits for real-time monitoring.

User feedback indicates a generally positive reception of the system, with 85% of users finding it effective and 80% reporting ease of use. However, overall satisfaction is slightly lower at 78%, suggesting that while the system provides substantial benefits, some users may have experienced minor issues, such as false positives or difficulty adapting to the technology. Enhancing the user interface and improving detection accuracy could further improve satisfaction levels.

A key advantage of the system is its ability to significantly reduce manual monitoring time, as demonstrated in Table 6. By automating the detection process, the system reduces the time spent monitoring exams from 30 hours to 10 hours, a two-thirds reduction. This time savings not only reduces the workload on proctors but also ensures continuous monitoring without fatigue, which can compromise manual surveillance.

The false negatives in the system's performance highlight an area for improvement, as missed cheating instances can compromise the integrity of an exam. Future research and development could focus on improving the system's ability to detect more subtle or complex cheating behaviors. Additionally, while the system performed well in real-time processing, optimizing its performance in more challenging environments (such as poor lighting or high traffic) could further enhance its reliability and robustness.

Overall, this study demonstrates that the YOLO-based face recognition system offers a promising solution for improving exam monitoring and cheating detection. However, further refinements, particularly in increasing recall and reducing false negatives, would make it a more comprehensive and reliable tool for educational institutions. The system's flexibility in tuning detection thresholds, real-time processing capabilities, and positive user feedback underscore its potential for widespread adoption in modern exam environments.

Conclusion

The YOLO-based face recognition system for automatic cheating detection in examination environments demonstrates significant potential to enhance exam security and reduce the manual burden of monitoring. With an accuracy of 89% and a precision of 91%, the system effectively identifies cheating instances while maintaining a low rate of false positives. However, the recall rate of 83% indicates room for improvement in detecting all cheating events. The system's real-time performance, with latencies under 220 milliseconds, ensures timely detection and intervention during exams, even under challenging conditions.

User feedback shows that the system is largely effective and easy to use, although there is still room for improvement in overall satisfaction. Most notably, the system's ability to reduce manual monitoring time by two-thirds highlights its efficiency and practicality for large-scale or high-stakes examinations.

While the system's performance is promising, further development is needed to reduce false negatives and enhance its detection capabilities in diverse exam environments. By fine-tuning detection thresholds and optimizing performance in varying conditions, the system can become a more robust and reliable tool for maintaining exam integrity. Overall, this system presents a valuable solution for educational institutions aiming to enhance the fairness and security of their examination processes.

References

1. Parkhi PN, Patel A, Solanki D, Ganwani H, Anandani M. Proficient Exam Monitoring System Using Deep Learning Techniques. InInternational Conference on Information and Communication Technology for Competitive Strategies 2022 Oct 9 (pp. 31-49). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
2. Padhiyar P, Parmar K, Parmar N, Degadwala S. Visual Distance Fraudulent Detection in Exam Hall using YOLO Detector. In2023 International Conference on Inventive Computation Technologies (ICICT) 2023 Apr 26 (pp. 1-7). IEEE.
3. Méndez-Ortega MG, Herrera-Granda EP, Malte AE, Enríquez RB. Supervision and control of students during online assessments applying computer vision techniques: a systematic literature review. Universal Journal of Educational Research. 2021;9(5):1000-13.
4. Parkhi PN, Patel A, Solanki D, Ganwani H, Anandani M. Proficient Exam Monitoring System Using Deep Learning Techniques Check for updates. ICT: Cyber Security and Applications: Proceedings of ICTCS 2023;3:31.
5. Haque M, Faisal SM, Islam MT, Akash TH. Computer Vision-Based Intelligent Classroom Systems for Efficient Power Management in Large Educational Institutions (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Electrical and Elecrtonics Engineering (EEE), Islamic University of Technology (IUT), Board Bazar, Gazipur-1704, Bangladesh).