

---

# Program Synthesis Benchmark for Visual Programming in XLogoOnline Environment

---

**Chao Wen**  
MPI-SWS  
chaowen@mpi-sws.org

**Jacqueline Staub**  
University of Trier  
staub@uni-trier.de

**Adish Singla**  
MPI-SWS  
adishs@mpi-sws.org

## Abstract

Large language and multimodal models have shown remarkable successes on various benchmarks focused on specific skills such as general-purpose programming, natural language understanding, math word problem-solving, and visual question answering. However, it is unclear how well these models perform on tasks that require a combination of these skills. In this paper, we curate a novel program synthesis benchmark based on the XLogoOnline visual programming environment. The benchmark comprises 85 real-world tasks from the Mini-level of the XLogoOnline environment, each requiring a combination of different skills such as spatial planning, basic programming, and logical reasoning. Our evaluation shows that current state-of-the-art models like GPT-4V and Llama3-70B struggle to solve these tasks, achieving only 20% and 2.35% success rates. Next, we develop a fine-tuning pipeline to boost the performance of models by leveraging a large-scale synthetic training dataset with over 80,000 tasks. Moreover, we showcase how emulator-driven feedback can be used to design a curriculum over training data distribution. We showcase that a fine-tuned Llama3-8B drastically outperforms GPT-4V and Llama3-70B models, and provide an in-depth analysis of the models' expertise across different skill dimensions. We will publicly release the benchmark for future research on program synthesis in visual programming.

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, large models have shown remarkable performance in various domains, such as general-purpose programming and visual question answering [1]. For instance, in programming, numerous tools and models use large language models (LLMs) for code generation [2, 3] and programming feedback generation [4, 5, 6], revolutionizing how programmers write code and how teachers instruct programming [7, 8]. Beyond text-based tasks, the focus has expanded to multimodal models that process and generate not only text but also images, achieving significant success in domains such as visual question answering [9] and text-to-image generation [10].

Despite these successes, the performance of large models on tasks that require a combination of skills remains unclear. Real-world tasks often demand a blend of skills. For example, a typical task like “navigating to the kitchen to fetch ten apples” involves spatial reasoning to understand the environment and plan a path around obstacles, together with basic arithmetic to ensure that exactly ten apples are retrieved. This example illustrates the multifaceted nature of real-world tasks. While various benchmarks focus on specific skills [2, 11, 12, 13], there is a lack of benchmarks evaluating how large models perform on tasks that require a combination of different skills.

To bridge this gap, we introduce XLOGOMINI PROG, a benchmark for program synthesis in the visual programming domain. Our benchmark is constructed using the Mini-level of the XLogoOnline platform [14], featuring 85 real-world visual programming tasks, each demanding a blend of diverse skills. Figure 1 illustrates examples of these tasks. Each task includes a visual grid with a turtle that needs




Figure 1: Illustrative examples of tasks, required skills, and solution codes in XLogoOnline-Mini.

to be directed to complete a specific goal. For example, in Task 28, the goal is to direct the turtle to collect all red shapes without stepping on the color green, requiring logical reasoning, spatial reasoning, planning, and basic programming skills. Task 38 requires additional math word problem-solving to collect 10 strawberries. These tasks provide a testbed for evaluating how large models perform on tasks that require a combination of skills, presenting a unique challenge to current large models.

We evaluate the performance of large models on these real-world tasks and find that GPT-4V (Vision) model [15] achieves a 20% success rate, and Llama3-70B model [16] struggles significantly, achieving only a 2.35% success rate. This indicates that current large models are not yet capable of effectively solving visual programming tasks requiring various skills. Figure 2 compares the performance of large models across different skill dimensions on these tasks. To improve performance, we develop a fine-tuning pipeline by leveraging a large-scale synthetic dataset containing over 80,000 visual programming tasks. Our fine-tuned Llama3-8B model outperforms GPT-4V and Llama3-70B, achieving a 54.12% success rate. Moreover, we leverage emulator feedback to design a curriculum over the training data distribution, improving performance by 6.1% over standard supervised fine-tuning.




Figure 2: Large models' performance across different skills.

Our contributions are as follows: First, we introduce XLOGOMINIPROG, a program synthesis benchmark based on the XLogoOnline platform to evaluate large models in visual programming, which requires a blend of different skills. Second, we develop a fine-tuning pipeline that includes synthetic dataset generation and supervised fine-tuning, along with an emulator-driven fine-tuning technique that improves standard supervised fine-tuning performance by 6.1%. Third, we conduct extensive experiments to benchmark the performance of different large models and provide an in-depth analysis of the models' expertise across different skill dimensions. We will publicly release the benchmark for future research on program synthesis in visual programming.

## 2 Related Work

**Program synthesis benchmarks for large models.** Program synthesis aims to automatically generate programs from specifications. Recently, numerous recent works have focused on training large models specifically for program synthesis [2, 17, 18, 19]. To evaluate these large models, many program

synthesis benchmarks have been developed, such as HumanEval [2], MBPP [20], and APPS [21]. However, these benchmarks focus on generating code from natural language or docstrings for general programming languages such as Python [2, 20, 21]. Our benchmark focuses on program synthesis in the visual programming domain. While our benchmark covers basic programming like loops and variables, it requires models to combine spatial, logical, and programming skills, posing unique challenges not addressed by these program synthesis benchmarks.

**Large models for visual programming.** Visual programming has been studied in various scenarios, such as task synthesis [22, 23, 24, 25], program synthesis [26, 27], and student modeling [28]. With the rise of large models, some initial works evaluate ChatGPT [29] and GPT-4 [15] in these scenarios, showing that large models struggle with visual programming tasks [25, 28, 30]. In contrast, we provide a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating large models for program synthesis in visual programming, considering a wider range of models and skills.

**Spatial reasoning and planning benchmarks.** Existing benchmarks for spatial reasoning and planning are primarily designed for reinforcement learning agents to solve sequential decision-making tasks [31, 32]. Additionally, some benchmarks aim to evaluate models in domains where spatial reasoning and planning skills are essential, such as visual navigation and object interaction [33, 34]. With the advent of large models, recent works have also begun to evaluate LLMs’ capabilities in spatial reasoning and planning [35, 36]. Our benchmark, however, focuses on the visual programming domain, which requires a broader range of skills beyond spatial reasoning and planning, including logical reasoning, math word problem-solving, and programming skills.

### 3 Background and Synthesis Objective

In this section, we provide the background on the XLogoOnline visual programming platform and then introduce the program synthesis objective.

#### 3.1 Background on XLogoOnline-Mini Programming

XLogoOnline [14] is a visual programming platform based on Logo programming language [37] and is widely used by tens of thousands of students every year [38, 39]. In this work, we focus on the Mini-level (XLogoOnline-Mini). In XLogoOnline-Mini, each task includes a text description of the goal and code constraints, along with a two-dimensional visual grid. The visual grid features a turtle and various elements such as fruits, shapes, colors, lines, walls, and forbidden areas. To solve the task, one needs to write a program to direct the turtle’s movement in the visual grid to achieve the specified goal. Figure 1 shows illustrative examples of tasks, the required skills, and solution codes.

**Required skills for XLogoOnline-Mini.** We examine the skills required for solving visual programming tasks in XLogoOnline-Mini. Specifically, the visual programming tasks in our domain cover the following skills: (i) *Logic*: Understand underlying logical relationships specified in the goal; (ii) *Math*: Apply basic arithmetic to solve the task; (iii) *Draw*: Identify patterns and generate the corresponding code; (iv) *Basic actions*: Move and change directions using only basic commands; (v) *Loops*: Utilize loops to repeat commands multiple times; (vi) *Variables*: Utilize variables to set and update colors to draw lines with a specific color; (vii) *Loops and Variables*: Integrate loops with variables to solve a task; (viii) *Code Constraints*: Adhere to specific code constraints such as maximum code length.


#### 3.2 Program Synthesis Objective

Next, we formally define task and code specifications, and introduce our synthesis objective.

**Task specifications.** In XLogoOnline-Mini, a task  $T := (G, L, W)$  consists of a goal  $G$ , code constraints  $L$ , and a visual grid world  $W$ . The goal  $G$  defines the turtle’s objective. The code constraints  $L$  specify the requirements for a solution code. There are five types of constraints for code: *None* (no restrictions), *AtMost* (maximum number of commands), *Exactly* (exact number of commands), *StartBy* (initial command sequence), and *Hybrid* (combination of constraints). The visual grid world  $W$  is a 2-dimensional visual grid featuring a turtle and various elements. We define the grid size as the maximum dimension of the grid. For example, in Figure 1 (Task 87), the goal is “Find the strawberry”, the code constraint is “use just 6 commands” (*AtMost*), and the visual grid world depicts a  $3 \times 4$  grid ( $size = 4$ ) with a turtle, a strawberry, and forbidden areas marked by gray cells.

Task Type	#	Code Constraints	#	Code Concepts	#	Code Length	#	Grid Size	#
Find	33	None	54	Basic Actions	47	Short (1-5)	41	$Size \leq 3$	59
Draw	33	AtMost	21	Loops	24	Medium (6-10)	29	$Size = 4$	15
Math	10	Exactly	6	Variables	7	Long (11-17)	15	$Size = 5$	4
Logic	9	StartBy	4	Loops and Variables	7			$Size = 6$	4
		Hybrid	0					$Size \geq 7$	3

(a) Task distribution of XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL.



(b) Skill distribution of XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL.

```
code C := def Run() Do b
rule b := a | b; b | repeat(x) do b
action a := forward | backward | left | right | setpc(r)
color r := red | blue | green | white | black | yellow
iter x := 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10
```

(c) Code DSL.

Figure 3: (a) shows the task distribution across five dimensions within the XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL dataset, where the total number of tasks for each dimension equals the total number of tasks  $N = 85$ . (b) illustrates the skill distribution of the XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL dataset. To describe these skills, we extract various aspects from task type, code constraints, and code concepts as detailed in (a), and consolidated these aspects into broader categories, which we refer to as skills. A task may require multiple skills (see Figure 1). (c) shows the code DSL used in the XLogoOnline-Mini domain.

**Code specifications.** The code space of XLogoOnline-Mini is defined by the domain-specific language (DSL) depicted in Figure 3c. Note that while the DSL defines the formal structure and syntax, we implement it using Python-style code representation to leverage the large models’ pre-trained knowledge on Python programming. A *solution code* for a given task is the code that meets the task’s code constraints and achieves the specified goal when executed in the visual grid world. In Figure 1, a solution code is provided below each task.

**Program synthesis objective.** Our objective is to develop a synthesizer function,  $f : T \rightarrow C$ , which generates a solution code  $C$  for a given visual programming task  $T$ . To evaluate  $f$  on a task  $T$ , we first use  $f$  to synthesize a code  $\hat{C}$  and then execute the synthesized code  $\hat{C}$  using an emulator. The emulator outputs *success* if the synthesized code  $\hat{C}$  successfully solves the task  $T$  and adheres to code constraints; otherwise, the emulator outputs *fail*. We use *success* as the main evaluation metric. Given a dataset  $D_{\text{eval}} = \{T_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , we calculate the success rate of  $f$  on this dataset as the overall performance. We curate a dataset XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL of  $N = 85$  real-world visual programming tasks from XLogoOnline-Mini and we use this as the main dataset for evaluation. In Figures 3a and 3b, we show the overall distribution of this dataset and the number of tasks requiring specific skills, respectively.

## 4 Methodology for Synthetic Dataset Generation and Fine-tuning

As discussed in Section 1, existing large models such as GPT-4V and Llama3-70B struggle with visual programming tasks in XLogoOnline-Mini. To address this, we develop a two-stage fine-tuning pipeline consisting of synthetic dataset generation and supervised fine-tuning. This section details the dataset generation process and the methodology for fine-tuning large models on the synthetic dataset.


### 4.1 Synthetic Dataset Generation

Our goal is to develop a large synthetic dataset for training models [26]. To achieve this, we adopt the task synthesis techniques from [22, 24], which were developed to automatically generate high-quality tasks in visual programming domains. Instead of random task generation, these techniques allow us to perform more controlled and systematic task synthesis, such as specifying task types, code concepts, and code lengths, enabling us to generate tasks with different skills and difficulty levels.

**Adapting task synthesis techniques.** Given a task-code pair as a reference input, the original task synthesis techniques can produce a small, predefined number of tasks and solution codes suited for educational purposes [22, 24]. Since our goal is to develop a large and diverse dataset for training,

Task Type	#	Code Constraints	#	Code Concepts	#	Code Length	#	Grid Size	#
Find	36,055	None	34,680	Basic Actions	53,779	Short (1-5)	20,985	$Size \leq 3$	35,908
Draw	24,851	AtMost	29,354	Loops	24,432	Medium (6-10)	45,682	$Size = 4$	25,933
Math	14,994	Exactly	16,169	Variables	5,931	Long (11-17)	22,386	$Size = 5$	14,852
Logic	13,153	StartBy	1,430	Loops and Variables	4,911			$Size = 6$	8,061
		Hybrid	7,420					$Size \geq 7$	4,299

(a) Task distribution of XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM.



(b) Skill distribution of XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM.

XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM	#
Train Size	87,053
Validation Size	1,000
Evaluation Size	1,000
Total Size	89,053

(c) Dataset split of XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM.

Figure 4: Statistics of the synthetic XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM dataset. (a) and (b) show the task distribution and the skill distribution, respectively. (c) shows the dataset split.

we make two key modifications: (i) we remove scoring functions used to filter out low-score tasks, enabling us to generate a large quantity of tasks instead of a limited selection for educational uses; (ii) we relax task synthesis parameters to enhance techniques’ ability to generate more tasks, including allowing larger grid sizes and longer code lengths. While the resulting tasks may not be ideal for educational purposes, they are diverse and challenging for training large models.

**Dataset generation process and statistics.** We use the adapted task synthesis technique to generate a synthetic dataset as follows: (i) we manually craft a solution code for each task in the XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL dataset, resulting in a set  $\{(T_i, C_i)\}_{i=1}^{85}$ ; (ii) for each  $(T_i, C_i)$ , we generate up to 1,500 synthesized tasks and their solution codes. To ensure the quality of the dataset, we take the following processing steps: we remove any duplicate task-code pairs to maintain diversity, conduct a correctness check on the generated solution codes using the emulator, and exclude any task-code pairs present in the real-world XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL dataset from our synthetic dataset. This last processing step guarantees that the model has not seen any tasks from the evaluation dataset during training. We ultimately produce the synthetic dataset XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM with 89,053 task-code pairs. The statistics of this dataset are detailed in Figure 4. Note that the distribution of this synthetic dataset slightly differs from the real-world dataset XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL due to the aforementioned processing steps and the fact that not all reference tasks can generate the desired number of synthesized tasks. From this synthetic dataset, we randomly select 1,000 samples for validation, 1,000 samples for evaluation, and the remaining samples for training. We will provide full details of the dataset generation process in the supplementary material.

## 4.2 Methodology for Fine-tuning

**Translating tasks and codes.** In our synthetic dataset, tasks and codes are represented in JSON format for ease of parsing and interpretation. However, directly using the JSON format can be challenging for training large models, which are typically pre-trained on natural language texts. Therefore, we translate the JSON representations of each task and code into natural language descriptions and Python-style code, respectively, using a fixed template shown in Figure 5a.

**Supervised fine-tuning using synthetic dataset.** Fine-tuning can involve adjusting all model parameters, modifying only a few layers, or adding new layers [40]. However, fully fine-tuning all parameters can be computationally expensive and time-consuming. Therefore, we adopt Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [41], a parameter efficient fine-tuning technique which introduces trainable rank decomposition matrices into the model’s network weights. We train models on the XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM dataset using LoRA in a standard supervised manner. The model receives a natural language task description as input and outputs Python-style code. The model is optimized to minimize the cross-entropy loss between the predicted code and the ground truth solution code.

You are presented with a visual programming task involving a goal, a grid, a turtle, various items (or lines). You need to write Python code that enables the turtle to accomplish the goal within the grid.

{description\_of\_grid\_properties}  
 {description\_of\_python\_functions}


Now, write a correct Python code that successfully solves the following task.

### Task:  
 {description\_of\_task}


### Goal:  
 {description\_of\_goal}

### Correct code:

(a) Prompt template.



(b) Overview of emulator-driven fine-tuning.



(c) Emulator-driven resampling.

Figure 5: (a) shows the prompt template for fine-tuning. This prompt has several **placeholders** to include details for the descriptions of different aspects of the task. We will provide full details in the supplementary material. (b) provides an overview of emulator-driven fine-tuning, starting with the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  and initial model  $f_0$ , and iteratively resampling and training to produce the final model  $f_K$ . (c) illustrates the resampling process in emulator-driven fine-tuning to create the dataset  $\mathcal{D}_k$ .

**Emulator-driven feedback for fine-tuning.** Standard supervised fine-tuning assigns equal weights to all samples in the training dataset. However, our domain presents a unique challenge where tasks vary widely in required skills and difficulty levels (see Figure 4). Additionally, some skills serve as prerequisites for mastering more advanced ones. For instance, a model typically needs to understand basic actions before mastering loops and variables, and it generally solves tasks with shorter code lengths before being able to tackle longer ones. Consequently, treating all tasks with equal importance can be suboptimal in our setting. To address this, we introduce emulator-driven fine-tuning, which designs a curriculum over training data distribution by leveraging emulator feedback. The key idea is to dynamically adjust the training data distribution based on the emulator’s evaluation of the model, assigning higher weights to tasks where the model struggles, thereby progressively guiding the model from simpler tasks that it can easily solve to more complex tasks.

The overall process is shown in Figure 5b and 5c. More formally, given an initial model  $f_0$  and the training dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , our goal is to learn a final model  $f_K$ . To achieve this, at each training epoch  $k$ , we first perform the *emulator-driven resampling* step (see Figure 5c), where we use the model  $f_k$  to infer on the training dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  to obtain the predicted code  $\hat{C}_i$  for each task  $T_i$ . We evaluate each predicted code using an emulator and update the weight  $w_i$  for  $(T_i, C_i)$  as follows:

$$w_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} [1 + \beta \cdot \mathbb{I}(\text{Emulator}(T_i, \hat{C}_i) = \text{fail})], \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that returns 1 if the predicted code fails to solve  $T_i$ , and 0 otherwise. The hyperparameter  $\beta$  is adjustable, with a larger  $\beta$  encouraging the model to focus more on its mistakes and  $\beta = 0$  equivalent to fine-tuning without resampling. Then, we sample the training dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  according to the categorical distribution  $w'_i = w_i / \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} w_j$ , obtaining a resampled dataset  $\mathcal{D}_k$ . After resampling, we perform the *training* step, where we train the model  $f_k$  using the resampled dataset  $\mathcal{D}_k$  to obtain the model  $f_{k+1}$ . Finally, we repeat the resampling and training steps until the model converges or reaches a predefined number of training epochs, yielding the final model  $f_K$ . To reduce computational costs, resampling can be performed at fixed intervals (set to 3 epochs in our experiments).

## 5 Experimental Evaluations

In this section, we evaluate the performance of large models and fine-tuned models on XLOGO-MINIPROG benchmark. We first describe the experimental setup in Section 5.1, and then present the main results in Section 5.2, followed by additional results and analysis in Section 5.3.

## 5.1 Experimental Setup

**Models evaluated.** We compare a range of large models and their fine-tuned versions. All models are queried with temperature 0. We evaluate the following models:

- *GPT family base models.* We consider the following models from OpenAI’s GPT family: (i) GPT-3.5 model with 175B parameters (version gpt-3.5-turbo-0125) [29]; (ii) GPT-4 model (version gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09) [15]; and (iii) GPT-4V model, which is identical to GPT-4, but we incorporate a task image as additional input to leverage its vision capabilities (version gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09) [15].
- *Llama family base models.* We consider the following models from Meta’s Llama2 and Llama3 family: (i) Llama2-7B, Llama2-13B and Llama2-70B models with 7B, 13B, and 70B parameters, respectively (version instruction-tuned) [42]; (ii) Llama3-8B and Llama3-70B models with 8B and 70B parameters, respectively (version instruction-tuned) [16].
- *Fine-tuned models.* We fine-tune the Llama2-7B and Llama3-8B base models (non-instruction-tuned versions) using our synthetic dataset. We choose non-instruction-tuned versions because the base models will be fine-tuned to generate code, without requiring instruction-following capabilities. For each base model, we use standard fine-tuning and emulator-driven fine-tuning. Llama3-8B-Uni is fine-tuned on our synthetic training dataset with uniform data distribution (i.e., standard fine-tuning). Llama3-8B-Emu is fine-tuned on the same dataset with emulator-driven resampling in Section 4.2. We apply the same fine-tuning procedures to Llama2-7B base models (non-instruction-tuned versions), yielding Llama2-7B-Uni and Llama2-7B-Emu. We will provide additional fine-tuning details in the supplementary material.

**Evaluation procedure and metrics.** We evaluate models using two datasets: XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL and the synthetic evaluation dataset (see Figure 4c), which we refer to as XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL. For each task in our evaluation datasets, we first convert the task from JSON format into natural language description using a fixed prompt template. For GPT-4V model, we also provide an image of the task as additional input to the model. Then, we use the model to generate the code in Python programming language. However, the model might produce the natural language explanation alongside code. We extract only the Python code from the models’ outputs. Finally, we run the extracted code using an emulator and evaluate the model. We use *success* as the main metric (see Section 3.2), and also consider two additional metrics: (i) *Format*, which evaluates if the model’s output adheres to the desired code format, and (ii) *No-Crash*, which evaluates if the code runs without crashing such as hitting walls, entering forbidden areas, or exceeding grid boundaries. To evaluate a model across various dimensions, such as skills and task types, we automatically categorize each task-code pair according to different dimensions (e.g., task type). We determine the model’s capability in a specific aspect within a dimension (e.g., math in the task type dimension) by calculating the success rates for all tasks involving that aspect.

## 5.2 Main Results

The results are shown in Figure 6. For fine-tuned models, we report the mean and standard error of the performance across 5 different random seeds.

**Base models’ performance.** Among the base models evaluated, GPT-4V performs the best with a success rate of 20.00% on the XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL. Notably, GPT-4V outperforms GPT-4, which has a success rate of 12.94%. This suggests that incorporating visual information can enhance the performance of large models on visual programming tasks. However, all other base models, including GPT-3.5 and Llama models, perform poorly on XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL. Regarding the synthetic evaluation dataset XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL, we find that the performance of most base models declines. This is because the tasks in XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL are more challenging than those in XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL in terms of code length and grid size (see Figure 3 and 4). For example, the calculated percentage of code with length “Long (11-17)” in XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL is 25.14%, compared to 17.65% in XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL.

**Effectiveness of fine-tuning.** Standard fine-tuning on a domain-specific dataset significantly enhances the performance of base models. As shown in Figure 6, after standard fine-tuning, the success rate for Llama3-8B-Uni is 54.12% on XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL and 62.72% on XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL. Similar improvements are observed for Llama2-7B-Uni. We also note that the performance

	XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL (85 samples)			XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL (1,000 samples)		
	Format (%)	No-Crash (%)	Success (%)	Format (%)	No-Crash (%)	Success (%)
<b>Base Models</b>						
GPT-3.5	92.94	11.76	1.18	87.60	9.50	1.60
GPT-4	95.29	38.83	12.94	<b>97.40</b>	16.80	5.30
GPT-4V (Vision)	<b>96.47</b>	<b>47.06</b>	<b>20.00</b>	95.50	<b>18.10</b>	<b>5.50</b>
Llama3-8B	48.24	5.88	0.00	40.90	2.80	0.60
Llama3-70B	67.06	8.24	2.35	15.50	1.20	0.30
Llama2-7B	27.06	5.88	0.00	21.90	2.90	0.40
Llama2-13B	60.00	7.06	0.00	54.40	3.50	0.40
Llama2-70B	28.24	7.06	0.00	38.30	1.10	0.10
<b>Fine-tuned Llama2</b>						
Llama2-7B-Uni	99.76 ± 0.24	65.88 ± 1.05	45.65 ± 0.86	<b>99.98 ± 0.02</b>	62.64 ± 0.33	53.04 ± 0.20
Llama2-7B-Emu	<b>100 ± 0.00</b>	<b>69.41 ± 1.97</b>	<b>51.53 ± 0.44</b>	99.96 ± 0.02	<b>68.70 ± 0.49</b>	<b>60.10 ± 0.69</b>
<b>Fine-tuned Llama3</b>						
Llama3-8B-Uni	99.53 ± 0.29	<b>73.65 ± 0.80</b>	54.12 ± 1.78	99.96 ± 0.04	71.26 ± 1.01	62.72 ± 1.17
Llama3-8B-Emu	<b>99.76 ± 0.24</b>	71.53 ± 0.78	<b>60.23 ± 1.01</b>	<b>100 ± 0.00</b>	<b>74.92 ± 0.60</b>	<b>66.92 ± 0.65</b>

Figure 6: Performance comparison of base and fine-tuned models on two evaluation datasets.




Figure 7: Comparative analysis of models’ capabilities across different dimensions on XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL. Each chart highlights the models’ capabilities in different aspects within a dimension. Note that code length and grid size are combined in the same chart, as both indicate the difficulty levels of the tasks. The performance metrics are logarithmically scaled to enhance clarity.

of fine-tuned models on XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL generally lags behind their performance on XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL. This is because the task distribution of XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL more closely resembles the training dataset due to the dataset split. Our results also show that emulator-driven resampling effectively enhances fine-tuning performance. Llama3-8B-Emu achieves a success rate of 60.23% and 66.92% on XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL and XLOGOMINIPROG:SIM-EVAL, respectively, outperforming Llama3-8B-Uni by 6.11% and 4.20%. Similar improvements are observed when comparing Llama2-7B-Uni and Llama2-7B-Emu, indicating that our resampling technique consistently boosts fine-tuning performance across different base models.

### 5.3 Additional Results and Analysis

**Comparative analysis of models’ capabilities.** In Figure 7, we present a comparative analysis of three representative models—GPT-4V, Llama3-70B, and Llama3-8B-Emu—across distinct dimensions using the XLOGOMINIPROG:REAL dataset. Overall, Llama3-8B-Emu consistently outperforms other models across all dimensions and GPT-4V shows superior performance compared to Llama3-70B in most aspects. In Figure 7a, 7b, and 7c, we find that the GPT-4V and Llama3-70B struggle most with tasks of type “logic” and with scenarios that impose code constraints such as `AtMost` and `Exactly`. In terms of the code concepts, Llama3-70B fails to solve any tasks that require variables, showing its limitations in handling complex programming concepts in visual programming. Notably, as shown in Figure 7d, the performance of all models declines with the increasing difficulty of tasks, as indicated by longer code lengths and larger grid sizes. GPT-4V fails to solve tasks requiring long code sequences or grid sizes larger than 6. Llama3-70B performs even more poorly, starting to fail on tasks requiring medium-length codes and grid sizes larger than 3.



### Fine-tuning performance across different epochs.

Figure 8 illustrates the performance of fine-tuned models across different epochs. For the emulator-driven fine-tuning (Emu), we adjust the resampling interval to every three epochs, specifically at epochs 3 and 6. At epoch 3, we reuse the checkpoint from the standard fine-tuning (Uni) to save time and resources. As a result, the performance of the emulator-driven fine-tuning (Emu) matches that of the corresponding standard fine-tuning (Uni) up until epoch 3. Then, an emulator-driven resampling is performed at epoch 3, leading to further performance improvements compared to models without resampling. Notably, at the end of training, Llama2-7B-Emu achieves performance close to that of Llama3-8B-Uni, despite the latter being fine-tuned on a more advanced base model. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the curriculum designed by emulator-driven resampling in enhancing the performance of standard fine-tuning.




Figure 8: Success rates of fine-tuned models across different training epochs.

## 6 Concluding Discussion

**Summary.** In this paper, we introduced the XLOGOMINIPROG benchmark to evaluate the program synthesis capabilities of large models within the XLogoOnline visual programming environment. We found that large models struggle with visual programming tasks that require a combination of skills, despite our benchmark tasks only requiring basic programming skills. Our best evaluated base model, GPT-4V, only achieved a 20% success rate. To improve performance, we developed a fine-tuning pipeline that involves synthetic dataset generation followed by supervised fine-tuning. This pipeline enabled the Llama3-8B model to achieve a success rate of 54.12% on the benchmark tasks. Additionally, we demonstrated that leveraging emulator-driven feedback can further enhance standard fine-tuning performance by approximately 6% in both Llama3-8B and Llama2-7B models.

**Limitations and future work.** We discuss some limitations of our work and propose ideas for addressing them in the future. First, we observe that GPT-4V outperforms GPT-4, indicating that incorporating visual information can enhance the ability of large models to understand visual and spatial relationships in tasks. In the future, one can fine-tune large vision models and evaluate their performance on our benchmark. Second, our emulator-driven fine-tuning provides the model with only binary feedback on the correctness of the predicted code. In the future, it would be interesting to provide more detailed feedback, such as identifying specific errors in the generated code and then using this more informative feedback to guide the fine-tuning process.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

Funded/Co-funded by the European Union (ERC, TOPS, 101039090). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

## References

- [1] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott M. Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of Artificial General Intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *CoRR*, abs/2303.12712, 2023.
- [2] Mark Chen et. al. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR*, abs/2107.03374, 2021.
- [3] GitHub. Github Copilot. <https://github.com/features/copilot>, 2021.
- [4] Tung Phung, Victor-Alexandru Padurean, Anjali Singh, Christopher Brooks, José Cambroneró, Sumit Gulwani, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. Automating Human Tutor-Style Programming Feedback: Leveraging GPT-4 Tutor Model for Hint Generation and GPT-3.5 Student Model for Hint Validation. In *LAK*, 2024.
- [5] Tung Phung, José Cambroneró, Sumit Gulwani, Tobias Kohn, Rupak Majumdar, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. Generating High-Precision Feedback for Programming Syntax Errors using Large Language Models. In *EDM*, 2023.
- [6] Tung Phung, Victor-Alexandru Padurean, José Cambroneró, Sumit Gulwani, Tobias Kohn, Rupak Majumdar, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. Generative AI for Programming Education: Benchmarking ChatGPT, GPT-4, and Human Tutors. In *ICER V.2*, 2023.
- [7] Sida Peng, Eirini Kalliamvakou, Peter Cihon, and Mert Demirer. The Impact of AI on Developer Productivity: Evidence from Github Copilot. *CoRR*, abs/2302.06590, 2023.
- [8] Paul Denny, Sumit Gulwani, Neil T. Heffernan, Tanja Käser, Steven Moore, Anna N. Rafferty, and Adish Singla. Generative AI for Education (GAIED): Advances, Opportunities, and Challenges. *CoRR*, abs/2402.01580, 2024.
- [9] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [10] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-Shot Text-to-Image Generation. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [11] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. In *NeurIPS Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021.
- [12] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. In *ICLR*, 2021.
- [13] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring How Models Mimic Human Falsehoods. In *ACL*, 2022.
- [14] XLogoOnline. XLogoOnline Platform. <https://xlogo.inf.ethz.ch/>, 2024.
- [15] Open AI. GPT-4. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4/>, 2023.
- [16] Meta. Llama 3. <https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>, 2024.
- [17] Baptiste Rozière et al. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. *CoRR*, abs/2308.12950, 2023.
- [18] Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Scott Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. InCoder: A Generative Model for Code Infilling and Synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [19] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. CodeGen: An Open Large Language Model for Code with Multi-Turn Program Synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [20] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell I. Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. Program Synthesis with Large Language Models. *CoRR*, abs/2108.07732, 2021.
- [21] Dan Hendrycks et al. Measuring Coding Challenge Competence With APPS. In *NeurIPS Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021.

- [22] Umair Z. Ahmed, Maria Christakis, Aleksandr Efremov, Nigel Fernandez, Ahana Ghosh, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Adish Singla. Synthesizing Tasks for Block-based Programming. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [23] Ahana Ghosh, Sebastian Tschiatschek, Sam Devlin, and Adish Singla. Adaptive Scaffolding in Block-Based Programming via Synthesizing New Tasks as Pop Quizzes. In *AIED*, 2022.
- [24] Chao Wen, Ahana Ghosh, Jacqueline Staub, and Adish Singla. Task Synthesis for Elementary Visual Programming in XLogoOnline Environment. In *AIED Track on Late Breaking Results*, 2024.
- [25] Victor-Alexandru Pădurean, Georgios Tzannetos, and Adish Singla. Neural Task Synthesis for Visual Programming. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [26] Rudy Bunel, Matthew J. Hausknecht, Jacob Devlin, Rishabh Singh, and Pushmeet Kohli. Leveraging Grammar and Reinforcement Learning for Neural Program Synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [27] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. Execution-Guided Neural Program Synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [28] Manh Hung Nguyen, Sebastian Tschiatschek, and Adish Singla. Large Language Models for In-Context Student Modeling: Synthesizing Student’s Behavior in Visual Programming from One-Shot Observation. In *EDM*, 2024.
- [29] OpenAI. ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2023.
- [30] Adish Singla. Evaluating ChatGPT and GPT-4 for Visual Programming. In *ICER V.2*, 2023.
- [31] Maxime Chevalier-Boisvert, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Salem Lahlou, Lucas Willems, Chitwan Saharia, Thien Huu Nguyen, and Yoshua Bengio. BabyAI: A Platform to Study the Sample Efficiency of Grounded Language Learning. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [32] Maxime Chevalier-Boisvert, Bolun Dai, Mark Towers, Rodrigo Perez-Vicente, Lucas Willems, Salem Lahlou, Suman Pal, Pablo Samuel Castro, and Jordan Terry. Minigrad & Miniworld: Modular & Customizable Reinforcement Learning Environments for Goal-Oriented Tasks. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [33] Mohit Shridhar, Jesse Thomason, Daniel Gordon, Yonatan Bisk, Winson Han, Roozbeh Motlaghi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Dieter Fox. ALFRED: A benchmark for Interpreting Grounded Instructions for Everyday Tasks. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [34] Howard Chen, Alane Suhr, Dipendra Misra, Noah Snaveley, and Yoav Artzi. TOUCHDOWN: Natural Language Navigation and Spatial Reasoning in Visual Street Environments. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- [35] Mohamed Aghzal, Erion Plaku, and Ziyu Yao. Can Large Language Models be Good Path Planners? A Benchmark and Investigation on Spatial-temporal Reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2310.03249, 2023.
- [36] Karthik Valmeekam, Matthew Marquez, Alberto Olmo Hernandez, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. PlanBench: An Extensible Benchmark for Evaluating Large Language Models on Planning and Reasoning about Change. In *NeurIPS Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2023.
- [37] Roy D Pea. Logo Programming and Problem Solving. 1987.
- [38] Juraj Hromkovic, Giovanni Serafini, and Jacqueline Staub. XLogoOnline: A Single-Page, Browser-Based Programming Environment for Schools Aiming at Reducing Cognitive Load on Pupils. In *ISSEP*, 2017.
- [39] Jacqueline Staub. Logo Environments in the Focus of Time. *Bulletin of EATCS*, 2021.
- [40] Zeyu Han, Chao Gao, Jinyang Liu, Jeff Zhang, and Sai Qian Zhang. Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning for Large Models: A Comprehensive Survey. *CoRR*, abs/2403.14608, 2024.
- [41] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [42] Hugo Touvron et. al. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023.