

Toward Finding and Supporting Struggling Students in a Programming Course with an Early Warning System

BELINDA SCHANTONG, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany

DOMINIK GORGOSCH, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany

JANET SIEGMUND, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany

Background: Programming skills are advantageous to navigate today's society, so it is important to teach them to students. However, failure rates for programming courses are high, and especially students who fall behind early in introductory programming courses tend to stay behind.

Objective: To catch these students as early as possible, we aim to develop an early warning system, so we can offer the students support, for example, in the form of syntax drill-and-practice exercises.

Method: To develop the early warning system, we assess different cognitive skills of students of an introductory programming course. On several points in time over the course, students complete tests that measure their ability to develop a mental model of programming, language skills, attention, and fluid intelligence. Then, we evaluated to what extent these skills predict whether students acquire programming skills. Additionally, we assess how syntax drill-and-practice exercises improve how students acquire programming skill.

Findings: Most of the cognitive skills can predict whether students acquire programming skills to a certain degree. Especially the ability to develop an early mental model of programming and language skills appear to be relevant. Fluid intelligence also shows predictive power, but appears to be comparable with the ability to develop a mental model. Furthermore, we found a significant positive effect of the syntax drill-and-practice exercises on the success of a course.

Implications: Our first suggestion of an early warning system consists of few, easy-to-apply tests that can be integrated in programming courses or applied even before a course starts. Thus, with the start of a programming course, students who are at high risk of failing can be identified and offered support, for example, in the form of syntax drill-and-practice exercises to help students to develop programming skills.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Programming education, Empirical study, Cognitive abilities

1 INTRODUCTION

The ability to program is becoming more and more important every day in a world that is becoming more and more digitalized. Some even see programming as the 4th literacy, as abilities that are so vital to the understanding of our current and future society that everyone will need to acquire them [32, 40]. Naturally, there is much research on programming education practices, yet we still struggle with teaching students programming skills. The failure rate for introductory programming courses varies around 30% and has not changed much since many years [5, 27], despite decades of dedicated research. To address this issues, one line of research studies how cognitive skills are related to programming skills, so that (programming) training can be tailored to how students think and develop programming skills.

For example, Ambrosio and others found that general intelligence and spatial reasoning are highly related to students' overall performance in a programming course [3]. Additionally, attention to detail also seems to be somewhat related to students' performance, but not mathematical reasoning. Endres and others found that both, reading skill and spatial skill, correlate with programming skill after an 11-week programming course [13].

Authors' addresses: Belinda Schantong, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany, belinda.schantong@informatik.tu-chemnitz.de; Dominik Gorgosch, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany, dominik.gorgosch@informatik.tu-chemnitz.de; Janet Siegmund, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany, janet.siegmund@informatik.tu-chemnitz.de.

Román-González and others used an integrated test battery to assess several cognitive skills, but instead of programming skills, they evaluated how these skills correlate with computational thinking. They also did not recruit university students, but students of middle and high school [32]. They found medium (reasoning and spatial skills) to high (problem-solving) correlations, concluding that "computational thinking could be fundamentally linked with general mental ability (particularly with fluid intelligence); and to a lesser extent with different cognitive aptitudes, such as logical reasoning and spatial ability." [32, p. 10]. This could be replicated by Stewart and others with a younger population (i.e., 4th and 5th grade elementary school students) [37]. In the end, Román-González and others have a successfully developed a test to measure computational thinking on the level of 5th to 10th grade students and are able to identify computationally talented students already in middle school [33]. However, struggling students cannot be identified with this test.

Helmlinger and others also evaluated reasoning skills on different modalities (verbal, numeric, figural), and found that only figural reasoning had a relationship with programming experience, such that students with programming experience performed significantly better in figural inductive reasoning tasks than students with no programming experience [16].

Prat and others assessed an entire battery of cognitive skills and computed a stepwise regression model of how these skills can predict programming skills [31]. They found that numerical skills seem to have no influence on acquired programming skills, but, depending on the concrete operationalization of programming skills, either general cognitive abilities (specifically fluid reasoning, working memory updating and working memory span) or language aptitude seem to be relevant [31].

These results are in line with recent neuro-imaging studies, in which a considerable contribution of language-processing areas in the brain are observed [15, 24, 34, 35]. Additionally, the contribution of spatial abilities has also been shown [17]. Thus, there is strong evidence of connection of several cognitive skills to programming.

Not only cognitive skills have been used to assess programming skills or to predict whether someone will acquire skills, also early programming tests have been developed and applied. For example, Ahadi and others evaluated how the development of a suitable mental model¹ for basic programming concepts (i.e., how values are assigned to and moved between variables) is related to the success or failure of a programming course [1]. They found that students who do not develop a suitable mental model at the beginning of a programming course often cannot overcome these difficulties.

Inspired by this line of research, we set out to develop an early warning system for students who are at high risk of failing a programming course. Since learning to program has its difficulties, it is important to intervene early enough so students do not fall behind early and stay behind, but instead can close their potential mental gap (or even avoid its emergence). To this end, we assess several of the cognitive skills and early programming skills that have been subject of previous studies. Our goal is to combine the results in a statistical model that predicts the programming performance of students at the end of a programming course.

With our early warning system, we would have an instrument that would help us to identify struggling students at a point where we would still be able to implement counter measures, such as tailored assignments [39] or training of skills that are related to programming and can be transferred to programming skills [13].

Another approach are syntax drill-and-practice exercises, since novice programmers often have problems with learning the syntax of a programming language, a phenomenon known since the 80s [36]. These problems persist to this day, even for students who otherwise show good performances in programming. For example, Denny and others found that nearly half of all submissions by students in the top quartile contain syntax errors [10]. Based on these findings, several studies used syntax drill-and-practice exercises to reduce the cognitive load caused by uncertainty about the syntactical rules

¹In terms of the neo-Piagetian model, which consists of a sensorimotor, preoperational, and concrete operational stage [25]

of a programming language [11, 12, 28, 38]. We integrated syntax drill-and-practice exercises into the second part of a programming course to evaluate whether they can improve programming skills of students at the end of the course.

In a nutshell, we found that especially the development of a suitable early mental model and language skills are potentially useful predictors for our early warning system. Fluid intelligence might also have some predictive power, but not attention. In summary, we make the following contributions:

- Empirical evidence for the role of cognitive skills in learning to program, strengthening the result of previous studies
- Differentiation of results of previous studies, showing ceiling effects in the cognitive skills of students of a programming course
- Course-specific syntax drill-and-practice exercises that improve programming skills
- The experimental design and raw data is available (<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/9252151/>) for others to build on and replicate our results, and we explicitly encourage researchers of other programming courses to do so.

2 EXPERIMENT

2.1 Objective Definitions

To guide our study design, we formulated 6 research questions. For each of these questions, programming skill is the dependent variable, which is operationalized as the performance (in terms of score) in the final exam of the programming course. In Section 2.2, we provide more details on this exam, as well as all independent variables.

RQ1: Can the development of an early mental model predict programming skill by the end of a programming course?

Ahadi and others have shown that a set of eight simple programming tasks can predict whether students without programming experience successfully complete a programming course [1]. These programming tasks, being provided a few weeks into the course, evaluated whether students have learned the concept of variables as having a state, rather than being a box that contains information. The easiest task was to identify the value of a variable after a few assignment statements, the most difficult task asked students to implement a swap of values between two variables. The cognitive prerequisites to successfully complete these tasks can be mapped to the neo-Piagetian stages of learning, with the easiest task mapping to the sensorimotor stage, and the most difficult to the concrete operational stage [25]. To investigate whether these tasks could be integrated into our early warning system, we replicated the study by Ahadi and others, comparing the students' performance in these tasks at the beginning of the course to their performance in the final exam.

RQ2: Can language skills predict programming skill?

RQ3: Can selective and sustained attention predict programming skill?

RQ4: Can fluid intelligence predict programming skill?

Since all these cognitive skills have been identified in some studies as predictor for learning to program, we include these in our study. The advantage of using purely cognitive skills that do not require knowledge of programming is that we can assess them even before a programming course starts, so that we might be able to identify possibly struggling students even before they struggle.

RQ5: What skills are suitable for an early warning system?

Previous studies have shown varying levels of predictive power for all the skills mentioned in RQ1 to RQ4. Some correlations are promising (e.g., between the Computational Thinking test and problem-solving ability with $r = 0.67$ [32], or between language aptitude and programming learning rate with $r = 0.56$ [31]). However, this means that only some

portion of the variance in the acquired programming skill can be accounted for. To increase the predictive power of these skills, we aim at combining them (i.e., the development of a suitable mental model (RQ1), language skills (RQ2), selected and sustained attention (RQ3), and fluid intelligence(RQ4)) into one model.

RQ6: Can syntax drill-and-practice exercises improve programming skill?

To provide an actionable plan for educators, we integrate syntax drill-and-practice exercises to our programming courses. Previous studies have shown the success of such exercises in improving the learning outcome of a programming course [11, 12, 28, 38]. Given the consistent finding of language skills as predictor for programming skill, and that learning syntax is difficult [10] and coupled to language skills, this seems to be a promising option as intervention for students who appear to have fallen behind in a programming course.

2.2 Material

In this section, we present the operationalization of our variables, arranged by research question. We start with the dependent variable, the programming skill.

2.2.1 Programming Skill. As indicator for programming skill, we use the points that students receive in the final exam. The format was a take-home exam. Students received instructions to implement three programs. We defined four tasks in total, and students could choose which of Task 3 or 4 to implement.

- Task 1: Implementation of a double linked list for integer values, including an algorithm that successively deletes sub-lists whose sums equal a prime number.
- Task 2: Implementation of a tree structure with weighted nodes, including an algorithm that searches for all nodes within a certain range of weight, while also considering the weight of their child-nodes.
and either one of:
- Task 3: Implementation of an algorithm that finds the shortest path on the board of a game while considering different types of terrain and different movement-speed assigned to units in the game.
- Task 4: Implementation of the simulation of a social network, including methods to identify friendship-circles within the network.

The time limit to complete the tasks was six hours. Students could implement their solutions in either Java or Python; both languages were used in the programming course. Since this was an open-book exam, students were allowed to use materials and code from the course and the internet, but needed to work alone.

While the conditions of the exam are less controlled than in a closed-book exam under observation, the measurement of programming skills is much more realistic. Thus, although there might be some outliers among the students about how they conduct the exam (e.g., seek help of colleagues), we believe that, for the majority of students, we have a valid operationalization of programming skill.

2.2.2 RQ1: Can the development of an early mental model predict programming skill by the end of a programming course? To evaluate whether and how students have developed an early mental model of programming, we used the Early-mental-model test (Early-MM) created by Ahadi and others [1]. It consists of eight tasks that test the student's understanding of assignment statements, one of the first concepts required to learn in programming, with the most difficult one requiring to implement a value swap between two variables. For each task, students get either 0 or 1 point, so the minimum of this test would be 0 points and the maximum 8 points.

1. In the boxes, write the values in the variables after the following code has been executed:
- ```
a = 1
b = 2
a = 3
```
- The value in a is:  
The value in b is:
8. Assume the variables `first` and `second` have been initialized. Write code to swap the values stored in `first` and `second`.
- Your Answer:
- (a) The easiest task was to name the values of variables a solution would be `temp = first; first = second; and b (a = 3 and b = 2 is correct).`
- (b) The most difficult task was to implement a swap. A correct solution would be `temp = first; first = second; second = temp`

Fig. 1. Tasks of the Early-MM [1].

In Figure 1, we show the easiest and most difficult tasks with correct solutions. Students who can implement the swap correctly must have fully understood the concept of variables having a state, whereas students who fail to answer the easiest question correctly have not yet understood how variables work. However, since variables are the building blocks of most programs, students will struggle with keeping up understanding higher concepts. Thus, these tasks may be a suitable predictor for programming skills.

**2.2.3 RQ2: Can language skills predict programming skill?** Since language skills are reliably found to predict programming skill, we selected several language skill tests to have different options to explore a relationship with programming skills. All three tests were provided by a local institute specialized in test development (will be disclosed after reviewing).

*C-Test (English).* A C-Test is an integrative written test to measure overall fluency in a specified language and is usually used to assess the participant's reference level in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)<sup>2</sup> [2]. The C-Test specifically ranked participants from the CEFR levels B1 to C1. For comparison, the level expected from high-school graduates is B2, with high-performing students being able to reach C1 [20]. The C-Test has four items which consist of a cloze text in the target language that is constructed according to specific rules. Each text has 25 gaps. We show an example with solution in Figure 2. The participant's score is computed by counting the correctly solved gaps, leading to a maximum score of 100 points. Participants had 5 minutes to solve each item.

*Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Test (English).* The vocabulary tests assess vocabulary size and indicate the test person's reading level in the target language. They assess the participant's vocabulary knowledge in five different ranks, which are based on high-frequency vocabulary lists. The first rank assesses knowledge among the 1000 most frequent words in the target language, the second rank among the most frequent 2000, and so forth, up to rank five [18]. A participant is considered to have passed a rank if they reach at least 80 % of the possible points in the rank. From the passed vocabulary ranks, the person's reading level in the CEFR can be inferred, in this case, ranging from level A2 to B2, so narrowly reaching the level expected from high-school graduates [20]. We used both, a receptive and a productive vocabulary test. Receptive (or passive) vocabulary competence refers to the words a person is able to understand while reading, which is usually higher than the productive vocabulary competence, which refers to words that can be actively used [18]. Points are awarded for both tests by counting the correctly solved tasks. Participants had a time limit of 30 minutes per test. Both tests use similar, but different items:

<sup>2</sup>The CEFR describes foreign language proficiency at three divisions, each divided into two levels: Basic users (levels A1-A2), independent users (levels B1-B2) and proficient users (levels C1-C2), with the highest level (C2) being similar to a native speaker. For further explanation, see [7].

## Community Projects

We can all agree that a clean neighborhood is a happy neighborhood. Are yo  
 streets fu  of gar  ? Then orga  a proj  
 together wi  your fri  and neig  . First, y  
 will ne  to ma  a pl  . Then lo  for  
 volun  and req  donations fr  local busin  .  
 Coordinating eve  like th  can b  a chal  .  
 However, evid  shows th  when peo  take ca   
 of their neighborhood, the community grows and becomes stronger together.

(a) As shown to students.

## Community Projects

We can all agree that a clean neighborhood is a happy neighborhood. Are yo  
 ur  streets fu  ll  of gar  bage  ? Then orga  nise  a proj  
 ect  together wi  th  your fri  ends  and neig  bours  . First, y  
 ou  will ne  ed  to ma  ke  a pl  an  . Then lo  ok  for  
 volun  teers  and req  uest  donations fr  om  local busin  esses  .  
 Coordinating eve  rything  like th  is  can b  e  a chal  lenge  .  
 However, evid  ence  shows th  at  when peo  ple  take ca  re  
 of their neighborhood, the community grows and becomes stronger together.

(b) Version with solutions (not shown to students).

Fig. 2. One item in the C-Test.

|     |              |                                           |
|-----|--------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1a: | - Select - ▾ | - an idea                                 |
| 1b: | age          | - how old somebody is                     |
| 1c: | road         | - the place where something or someone is |
|     | order        |                                           |
|     | future       |                                           |
|     | position     |                                           |
|     | concept      |                                           |

*Example: In Britain, children must go to s\_\_\_\_\_ between the ages of four and sixteen.*

(a) For question 1a, 'concept' needs to be selected from the drop-down menu. [18]

(b) The solution is 'school', thus 'chool' needs to be added. [18]

Fig. 3. Possible items of the R-Voc (a) and the P-Voc (b).

- An item of the receptive vocabulary test (R-Voc) consists of a drop-down menu with six words from the current vocabulary level, and three phrases that define one of the words from the drop-down menu, as shown in Figure 3a. The test person matches the words with the corresponding phrases. The tests consisted of 10 items per rank with up to 3 points per item, leading to maximum 30 points per rank and a total possible score of 150.
- An item of the productive vocabulary test (P-Voc) consists of a cloze text that is one or two sentences long. There is one gap for the target word, as shown in Figure 3b. To disambiguate an item, up to the first three letters of the missing word are given. The test consists of 18 items per rank with 1 point per correctly solved item, leading to a maximum of 18 points per rank and a total possible score of 90.

**2.2.4 RQ3: Can selective and sustained attention predict programming skill?** The d2 Test of Attention measures selective and sustained attention, and visual scanning speed, allowing for a neuropsychological estimation of individual attention and concentration performance [6]. For this study, we used the digital version of the d2-R (Revision). In Figure 4, we show an excerpt of the test. Participants were instructed to react as quickly as possible to every symbol containing a d with two lines, no matter where the lines were. The test consists of 14 items, with a time limit of 20 seconds per item. One item consists of 6 rows, each row consisting of 10 symbols. Including instructions, the test can take up to 10 minutes




Fig. 4. The task is to react as quickly as possible to any d with two lines. The target symbols are highlighted with thicker boxes for purpose of illustration.




Fig. 5. DESIGMA-A: Participants need to compose the missing figure of the matrix. In this example, the correct solution is a circle, which can be composed by the elements of the second column. [4]

to complete, but typically takes less time. The results of the d2-R are measured on a T scale, so the standardized mean is 50, with a standard deviation of 10. The test’s reference groups consists of Europeans, male and female, aged 18 to 55 [6].

**2.2.5 RQ4: Can fluid intelligence predict programming skill?** The DESIGMA-Advanced is a test for fluid intelligence using figural matrices. In Figure 5, we show one item of the test. The missing figure is a circle, which participants can compose with the elements of the second column. With this composition approach, distractor elements are not necessary, so the probability that a participant can guess the solution by process of elimination is reduced [4].

There are 38 items in the entire test, and the time limit is 90 seconds per item, meaning the test takes at max 57 minutes to complete. The results of the DESIGMA-A are measured on the IQ scale, so it has a standardized mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

**2.2.6 RQ6: Can syntax drill-and-practice exercises improve programming skill?** We designed syntax drill-and-practice exercises for the following programming constructs: conditions, for-, while- and do-while-loops. We introduced syntax errors in each of the constructs. We defined 5 categories of errors: brackets (mismatched, unbalanced, or abused usage of brackets, braces and parenthesis), semicolon (e.g., an unnecessary semicolon, or an incorrect character instead of a semicolon), loop counter (e.g., `i+` instead of `i++`), keywords (e.g., capitalized keywords) and several other errors that do not fit into the categories (e.g., a misplaced `else if`). In Figure 6, we show examples for different constructs and different error categories.

The tasks were summarized per programming construct, leading to 23 to 25 tasks per construct (98 tasks in total), with varying categories of errors. For each construct, we expected students to take about 15 minutes to complete, but there was no time limit for the exercises. Students should identify and fix errors so that a program would compile; each task contained one error. The responses were assessed automatically, giving the participants direct feedback. Students could obtain either 0 or 1 point for a task, leading to a maximum of 98 points. We presented the programming constructs in fixed order, but the individual tasks per construct were randomized.

## 2.3 Participants

As participants, we recruit students from a programming course that spans two semesters. The first part of the course is referred to as *Algorithms and Programming* (AP) and the second part is called *Data Structures* (DS). Due to the pandemic and varying study regulations, we have a high fluctuation of participants for the different research questions. Specifically, 111 students participated for RQ1, and for the remaining RQs, we have between 35 and 50 participants. The age ranged between 18 to about 43. Students who started AP have been programming for an average of about 1.8 years ( $sd = 1.8$ ) before taking the course. Most students are enrolled in a major that is rooted in the department of computer science at our university, with some of the majors being more interdisciplinary. All students are non-native English speakers. A detailed breakdown of students based on each research question is available on the project's Web site.

## 2.4 Conduct

After consulting with the instructors of AP, the Early-MM test was released to the students shortly after the start of the first semester. It was given in the form of an online survey, which was available to the students over the course of two months. As compensation, students received 2 bonus points for their assignments in AP for participation (independent of the performance).

In DS, the experiment was linked with assignments that were mandatory to pass for the students to be allowed to take part in the exam. Students would need to get at least 50% of the points that were achievable in the assignments to pass. Students could choose whether they wanted to participate in the experiment or not. If they chose to participate, they would get slightly easier assignments to make up for the extra time they would use for the experiment, but they still had access to the normal version of the assignments in case they needed it, for example, in preparation for the exam. In addition, students who participated in all tests were offered two bonus points to count to the 50% of points, independent of their performance in the tests. Few students exploited this by just clicking through tests, which we removed from our analysis (we present details in the results section).



```

1 public class SyntaxExample {
2
3 public static void main(String [] args){
4 int x = 10;
5
6 if (x = 10) {
7 System.out.println("x is 10");
8 } else {
9 System.out.println("x is not 10");
10 }
11 }
12 }
(a)
1 public class SyntaxExample {
2
3 public static void main(String[] args){
4 print()
5 }
6
7 static void print() {
8 for (int i = 1, i <= 10, i++) {
9 System.out.println(i);
10 }
11 }
12 }
(b)
1 public class SyntaxExample {
2
3 public static void main (String[] args){
4 System.out.println(sum(12));
5 }
6
7 static int sum(int number) {
8 int i = 0;
9 int sum = 1;
10
11 while (i <= n) {
12 sum += i;
13 i++;
14 }
15 return sum;
16 }
17 }
(c)
1 public class SyntaxExample {
2
3 public static void main(String[] args) {
4 print();
5 }
6
7 static void print() {
8 int i = -2;
9
10 do {
11 System.out.println(i);
12 i++;
13 } While (i <= 3);
14 }
15 }
(d)

```

Fig. 6. Syntax drill-and-practice exercises. The errors are: (a) Line 6 - Incorrect Assignment Operator (Category: Other), (b) Line 8 - Incorrect separators in the head of a for-loop (Category: Semicolon), (c) Line 14 - Missing closing bracket (Category: Bracket), (d) Line 13- incorrect capitalization of a keyword (Category: Capitalization).

The course spanned fourteen weeks. Assignments were distributed weekly starting in the third week of the course. The students had two weeks to complete each assignment, including the tasks for the experiment. The tests and syntax drill-and-practice exercises were distributed as follows:

- Week 7: Syntax drill-and-practice exercises
- Week 9: d2-R and C-Test
- Week 10: DESIGMA-A, R-Voc and P-Voc

One could argue that applying the cognitive tests to be used as early warning systems so late in the course does not make much sense. However, since in this experiment, we are developing the early warning system (not applying it), and since the cognitive skills as measured by these tests are not subject to change considerably over the course of several months, the results would still tell us whether these tests are useful for an early warning system. In that case, they must be applied early on, possibly even before the start of a course.

The final exam took place five weeks after the end of the fourteen-week course.

### 3 THREATS TO VALIDITY

#### 3.1 Construct Validity

With measuring cognitive constructs, it is always challenging to find a suitable operationalization that is also fast enough to apply. With this compromise, we have used for most cognitive skills established tests that are fast to apply; however, we found that they cannot differentiate well among the high-skilled population of students. Thus, we might misinterpret the role of certain cognitive skills as predictor for programming skill. To mitigate this threat, we take it into account when discussing the results.

For programming skills, one could also argue whether the final exam is a good operationalization. However, since the exam takes place in a realistic setting with sufficient time, we believe that our measurement of programming skill is valid (e.g., evaluation apprehension is reduced).

#### 3.2 Internal

Since participation was voluntary, we have a high risk of selection bias. Given the number of tests, distributed over two semesters, we have only a relatively small number of students who participated in all tests and the final exam. Thus, our results for the early warning system should be considered in light of this higher motivation.

Additionally, students did all the tests at home, online, and without supervision. Thus, we cannot be sure that all students followed the protocol for all tests. To mitigate this threat, we removed outliers that indicate when students violated the instructions (e.g., were considerably faster than the expected time a test takes).

#### 3.3 External Validity

It is difficult to generalize the results to other settings, such as different programming courses, different majors, or different education systems. Nevertheless, since our sample is representative for many universities in our country, they have an implication for many students who want to learn programming.

#### 3.4 Statistical Conclusion Validity

Unfortunately, due to the nature of the long-term experiment, and also the Covid-19 pandemic, our sample on which we intended to compute the integrated model with the cognitive skills is too small; only 18 student completed all the tests. For the other tests, the data is rather fragmented, so we also could not select a useful subset of tests for cognitive skills. Thus, we cannot reasonably compute a statistical model. Instead, we only did a manual analysis of the correlations and co-correlations of our variables to not come to false conclusions.

### 4 RESULTS

Since we have highly fragmented data, (i.e., not all students completed all cognitive tests and the exam), we decided to present the data description per research question in 2 steps. For completeness, we first present the data of all students who completed a test that is used for a certain RQ. Second, we present the data for the students who participated in an RQ **and** who completed the final exam. For example, for RQ1, 111 students took the Early-MM test, but only 32 of these took the final exam. For outlier removal, we report the concrete procedure for each of the research questions separately, since there was no unified procedure due to the diverse nature of the tests.

Before diving into the research questions, we start by presenting data on the final exam. A maximum of 100 points could be reached, and it was taken by 102 students. The mean was 66.61 with a standard deviation (sd) of 18.16. The median

Table 1. On the left: Mean results for each test with all participants. On the right: Mean values of the exam and the tests, as well as correlation values between the exam and each test, with participants who did take in both.

| Test       | Participants (All) | Mean Test (SD) | Participants (Test + exam) | Mean Exam (SD) | Mean Test (SD) | Correlation with exam |
|------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Final exam | 102                | 66.61 (18.16)  |                            |                |                |                       |
| Early-MM   | 111                | 6.17 (1.86)    | 32                         | 75.09 (15.22)  | 6.97 (1.03)    | 0.23                  |
| C-Test     | 50                 | 76.90 (14.62)  | 36                         | 73.75 (14.79)  | 80.11 (12.03)  | 0.20                  |
| R-Voc      | 38                 | 129.76 (18.09) | 27                         | 73.65 (14.99)  | 130.74 (14.41) | 0.28                  |
| P-Voc      | 35                 | 61.77 (11.45)  | 26                         | 72.81 (14.69)  | 62.38 (11.85)  | 0.27                  |
| d2-R       | 49                 | 57.12 (8.99)   | 36                         | 73.75 (14.79)  | 57.11 (9.27)   | 0.09                  |
| DESIGMA-A  | 35                 | 115.97 (12.50) | 25                         | 72.42 (14.75)  | 118.72 (10.32) | 0.19                  |

was 68.5 points. Since the number of students who took part in the tests for the RQs fluctuated, we present the concrete mean of the participants in the exam per research question in Table 1. The exam results were not normally distributed, as assessed by the Shapiro-Wilk-Test ( $p = 0.004$ ). Thus, we always use the Spearman rank correlation as non-parametric alternative to the Pearson correlation when comparing test results.

#### 4.1 RQ1: Can the development of an early mental model predict programming skill by the end of a programming course?

The mean score for all 111 students who participated in the Early-MM test was 6.17 ( $sd = 1.86$ ), with a maximum of 8 points. The majority of the students received at least 75 % of the points, indicating a ceiling effect. In Figure 7, we visualize the results. Considering the responses by task (Fig. 7b), the majority of the students is able to correctly solve them, with the second task being the easiest. Thus, most of the students in the course appear to have mastered the preoperational stage, but may not have fully reached the concrete operational stage. Interestingly, Tasks 6 and 7 (providing a natural-language description of source code) appeared to be most difficult, but not Task 8, which was intended to be the most difficult tasks (i.e., implement a swap).

Of these 111, only 32 students finished the programming course by taking the final exam of the DS course. The mean for these 32 is 6.97 points ( $sd = 1.03$ ), so the ceiling effect is even more pronounced. Of these 32, all scored 5 or more points, with the majority scoring 7 or 8 points (23; cf. Fig. 7a). Regarding the points per task, the first 3 tasks have been answered correctly by all participants. Furthermore, the students are performing approximately 10 % better, compared to all participants who completed the Early-MM test.

The correlation with the exam is  $r = 0.23$  ( $p = 0.204$ ). Thus, the performance in the Early-MM test has a weak correlation with the performance in the final exam of the course.

The Early-MM test can predict the success of the programming course to a small degree.

#### 4.2 RQ2: Can language skills predict programming skill?

To answer RQ2, we used three different tests: The C-Test, the R-Voc and the P-Voc (cf. Section 2.2).

50 students completed the C-Test. The mean score was 76.90 points (a maximum of 100 points could be reached), with a standard deviation of 13.89. The median was 81. From these 50 participants, 36 took the final exam. The mean for these 36 is 80.11 points ( $sd = 12.03$ ) and the median is 84. Most students (31 of 50) are in the C1 level, which indicates a ceiling effect.




Fig. 7. (a) sum of points for all participants and those who took part in the final exam. (b) number of correct solutions per task.

The R-Voc was completed by 39 students. We removed the data of one student, because they only received 24 points (from a maximum of 150 points), which is more than two standard deviations below the mean. The remaining 38 students received on average 129.76 points ( $sd = 18.09$ ), and the median was 134.5 points. 27 students took part in the final exam. For these 27, the mean was 130.74 points ( $sd = 14.41$ ) and the median was 134. Most students (28 of 38) are in the B2 level, indicating a ceiling effect.

The P-Voc had 35 participants. Out of 90 points, the mean was 61.77 points ( $sd = 11.45$ ) and the median was 62 points. Out of the 35 participants, 26 completed the exam. They have a mean of 62.38 points ( $sd = 11.85$ ) and the median was 61 points. The ceiling effect here is less pronounced: While on average, the participants still reached far more than half the points, only 7 students passed the highest rank and are at the B2 level.

Noteworthy is also that, when considering only the students who completed the final exam, the test scores are a bit higher.

To answer RQ2, we correlate the points of each of the three language-skill tests with the points in the final exam. For all tests, the correlations are in the weak range, starting with 0.20 for the C-Test ( $p = 0.251$ ), 0.28 for R-Voc ( $p = 0.159$ ), and 0.27 for P-Voc ( $p = 0.186$ ).

Language skills can predict the success of the programming course to a small degree.

### 4.3 RQ3: Can selective and sustained attention predict programming skill?

49 students participated in the d2-R. For our participants, the mean was 57.12 ( $sd = 8.99$ ). 36 finished the DS course by taking the final exam. Of these 36, the mean was 57.11 ( $sd = 9.27$ ). As with the language skill tests, the students performed above average (the standardized mean is 50 points,  $sd = 10$ ), although the higher performance was not so pronounced as for the language-skill tests or the Early-MM test.

The correlation between the d2-R and the exam is 0.09 ( $p = 0.584$ ).

Selected and sustained attention cannot predict the success of the programming course.

Table 2. Correlation matrix of all tests. \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ . Exact p-values provided on the project's Web site.

|           | d2-R  | DESIGMA-A | C-Test | R-Voc  | P-Voc  | Early-MM | Exam |
|-----------|-------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|----------|------|
| d2-R      | 1.00  | 0.12      | -0.16  | 0.20   | -0.14  | -0.14    | 0.29 |
| DESIGMA-A | 0.12  | 1.00      | -0.17  | 0.41   | 0.20   | 0.36     | 0.23 |
| C-Test    | -0.16 | -0.17     | 1.00   | 0.52*  | 0.83** | -0.05    | 0.13 |
| R-Voc     | 0.20  | 0.41      | 0.52*  | 1.00   | 0.68** | -0.06    | 0.24 |
| P-Voc     | -0.14 | 0.20      | 0.83** | 0.68** | 1.00   | -0.11    | 0.24 |
| Early-MM  | -0.14 | 0.36      | -0.05  | -0.06  | -0.11  | 1.00     | 0.28 |
| Exam      | 0.29  | 0.23      | 0.13   | 0.24   | 0.24   | 0.28     | 1.00 |

#### 4.4 RQ4: Can fluid intelligence predict programming skill?

We received the response of 35 students for the DESIGMA-A. One participant took the test twice, and we only kept the response of the first attempt. The mean was 115.97 (sd = 12.51). 25 students finished the DS course by taking the final exam. Of these 25, the mean was 118.72 (sd = 10.32).

As for the language tests and d2 tests, the students performed above average, even one standard deviation above, showing their higher than normal intelligence as measured with this test. As for the Early-MM and the language skills, the performance of the students who finished the DS course is a bit higher than for all students who completed the DESIGMA-A.

The correlation between the DESIGMA-A and the exam is 0.19 ( $p = 0.373$ ).

Fluid intelligence can predict the success of the programming course to a small degree.

#### 4.5 RQ5: What skills are suitable for an early warning system?

To answer RQ5, we calculated the correlations for all tests from RQ1 to RQ4. The plan was to integrate the results into a stepwise regression model. However, only 18 students completed all tests and the final exam, which is not sufficient for computing a stepwise regression model. Instead, we take a detailed look at each correlation one by one. In Table 2, we present the correlation matrix of all tests and the final exam. The mean score for the 18 students in the exam was 73.03 (sd = 16.63), which is higher than the mean for all students (66.61).

Early-MM has no considerable correlations with the other tests, except DESIGMA-A, which means the uniqueness it provides as predictor appears rather high. The correlation with the exam is low (0.28), but still among the highest when compared to the other predictors. Thus, even though there is a ceiling effect, the Early-MM might be a good candidate for the early warning system.

The language tests correlate highly with each other ( $r \geq 0.52$ ), especially C-Test and P-Voc, suggesting that these two tests do not add much uniqueness as predictors. Thus, one of these tests would suffice for the early warning system. Of these two, the P-Voc has a higher correlation with the exam, but the C-Test has a lower correlation with the DESIGMA-A. Since both tests take about the same amount of time to apply, either of these tests might be a good candidate for the early warning system.

The d2-R only has low correlations with the other tests, so from that perspective, is a good candidate for the early warning system. Interestingly, taking only the students into account who completed all the tests as well as the final exam, the correlations changes drastically, from almost zero to an (cf. Table 1) almost medium correlation. Thus, it may not be a




Fig. 8. (a) Percentage of correct submissions per exercise type. (b) Points in the final exam, divided into students who participated in the syntax drill-and-practice exercises (orange) and students who did not participate (purple).

good predictor for all students of a course, but only for the ones who are highly motivated. Hence, the d2-R may not be suitable for our early warning system, as it cannot differentiate among the weaker students, which we want to identify with it.

The DESIGMA-A has a medium correlation with Early-MM, but a low correlation with the exam. Additionally, it has a medium correlation with R-Voc. Low correlations with the other tests also make it a good predictor regarding uniqueness. In contrast to Early-MM, it can be applied before a programming course starts, since it does not require any prior training.

Possible candidate tests for an early warning system are the Early-MM and/or the DESIGMA-A, plus one language-skill test, such as the C-Test or the P-Voc.

#### 4.6 RQ6: Can syntax drill-and-practice exercises improve programming skill?

47 students participated in all parts of the syntax drill-and-practice exercises. One participant submitted partially blank responses, so we assume his responses are not genuine, so we remove the data as an outlier. Thus, our sample consists of 46 students. Overall, the students received an average score of 95.67%. Students' performance improved from exercise to exercise, that is, from 92.16% to 98.17%.

Of these 46, 33 students participated in the final exam. The average score in the syntax drill-and-practice exercises of these participants was 96.47% (sd = 2.69), so comparable to the entire sample (95.67%, sd = 2.89). Broken down per programming construct, the number of points also increases per construct (93.41% to 98.79%), with a still stand from for loops (96.97%) to do-while loops (96.73%).

Regarding error category, there are some interesting observations: First, there were many mistakes students made with errors of the bracket category at the first exercise (33), which drastically was reduced for the last exercise (2). Second, for errors in the loop counter category, the only mistakes students made was for the for loops, which was the first construct in which these errors occurred. Last, for the errors that cannot be assigned to a specific category, in the last exercises (while loop), students made most of the mistakes (8 of 10). This specific error was that the loop counter (a.k.a., stepper) was missing, making the loop an infinite loop. Thus, this may actually not be a syntactical error, but more a semantic error, or a combination of both.

To evaluate whether the syntax drill-and-practice exercises have an effect on the acquired programming skills, we compare the points in the exam for students who participated in the syntax drill-and-practice exercises with students who did not participate. Students who completed the syntax drill-and-practice exercises received on average 74.61 points (sd = 15.04; the maximum is 100 points). By contrast, the 69 students who did not participate in the syntax drill-and-practice exercises scored an average of 62.96 points (sd = 18.5) in the exam, so considerably lower. This difference is significant (Mann-Whitney-U test;  $U = 1555.5$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ) and indicates a medium effect size of 0.37 (Cliff's Delta).

Syntax drill-and-practice exercises can help students improve their programming skill.

## 5 DISCUSSION

### 5.1 RQ1: Can the development of an early mental model predict programming skill by the end of a programming course?

We found that students' ability to develop a suitable mental model at the beginning of a programming course can predict the performance of acquired programming skill to a certain degree. Given that it is also easy to apply, it is a suitable test for our early warning system. In contrast to the results by Ahadi and others, we found that most students had reached the concrete operational state and could implement a swap of values between two variables. One reason might be that many of our students had some previous programming experience: On average, our students have been programming for 1.8 years, while Ahadi and others assume that their students do not have any programming experience [1]. Thus, the students of our sample had considerably more time to develop a suitable mental model of programming. This might also explain why we observe a lower correlation, that is, in our sample, the Early-MM test cannot differentiate sufficiently among our more experienced students. In the second instance of the programming course, we have extended the task to cover more advanced aspects of programming, such as logical expressions and arrays. Data collection is currently ongoing, so we cannot give an impression of how the revised version of the Early-MM works.

Interestingly, we observed that two of the questions are especially difficult for our students. In these questions, students had to give a natural-language description of what a piece of source code was doing. Especially describing the swap proved more difficult than implementing one. This could hint to a problem that students have difficulties in comprehending code, rather than producing it. Another explanation could be that, since the swap is such a basic algorithm, students might be used to implementing it without actually having a natural-language representation. This result was also observed by Ahadi and others for one of their sample of students, who also scored better at implementing the swap than describing it, although the difference was less pronounced (i.e., 50 %, 44 %, and 53 % for Tasks 6, 7, and 8, respectively; in the other sample, the implementation of the swap was the most difficult, i.e., 42 %, 33 %, and 31 % for Tasks 6, 7, and 8, respectively). Diving deeper, we found that common mistakes were that participants (i) assumed that all variables would get the same values, (ii) named the temporary variable to be swapped, instead of the target variables, or (iii) described the swap on a too high abstraction level. Thus, it might be helpful for students to focus more attention on the purpose of code, so to also include program-comprehension task in programming courses [19]. Although students were able to read source code and trace variable values, they could not describe the exact purpose of the code, so failed to integrate the statements into semantic chunks, an important part of bottom-up program comprehension [30]. Hence, students have not yet reached the concrete operational stage and their mental model is not sufficiently developed to understand more complex algorithms [26].

## 5.2 RQ2: Can language skills predict programming skill?

All the language tests showed a certain relationship with the performance in the final exam. Thus, we could strengthen the result of previous studies, even though the strength of the relationship is weaker in our data than, for example, compared to Prat and others [31]. One reason could be that most participants received an above average score, so the language tests were too easy for our intended population of computer science majors. Additionally, Prat and others used a different operationalization of language skills that predicts whether someone is able to learn a new language, whereas we tested whether someone already is proficient in a foreign language.

In the future, we intend to look for tests that are more difficult, but still easy to apply. Currently, there is a C-Test being constructed that is more difficult, and we plan to integrate this test in our ongoing data collection among students of the two-semester programming course.

The advantage of our tests is that they are very quick to apply and easy to access. That is a problem for the test used by Prat and others [31], which is not available for research, so it is not useful for our early warning system.

## 5.3 RQ3: Can selective and sustained attention predict programming skill?

It is unclear how selective and sustained attention is related to programming skill. Considering the relationship between students who completed the d2-R test and the exam, the correlation is not different from zero, but considering the correlation of students who completed all tests and the exam, the correlation increases and could almost be considered as medium (0.29, cf. Table 1). One possible interpretation could be that the d2-R test can only differentiate among the students who are highly motivated to perform well in a course and take part in all learning opportunities. However, since this test cannot differentiate between the students that we want to identify with it, it is not suitable for our early warning system. This is in line with the interpretation by Ambrosio and others, who concluded that simple attention tasks might be too easy to really differentiate between programming students [3]. Even though they used a different operationalization of attention, we observed a similar result.

## 5.4 RQ4: Can fluid intelligence predict programming skill?

We found weak correlations between the fluid intelligence and programming skill, strengthening previous findings that higher fluid intelligence is useful when acquiring programming skills. As with the other cognitive skills, this is less pronounced compared to other studies, which often reported medium to high correlations between fluid intelligence and programming skill [3, 31, 32]. The disparity between these and our results might be due to the difference in operationalization of fluid intelligence, since the DESIGMA-A uses a solution-composition approach to figural matrices (cf. Section 2.2). The operationalization of programming skill also differs between studies, so it is difficult to truly compare the results.

Additionally, we found that fluid intelligence and the ability to build a correct early mental model of programming have a medium correlation. Thus, in the beginning of a programming course, a higher fluid intelligence appears to be helpful, but this advantage may vanish during the programming course. This is also in line with neuro-imaging studies, in which researchers observed that experience in programming leads to a more specific brain activation during programming tasks, compared to novices, who typically show a pattern of individual cognitive processes and less efficient use of neuronal resources [8, 16, 35]. Thus, the DESIGMA-A might be a good predictor for how students start a programming course, but might be less relevant when students have acquired a certain skill level in programming.



Hence, the DESIGMA-A could be a useful predictor for our case, but is rather tedious to apply, as it takes over one hour to administer. Recently, a short version of the DESIGMA has been released, which only takes up to 23 minutes [22], so less than half the time of the long version. With this reduced effort, the short version of DESIGMA may be of help for us, so we have integrated this version in our ongoing study.

### 5.5 RQ5: What skills are suitable for an early warning system?

Unfortunately, the small sample size for students who participated in all tests and the final exam did not allow us to compute a statistical model, such as a stepwise regression model, to build an early warning system. Nevertheless, we could get a first impression of possible candidates by manually analyzing the correlations among all tests and exam scores.

Especially language skills and a correct early mental model appear to be able to predict whether students have developed programming skills at the end of a two-semester programming course. In addition, fluid intelligence may also be a suitable predictor. The advantage of assessing cognitive skills, rather than programming skills, is that this can happen directly at the beginning of a programming course or even before that, so that students who have a higher risk of failing a course can be made aware of that risk early on. This way, they know that they should be careful not to fall behind, because it is difficult to catch up. Furthermore, these students can receive special course offers, for example, in terms of tailored assignments or especially trained teaching assistants, which can help students not to fall behind.

In a sample where students have some previous exposure to programming, the Early-MM test can also be applied directly at the beginning or before the actual course, with the same goal of identifying students who are at high risk of struggling. When applied a few weeks into a programming course, it may need some adjustments to fit a more experienced demographic. With the integration of programming education in more and more middle and high schools, it is highly likely that more and more students start a major and already have some programming skills, so an adjusted test is definitely useful in the future.

### 5.6 RQ6: Can syntax drill-and-practice exercises improve programming skill?

We found that syntax drill-and-practice exercises can improve students' programming skill at the end of a two-year programming course. Unfortunately, our data does not allow us to draw conclusions on whether these exercises are especially useful for students who have a low score in the early warning system, as we only have 12 students who participated in all tests, the exam, and the syntax drill-and-practice exercises. Nevertheless, since these exercises do not require much effort, neither for students nor for educators, and since there is a measurable positive effect, we are currently integrating these exercises into the course material. Additionally, we are increasing their difficulty level, so that not only the inexperienced students profit from them, but that also more skilled students can improve their programming skills.

Interestingly, we found that, for later syntax drill-and-practice exercises, the number of mistakes decreases across error categories, especially for bracket errors (33 vs. 2) and loop counter errors (only for for loops). This could mean that, when students have familiarized themselves with certain errors, they can transfer that to different programming constructs. Thus, it may be possible to create a more efficient version of syntax drill-and-practice exercises, such that programming constructs and error categories can be combined and the number of items can be decreased.

More efficient syntax drill-and-practice exercises also means that we can include more programming exercises that build on the syntax drill-and-practice exercises, such as fill-in-the-blank tasks (e.g., used by Kramer and others [21] and Kyaw and others [23]) or parsons puzzle [9, 14, 29]. Additionally, errors that can be a combination of both, syntactical and semantic errors, can be integrated, such as the missing loop counter that we accidentally as syntax error, but might actually turn out to be a semantic error, or a combination of both.

## 6 IMPLICATIONS

The results of our study are promising for an early warning system. It can be applied even before actual programming courses start to help students by assigning them to specially trained tutors or provide them with tailored training tasks. These could be similar to the tasks defined by Thurner and others, who provide tailored tasks based on performance of preceding programming tasks [39]. However, this can only happen a few weeks into a course, but with an early warning system, this process can be started even before that, so that we do not lose valuable time at the beginning of a course.

Syntax exercises help, even when they are applied later in the course. Of course, earlier might even be more helpful, as found by the use of Phanon by Edwards and others in several studies [11, 12, 28, 38]. Additionally, special training in reading and spatial skills can also help improve programming skill, and these can happen even before a programming course [13].

Despite having rather preliminary data, we are hopeful that our candidate early warning system is a good starting point to identify struggling students so early that we can still implement measures to support them in overcoming their struggles. Noteworthy are the consistent ceiling effects for all tests, meaning that, for all tests, our sample performed well above the mean. This can be expected, considering that our sample typically has higher cognitive skills than the average population (i.e., including persons not pursuing a degree in higher education). For building an early warning system, it may increase predictive power if we include tests for cognitive skills that are designed for a population of higher cognitive skills and can differentiate better among students. This is what we currently do in our ongoing studies.

Another interesting trend is that students who persevered in the course until the final exam tend to score better in all the tests that we applied. Additionally, students who took part in the study for at least one test or even all of the tests have a higher mean in the final exam. This may be because these students actually have higher cognitive skills or acquired better programming skills, but might also hint at a selection bias, such that only the highly motivated students participated (participation in the tests was voluntary). There might also be a moderator effect, such that higher cognitive skills lead to higher motivation in the course, because students have an easier time to understand the course material. In future studies, we hope that we can nudge more students to complete these tests, so that we can differentiate the true effect of cognitive skills and motivation.

To conclude, even though the early warning system does not solve the difficulties of teaching programming, it is still an important piece in the puzzle to do so, because when detected early, it is possible to provide support for struggling students to overcome their struggles and successfully acquire programming skills.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to our students who participated in our studies.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alireza Ahadi, Raymond Lister, and Donna Teague. 2014. Falling Behind Early and Staying Behind When Learning to Program. In *Proceedings of the 25th Psychology of Programming Conference*, Vol. 14. 77 – 88.
- [2] Parviz Ajideh and Sorayya Mozaffarzadeh. 2012. A Comparative Study on C-Test vs. Cloze Test as Tests of Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research* 2, 11 (2012), 1159–11163.
- [3] Ana Paula Ambrósio, Fábio Moreira Costa, Leandro Almeida, Amanda Franco, and Joaquim Macedo. 2011. Identifying Cognitive Abilities to Improve CS1 Outcome. In *2011 Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*. IEEE, F3G–1–F3G–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2011.6142824>
- [4] Nicolas Becker, Franzis Preckel, Julia Karbach, Nathalie Raffel, and Frank M Spinath. 2014. Die Matrizenkonstruktionsaufgabe. *Diagnostica* (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924/a000111>
- [5] Jens Bennedsen and Michael E. Caspersen. 2007. Failure Rates in Introductory Programming. *SIGCSE Bull.* 39, 2 (2007), 32–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1272848.1272879>

- [6] R Brickenkamp, L Schmidt-Atzert, and D Liepmann. 2016. The d2 Test of Attention-Revised. A Test of Attention and Concentration.
- [7] Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/home>
- [8] Igor Crk, Timothy Kluthe, and Andreas Stefik. 2015. Understanding Programming Expertise: An Empirical Study of Phasic Brain Wave Changes. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 23, 1, Article 2 (2015), 2:1–2:29 pages.
- [9] Paul Denny, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, and Beth Simon. 2008. Evaluating a New Exam Question: Parsons Problems. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Computing Education Research* (Sydney, Australia) (*ICER '08*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1404520.1404532>
- [10] Paul Denny, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, Ewan Tempero, and Jacob Hendrickx. 2011. Understanding the Syntax Barrier for Novices. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Joint Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education* (Darmstadt, Germany) (*ITiCSE '11*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 208–212. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1999747.1999807>
- [11] John Edwards, Joseph Ditton, Dragan Trninic, Hillary Swanson, Shelsey Sullivan, and Chad Mano. 2020. Syntax Exercises in CS1. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research* (Virtual Event, New Zealand) (*ICER '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 216–226. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3372782.3406259>
- [12] J. M. Edwards, E. K. Fulton, J. D. Holmes, J. L. Valentin, D. V. Beard, and K. R. Parker. 2018. Separation of Syntax and Problem Solving in Introductory Computer Programming. In *2018 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2018.8658852>
- [13] Madeline Endres, Madison Fansher, Priti Shah, and Westley Weimer. 2021. To Read or to Rotate? Comparing the Effects of Technical Reading Training and Spatial Skills Training on Novice Programming Ability. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (Athens, Greece) (*ESEC/FSE 2021*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 754–766. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468264.3468583>
- [14] Barbara J. Ericson, Lauren E. Margulieux, and Jochen Rick. 2017. Solving Parsons Problems Versus Fixing and Writing Code. In *Proceedings of the 17th Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research* (Koli, Finland) (*Koli Calling '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3141880.3141895>
- [15] Benjamin Floyd, Tyler Santander, and Westley Weimer. 2017. Decoding the Representation of Code in the Brain: An fMRI Study of Code Review and Expertise. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, Buenos Aires, 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2017.24>
- [16] Birgit Helmlinger, Markus Sommer, Martina Feldhammer-Kahr, Guilherme Wood, Martin E Arendasy, and Silvia E Kober. 2020. Programming Experience Associated With Neural Efficiency During Figural Reasoning. *Scientific reports* 10, 1 (2020), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-70360-z>
- [17] Yu Huang, Xinyu Liu, Ryan Krueger, Tyler Santander, Xiaosu Hu, Kevin Leach, and Westley Weimer. 2019. Distilling Neural Representations of Data Structure Manipulation Using FMRI and FNIRS. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering* (Montreal, Quebec, Canada) (*ICSE '19*). IEEE Press, 396–407. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00053>
- [18] Institute for Test Research and Test Development Leipzig 2019. *Vocabulary Tests*. <https://itt-leipzig.de/about-the-vocabulary-tests-2/?lang=en>
- [19] Cruz Izu, Carsten Schulte, Ashish Aggarwal, Quintin Cutts, Rodrigo Duran, Mirela Gutica, Birte Heinemann, Eileen Kraemer, Violetta Lonati, Claudio Mirolo, and Renske Weeda. 2019. Fostering Program Comprehension in Novice Programmers - Learning Activities and Learning Trajectories. In *Proceedings of the Working Group Reports on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ITiCSE-WGR '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3344429.3372501>
- [20] Stefan D. Keller, Johanna Fleckenstein, Maleika Krüger, Olaf Köller, and André A. Rupp. 2020. English Writing Skills of Students in Upper Secondary Education: Results From an Empirical Study in Switzerland and Germany. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 48 (2020), 100700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100700>
- [21] Matthias Kramer, Mike Barkmin, and Torsten Brinda. 2019. Identifying Predictors for Code Highlighting Skills: A Regression Analysis of Knowledge, Syntax Abilities and Highlighting Skills. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ITiCSE '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 367–373. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3304221.3319745>
- [22] Florian Krieger, Nicolas Becker, Samuel Greiff, and Frank M Spinath. 2022. *Design a Matrix - Standard*. <https://www.testzentrale.de/shop/design-a-matrix-standard.html>
- [23] Htoo Htoo Sandi Kyaw, Nobuo Funabiki, Shune Lae Aung, Nem Khan Dim, and Wen Chung Kao. 2021. A Study of Element Fill-In-Blank Problems for C Programming Learning Assistant System. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology* 11, 6 (June 2021), 255–261. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2021.11.6.1520> Publisher: International Journal of Information and Education Technology.
- [24] SeolHwa Lee, Andrew Matteson, Danial Hooshyar, SongHyun Kim, JaeBum Jung, GiChun Nam, and HeuiSeok Lim. 2016. Comparing Programming Language Comprehension Between Novice and Expert Programmers Using EEG Analysis. In *2016 IEEE 16th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Bioengineering (BIBE)*. IEEE, 350–355. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BIBE.2016.30> ISSN: 2471-7819.
- [25] Raymond Lister. 2011. Concrete and Other Neo-Piagetian Forms of Reasoning in the Novice Programmer. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Australasian Computing Education Conference - Volume 114* (Perth, Australia) (*ACE '11*). Australian Computer Society, Inc., AUS, 9–18.
- [26] Raymond Lister. 2020. On the Cognitive Development of the Novice Programmer: And the Development of a Computing Education Researcher. In *Proceedings of the 9th Computer Science Education Research Conference* (Virtual Event, Netherlands) (*CSERC '20*). Association for Computing

- Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 2, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442481.3442498>
- [27] Andrew Luxton-Reilly. 2016. Learning to Program is Easy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*. ACM, Arequipa Peru, 284–289. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2899415.2899432>
- [28] Anna Ly, John Edwards, Michael Liut, and Andrew Petersen. 2021. Revisiting Syntax Exercises in CS1. In *Proceedings of the 22st Annual Conference on Information Technology Education (SIGITE '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450329.3476855>
- [29] Dale Parsons and Patricia Haden. 2006. Parson’s Programming Puzzles: A Fun and Effective Learning Tool for First Programming Courses. In *Proceedings of the 8th Australasian Conference on Computing Education - Volume 52 (Hobart, Australia) (ACE '06)*. Australian Computer Society, Inc., AUS, 157–163.
- [30] Nancy Pennington. 1987. Stimulus Structures and Mental Representations in Expert Comprehension of Computer Programs. *Cognitive Psychology* 19, 3 (1987), 295–341.
- [31] Chantel S Prat, Tara M Madhyastha, Malayka J Mottarella, and Chu-Hsuan Kuo. 2020. Relating Natural Language Aptitude to Individual Differences in Learning Programming Languages. *Scientific reports* 10, 1 (2020), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60661-8>
- [32] Marcos Román-González, Juan-Carlos Pérez-González, and Carmen Jiménez-Fernández. 2017. Which Cognitive Abilities Underlie Computational Thinking? Criterion Validity of the Computational Thinking Test. *Computers in human behavior* 72 (2017), 678–691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.08.047>
- [33] Marcos Román-González, Juan-Carlos Pérez-González, Jesús Moreno-León, and Gregorio Robles. 2018. Can Computational Talent Be Detected? Predictive Validity of the Computational Thinking Test. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* 18 (2018), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2018.06.004>
- [34] Janet Siegmund, Christian Kästner, Sven Apel, Chris Parnin, Anja Bethmann, Thomas Leich, Gunter Saake, and André Brechmann. 2014. Understanding Understanding Source Code with Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering (Hyderabad, India) (ICSE 2014)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 378–389. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2568225.2568252>
- [35] Janet Siegmund, Norman Peitek, Chris Parnin, Sven Apel, Johannes Hofmeister, Christian Kästner, Andrew Begel, Anja Bethmann, and André Brechmann. 2017. Measuring Neural Efficiency of Program Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering (Paderborn, Germany) (ESEC/FSE 2017)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3106237.3106268>
- [36] Elliot Soloway, Jeffrey Bonar, and Kate Ehrlich. 1983. Cognitive Strategies and Looping Constructs: An Empirical Study. *Commun. ACM* 26, 11 (nov 1983), 853–860. <https://doi.org/10.1145/182.358436>
- [37] William H Stewart, Youngkyun Baek, Gina Kwid, and Kellie Taylor. 2021. Exploring Factors That Influence Computational Thinking Skills in Elementary Students’ Collaborative Robotics. *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 59, 6 (2021), 1208–1239.
- [38] Shelsey Sullivan, Hillary Swanson, and John Edwards. 2021. Student Attitudes Toward Syntax Exercises in CS1. In *Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 782–788. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3408877.3432399>
- [39] Veronika Thurner, Philipp Chavaroche, Axel Böttcher, and Daniela Zehetmeier. 2017. A Concept for an Intelligent Tutoring System to Support Individual Learning Paths in Software Development Courses. In *International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning*. Springer, 774–783.
- [40] Annette Vee. 2013. Understanding Computer Programming as a Literacy. *Literacy in Composition Studies* 1, 2 (Oct. 2013), 42–64. <https://doi.org/10.21623/1.1.2.4>