

The virtual CAT: A tool for algorithmic thinking assessment in Swiss compulsory education

Giorgia Adorni^{a,*}, Alberto Piatti^b

^aDalle Molle Institute for Artificial Intelligence (IDSIA), Università della Svizzera Italiana and University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland (USI-SUPSI), Polo universitario Lugano - Campus Est, Via la Santa 1, 6962, Lugano-Viganello, Switzerland

^bDepartment of Education and Learning (DFA), University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland (SUPSI), Piazza S. Francesco 19, 6600, Locarno, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Algorithmic thinking skills
Large-scale assessment
Child Computer Interaction
Swiss compulsory education
Educational technology
Usability evaluation

Abstract

In today's digital era, holding algorithmic thinking (AT) skills is crucial, not only in computer science-related fields. These abilities enable individuals to break down complex problems into more manageable steps and create a sequence of actions to solve them.

To address the increasing demand for AT assessments in educational settings and the limitations of current methods, this paper introduces the virtual Cross Array Task (CAT), a digital adaptation of an unplugged assessment activity designed to evaluate algorithmic skills in Swiss compulsory education.

This tool offers scalable and automated assessment, reducing human involvement and mitigating potential data collection errors. The platform features gesture-based and visual block-based programming interfaces, ensuring its usability for diverse learners, further supported by multilingual capabilities.

To evaluate the virtual CAT platform, we conducted a pilot evaluation in Switzerland involving a heterogeneous group of students. The findings show the platform's usability, proficiency and suitability for assessing AT skills among students of diverse ages, development stages, and educational backgrounds, as well as the feasibility of large-scale data collection.

1. Introduction

Algorithmic thinking (AT) is the systematic approach to breaking down complex problems into manageable steps and devising sequential actions to solve them [10, 24, 75, 87, 100]. It is an indispensable skill in today's digital era, transcending its origins in computer science [8, 42, 100, 101, 103]. AT empowers individuals to excel in various personal and professional domains by enhancing problem-solving abilities, logical reasoning, and creativity [53]. Consequently, it has become increasingly important in educational contexts [68], where it serves as a foundational pillar for comprehending essential concepts such as algorithms and data structures [18, 49, 50, 69]. As a result, a growing need exists to assess this skill to measure students' development and tailor teaching methods to their needs [23, 73, 84].

In the current landscape of AT assessment, educators have a spectrum of approaches at their disposal. Traditional methods, such as closed-ended questions and multiple-choice tests, are commonly used in education and training. They are often used to assess students' knowledge, skills and understanding in various educational contexts. Closed-ended questions elicit brief, direct responses, while multiple-choice tests require selecting answers from pre-defined options. Such methods can assess mastery of specific concepts, memorisation of information and the ability to answer questions clearly and concisely. However, they have been criticised for their limitations in evaluating AT comprehensively, as they often prioritise rote memorisation

and basic knowledge recall, failing to align with the real-world problem-solving nature of AT [14, 17, 70, 88, 98]. Alternative approaches like open-ended questions have the advantage of showcasing problem-solving skills and critical thinking but can be time-consuming and subject to grading inconsistencies [17]. Programming assignments and coding challenges emphasise practical application and offer hands-on evaluation of algorithmic skills. While they provide valuable real-world learning experiences, grading can be labour-intensive and evaluating code quality may require significant effort [91]. Robotic activities provide a hands-on approach to AT assessment, engaging students in real-world problem-solving with physical robots [45, 58]. Despite their benefits, challenges arise concerning access to robotic equipment, resource requirements, and the need for specialised knowledge to facilitate these activities effectively. The domain of automatic assessment systems offers a promising avenue to mitigate some of the challenges associated with standardisation and subjectivity [76, 81]. These systems provide immediate feedback to students, ensuring more consistent evaluations and contributing to a more dynamic and interactive learning experience [76]. Automated assessment tools are well-suited for large-scale educational programs. However, research is still refining their ability to comprehensively assess AT, especially in monitoring learners' progress [90]. Finally, these assessment methods sometimes overlook developmental aspects, social and environmental contexts, and the availability of appropriate educational resources [13, 50, 51, 57, 74, 79, 80, 82, 94, 101]. These emphasise the need for a comprehensive, reliable, and objective assessment tool that can be broadly applied and scaled to accommodate diverse age groups and educational settings [10, 31, 66, 97].

*Corresponding author

✉ giorgia.adorni@idsia.ch (G. Adorni); alberto.piatti@supsi.ch

(A. Piatti)

ORCID(s): 0000-0002-2613-4467 (G. Adorni)

To overcome the inherent limitations in existing approaches, this study builds upon previous work, introducing the Cross Array Task (CAT) [72], an unplugged assessment activity designed to align seamlessly with the distinctive educational landscape of Switzerland. This activity considers tasks' developmental and situated nature in social and artefactual environments, aspects that are often overlooked in the literature. The CAT's focus on these characteristics complements the Swiss educational philosophy, which strongly emphasises diversity and integration. Swiss schools are known for accommodating students with diverse backgrounds, capabilities, and linguistic proficiencies, and the CAT's flexibility enables it to support these goals effectively. While the CAT has demonstrated its effectiveness in evaluating AT abilities in K-12 students, nonetheless, it presents certain limitations. The CAT was conceived as a bilateral activity between a student and a specialist. Thus, it cannot be feasibly administered to an entire class simultaneously by a single expert. Consequently, it proves to be time-consuming and impractical when applied to large-scale assessments. Furthermore, the presence of a human agent in the assessment process can introduce additional challenges. It can make the process raise the potential for errors, given the possibility of inconsistent interpretations of instructions. This paper introduces a digital version of the CAT activity designed to overcome its limitations and enable large-scale assessment, focusing on Switzerland's compulsory education system. While our main objective in this study is to assess AT on a large scale, it also encompasses the design of a tool that can effectively achieve this goal and lays the foundation for understanding how to develop such a tool. This virtual CAT offers multiple interfaces as interaction modes and multilingual support, making it adaptable and accessible to a wide range of pupils. It can be administered through individual devices, allowing multiple pupils to take the assessment simultaneously. This streamlines and automates the assessment process, making it faster and more efficient while reducing human involvement and minimising errors in data collection and interpretation inconsistencies. Given the characteristics of the virtual adaptation of the unplugged CAT, it shows promise in addressing the limitations of current assessment tools and facilitating larger-scale assessments of AT in compulsory education.

2. Design process

This section discusses the design process of the virtual CAT. We employ a formative evaluation approach, drawing from various methodologies, focused on usability, to continuously refine our design [15, 19, 35, 86, 99].

Our design process comprises three distinct User Experience (UX) Design Lifecycles. In the initial phase, we define objectives, analyse prior experiences, and establish tool requirements [48]. We proceed to the designing and prototyping phase, prioritising user experience and usability. During the second phase of our design process, we aimed to improve the user-friendliness of our initial prototype. To

achieve this, we enlisted the expertise of a UX inspector. With their knowledge of UX design guidelines and professional experience, they carefully examined our prototype to identify any potential issues. Based on their findings, we developed an improved prototype that addressed these concerns and provided a better user experience [35].

In the final cycle, we engage children in participatory design, considering their needs and preferences to extract new user requirements [29, 30, 77, 78, 85]. Usability remains central as we actively involve children as informants and evaluators, with teachers facilitating the process [9, 12, 20, 28, 36, 43, 64, 65, 83]. Multiple data elicitation techniques are used to gain insights into usability and effectiveness [32, 33]. More in-depth details are provided in Sections 4 and 5.

2.1. The CAT: from unplugged to virtual interactions


The Cross Array Task (CAT), illustrated in Figure 1, is an assessment activity for K-12 pupils conceived using the CT-cube [72]. This theoretical framework guarantees that any Computational Thinking Problem (CTP) designed includes the necessary cognitive processes involved in problem-solving while also considering the social and environmental factors that influence these processes.

The CAT revolves around the concept of a cross array – a cross-shaped array of 20 dots forming a 2-thick cross, consisting of five 2×2 square arrays of coloured dots, with colours chosen from a set of k colours, usually yellow, green, blue, or red. Each student in this activity receives 12 reference schemas, essentially coloured cross arrays exhibiting different regularities and increasing complexities. The problem solver's task is to devise a set of instructions, referred to as algorithm, to replicate these intricate patterns on a blank cross array. These instructions need to be conveyed to an agent for execution. To communicate the algorithm, the problem solver has the flexibility to use various artefacts, depending on the version of the CAT used. The human or artificial agent is tasked with interpreting the student's instructions and replicating the colouring pattern on a blank cross array, also known as a colouring schema. Typically, during this interaction, a visual barrier prevents the problem solver from seeing the colouring schema to enhance the task's challenge. However, if necessary, the problem solver can remove this barrier and rely on visual clues of the colouring process.

Within the CT-cube framework, the CAT is structured around three dimensions:

1. **Type of activity:** The CAT focuses on algorithm development, or breaking down complex processes into more straightforward instructions that a human or an artificial agent can execute to solve the problem.
2. **Cognitive artefacts:** These are the tools and resources used during the activity. The CAT employs two main types of artefacts: embodied (rooted in sensory experiences) and symbolic (based on abstract representations).

The virtual CAT



(a) The unplugged CAT (Adapted from [72]). The problem solver, a student, is tasked with instructing the agent, typically a researcher, to reproduce a reference schema. The instructions can be communicated orally or through gestures on a support schema. A physical, removable barrier between the problem solver and the agent prevents visual cues between them and heightens the challenge. The agent interprets and records the student's instructions on a protocol and replicates the colouring pattern on a blank cross array.

(b) The virtual CAT. The problem solver, a student, is tasked to reproduce a reference schema using a gesture-based interface or a block-based interface based on a formal programming language that combines visual blocks to compose a set of instructions. The task's default setting limits the problem solver's ability to see the outcome of their actions due to a visual cue prevention feature that can be easily turned on or off. The system automatically logs all actions and algorithms.

Figure 1: Comparison of the setting between the unplugged and virtual CAT.

3. Level of autonomy: The degree of independence exhibited by students during the activity. In the CAT, inactive pupils do not attempt to solve the task; non-autonomous ones rely on visual feedback to do it; autonomous ones provide intelligible instructions without clues.

The CAT assessment process is designed to evaluate pupils based on these dimensions: algorithm complexity, artefact choice, and autonomy level. Specifically, the complexity of the algorithm is assessed based on the operations' dimensions involved: 0D operations involve colouring dots individually, 1D operations involve colouring multiple dots with the same colour based on patterns such as rows, diagonals, and squares, 2D involve more complex patterns with alternating colours, repetition or mirroring of operations. The most complex operation used in an algorithm determines its final classification.

The task is successful if the student conceives a complete and correct algorithm, regardless of its complexity, the artefactual environment or autonomy. A comprehensive metric called the CAT score is used to quantify this multi-facet performance, consisting of two components: the combination of artefact used and autonomy level, referred to as the interaction dimension, and the algorithm dimension. Each component is assigned a numerical score, with a higher score indicative of a student who has navigated the complexities of challenging artefacts, assumed an autonomous role, and/or conceived a higher-dimensional algorithm.

To better understand the evolution of the CAT activity from its original unplugged domain to the virtual one and easily allow for a visual comparison of them, Figure 1 visually illustrates the setup of the two versions, while Table 1 highlights their differences.

The CAT was conceived as an unplugged activity, characterised by a face-to-face interaction between the problem solver and a human agent. In this task version, the problem solver's primary objective was to conceptualise an algorithm and effectively communicate it to the agent.

Within this setup, two different representational artefacts are at the student's disposal. The first was a symbolic artefact, where students could verbally communicate their instructions, describing the process using words. This includes using natural language, which is considered symbolic as it employs words and phrases to represent ideas and concepts. Alternatively, an embodied artefact allowed students to augment voice instructions with physical gestures. For instance, they could use hand movements to point to specific dots on an empty cross array schema, physically illustrating the commands they wished to convey.

Regarding the interaction dynamics between the problem solver and the agent, they were seated in front of each other across a table, with a physical barrier separating them. This screen obstructed the direct visual exchange of actions between the student and the agent. It effectively prevented the student from observing how the agent executed the task of colouring the empty cross array and vice versa.

Table 1

Comparison of unplugged and virtual CAT. The table compares the unplugged and virtual CAT, highlighting key differences in interaction types, available artefacts, autonomy settings, algorithm classification and data collection approaches.

	Unplugged CAT	Virtual CAT
Interaction type	Face-to-face (problem solver & human agent)	Face-to-device (problem solver & virtual agent)
Embodied artefact	S: hand gestures on a schema	G: gesture interface
Symbolic artefact	V: voice	P: visual programming interface
Autonomy	F (or not): removable physical barrier to enable visual feedback	F (or not): button to enable visual feedback
Algorithm classification	A human agent interprets instructions and manually codifies the algorithm	A virtual agent translates actions into formal programming language using an interpreter
Data collection	Manual	Automatic

The agent has the role of interpreting student instructions, documenting them on a protocol, and finally replicating the colouring pattern on a blank cross array based solely on the algorithm communicated by the student.

The evolution from the CAT unplugged version to its virtual counterpart required a transformation in the interaction methods between the problem solver and the artificial agent [5]. The problem solver now interacts with a device, a virtual agent, replacing face-to-face interaction with a human agent.

The original idea of using two different representation methods to convey the algorithm remains, but they have been adjusted. A gesture-based interface is available to replicate hand gestures, maintaining the embodied artefact aspect. The original voice interaction was removed as it posed multiple challenges in a multilingual context and with younger learners. Speech recognition technology struggled to accurately interpret spoken instructions in these scenarios, resulting in a less practical learning experience. As a replacement, we introduced an alternative symbolic artefact, a visual programming interface, hereafter referred to as CAT-VPI, with ready-made building blocks, reproducing commands akin to those encountered in the unplugged CAT. These blocks come in two variations: one conveys commands through textual instructions, while the other employs symbols. The advantage of this block-based coding approach lies in its user-friendly nature, enabling students to construct instructions through simple drag-and-drop actions, enhancing accessibility and reducing the likelihood of syntax errors.

Regarding interaction dynamics, as in the unplugged version, the problem solver cannot observe the executed code or the cross-colouring points reached, however, the interfaces allow the user to activate the visualisation of the progress of the colouring.

The agent maintains the role of interpreting the student’s instructions. A programming language interpreter is used to translate gesture interaction and visual blocks into a formal programming language that mimics the operations observed in the unplugged activity, which we assumed the student would reuse in the virtual version. The algorithms are thus automatically recorded by the virtual agent.

Table 2

CAT score metric to assess task performance. In the tables, rows represent algorithm dimensions, while columns represent interaction dimensions, determined by the combination of artefact used and autonomy level. The two tables differ in the scoring system applied, with the unplugged CAT going from 0 to 4 and the virtual CAT going from 0 to 5.

(a) Unplugged CAT. Interaction dimension acronyms V, VS, and VSF stand for voice, voice with hand gestures on a schema, and the latter incorporating visual feedback.

(b) Virtual CAT. Interaction dimension acronyms G and P stand for gesture and visual programming interfaces, with GF and PF incorporating visual feedback.

	VSF	VS	V		GF	G	PF	P
0D	0	1	2	0D	0	1	2	3
1D	1	2	3	1D	1	2	3	4
2D	2	3	4	2D	2	3	4	5

As the virtual CAT introduces a new set of artefacts for students to interact with compared to the unplugged version, we have slightly adjusted the performance metric used for assessment, as reflected in Table 2.

2.2. The first prototype

In the design of our platform, we prioritised accessibility and usability. In educational technology, accessibility centres on crafting solutions to meet users’ needs from various backgrounds, regardless of their physical or cognitive abilities [44]. In contrast, usability focuses on the user experience, aiming at delivering an intuitive and effective learning environment [7, 27]. To achieve these goals, we made a series of strategic decisions, including considerations such as the choice of compatible devices, language support, and the design and layout of various interfaces, following guidelines and best practices found in [35].

For practical reasons, we opted to skip certain stages, such as crafting paper prototypes, and directly develop a functional prototype. This decision was influenced by limited access to schools and children, along with time constraints, which made a streamlined approach necessary. Additionally, the involvement of very young children in the




Figure 2: CAT visual programming interface (CAT-VPI). (1) The left column organises predefined building blocks using a colour-coding system that groups together commands with similar functionalities. (2) The central column is the workspace where users arrange and combine visual coding blocks from the left column. At the top are three buttons for users to switch between different interfaces. (3) The right column comprises two sections: the reference schema at the top, and the cross representing the current progress at the bottom. An eye button is available above it to toggle visual feedback on and off. The bottom section provides a restart button and a green arrow to confirm and move to the next exercise.

participatory design, who may find abstract reasoning challenging, makes it necessary to opt for a different type of prototype [20, 32, 34, 56].

The app is tailored for iPads, primarily due to their touch-screen interaction, which closely aligns with the intuitive and interactive learning experiences sought in educational settings. This design choice ensures that students, particularly those in K-12 educational contexts, can engage with the application user-friendly and pedagogically effectively, fostering an enriching educational experience [83].

The app is available in four languages: Italian, French, and German to cater to the diverse linguistic landscape of Switzerland; English to extend the app’s utility to a broader range of educational institutions, ensuring that a wider student demographic can benefit from the learning experience it offers, paving the way for potential adoption beyond Switzerland’s borders (see Figure A.1).

The platform provides users with two distinct methods to engage with it - a gesture interface (CAT-GI) and a visual programming interface (CAT-VPI). We adhered to standard mobile application design principles when crafting the interfaces to ensure their usability and effectiveness [16, 35, 62, 93]. This includes incorporating common elements, like a top bar and a left-side menu list, to create an interface familiar to users with experience with other applications. We prioritised the legibility and readability of text, ensuring that font sizes were large enough for all users and that the background had a good contrast. We ensured our system was accessible to everyone, including people with

visual impairments and colour blindness. To achieve this, we used high-contrast visuals and colours that are easy to see. Users can switch to a colour-blind mode and also use our text-to-speech feature. We maintained consistency by using similar names and labels for similar objects and functions and employing precise wording in menus, icons, and data fields to enhance clarity. We avoided synonyms to ensure an intuitive user experience. To align with established conventions, we placed commonly used features in easily accessible locations. Our platform features a responsive design that adapts seamlessly to different devices for optimal usability. Overall, our adherence to these mobile application design principles aimed to create a user-friendly and accessible, enhancing the overall experience for all users, regardless of their abilities or prior experience with similar applications.

2.3. Expert evaluation and design of a refined prototype

After developing the initial prototype of the platform, we collaborated with experts to enhance its usability and accessibility. First, we consulted with an interaction design researcher and teacher, who recommended more intuitive icons and a restructuring of the interfaces to establish a shared uniform page layout. This resulted in adopting a consistent design featuring three columns, each optimised for specific functions: the left column featured predefined code blocks or buttons, the central column served as the workspace for user interactions, and the right column displayed the coloured schemas to be replicated. Additionally,




Figure 3: CAT gesture interface (CAT-GI). (1) The left column provides buttons to select colours and actions. (2) The central column is the workspace where users can directly touch the dots to colour the cross. At the top are three buttons for users to switch between different interfaces. (3) The right column comprises two sections: the reference schema at the top, and the cross representing the current progress at the bottom. An eye button is available above it to toggle visual feedback on and off. The bottom section provides a restart button and a green arrow to confirm and move to the next exercise.

we sought the expertise of three pedagogical specialists in computer science education and pedagogy to refine the educational aspects of our initiative. They provided strategies for introducing the activity and platform to pupils in an engaging and age-appropriate manner.

Visual programming interface The development of the CAT-VPI has given rise to a visual programming language (CAT-VPL) designed to make coding accessible to a broad audience, particularly K-12 students, including those with no prior programming experience. The CAT-VPI is depicted in Figure 2a. Within this virtual environment, users engage with a drag-and-drop mechanism, which facilitates the organisation of predefined building blocks for constructing a colouring algorithm. These building blocks inherently possess predefined functions that mirror their counterparts in the formal programming language. Nevertheless, users can customise these blocks by adjusting parameters such as colour or pattern choices. To ensure inclusivity for learners of diverse backgrounds, ages, and cognitive abilities, we provided two different representations for commands, one textual, offering explicit linguistic command expressions (see Figure 2b) and one symbolic, enabling non-literate learners to interact effectively with the interface (see Figure 2c).

Gesture interface The CAT-GI is intentionally designed to emulate the hand gestures observed during the unplugged CAT activity. This interface allows engaging in a hands-on, tactile experience similar to interacting with the physical empty cross array, bridging the gap between physical and virtual learning environments. Users can directly interact

with the cross by selecting colours and touching the dots, mimicking the physical engagement of the unplugged activity. By dragging their fingers across the screen, users can create patterns, while additional complex actions such as repeating instructions or mirroring patterns can be executed using action buttons, adding layers of complexity to their algorithm, as showcased in Figure 3.

3. Implementation

The final application, described in a comprehensive software article [4, 5], was developed using Flutter [26]. This choice of framework yielded multiple advantages. Its extensive platform support, including Android, iOS, Linux, macOS, Windows, and the web, ensures compatibility across various devices. Although the app is designed to be used on an iPad, thanks to the cross-platform framework, we developed a single codebase that runs seamlessly on multiple platforms, saving us much time and effort in platform-specific development. The application design is responsive, which means it has a consistent look across different platforms and screen sizes. Another benefit is the streamlined and effective development experience provided by the hot reload feature, which allows developers to see the effects of code changes, making iterative development more seamless and increasing productivity. Additionally, Flutter provides ample pre-built widgets and libraries, offering the necessary tools to create visually engaging and interactive user interfaces. The latest version of the application, along with its comprehensive source code and documentation, is available online and can be accessed through reference [4].

3.1. Definition of a formal programming language

To establish a standardised set of instructions that users could employ within the application interfaces to design the algorithm, we defined the CAT programming language, which codifies and formalises all the commands and actions observed during the original experimental study with the unplugged CAT.

Cross representation The cross-board dots are manipulated and referenced using a coordinate system, where rows are labelled from bottom to top using letters (A-F), and columns are numbered from left to right (1-6).

Moves Moving around the cross-board can be done in two ways. The `goCell(cell)` method allows jumping directly to a specific coordinate. Alternatively, the `go(move, repetitions)` method allows traversing a certain number of dots in one of the eight available directions (either cardinal or diagonal) to reach the desired destination.

Basic colouring Colouring the board is a fundamental aspect of the CAT application, and we offer various methods to achieve this. The `paintSingleCell(color)` method allows colouring the dot they are currently positioned on with a single colour. The `paintPattern(colors, repetitions, pattern)` method allows colouring multiple dots according to predefined patterns. A sequence of colours can be specified, which will alternate following the selected pattern. Additionally, users can choose from five pattern types (cardinal, diagonal, square, L, zigzag), each with various directions. The `paintMultipleCells(colors, cellsPositions)` method enables colouring multiple dots with custom patterns, defined by specifying the coordinates of the cells to be coloured. The `fillEmpty(color)` method colours all the uncoloured dots on the board with the same colour.

Repetition-based colouring Moving beyond the basics, other methods allow for more complex operations. The `repeatCommands(commands, positions)` method allows specifying a sequence of commands (e.g., a series of `go` and `paint` operations) and applying them to specific coordinates. The `copyCells(origin, destination)` method copies the colours from origin coordinates to destination coordinates.

Symmetry-based colouring Finally, symmetrical colouring approaches are available. The `mirrorBoard(direction)` method, which reflects the coloured dots on the board onto the non-coloured ones, following the principle of symmetry. This mirroring can be done horizontally on the x-axis or vertically on the y-axis. The `mirrorCells(cells, direction)` method performs similar mirroring operations but on a specified set of dots. The `mirrorCommands(commands, direction)` method applies the mirroring to a list of commands.

3.2. Definition of the virtual CAT interpreter

The virtual CAT programming language interpreter [3] is a dedicated Dart package that can be integrated into any Flutter project, in our case, the virtual CAT app [4].

It translates student actions, including gesture interactions and arranged visual programming blocks, into executable machine-readable instructions. It analyses the user's input, converting actions into a formal algorithm specified using the CAT programming language.

Each command that composes the algorithm, such as colour selections and other operations, undergoes a validation process to identify and address semantic errors. Notably, the interface's design, featuring predefined programming blocks and buttons, obviates the need for syntax checking, as it inherently eliminates the possibility of such errors, significantly streamlining the process. However, semantic errors can still occur during command execution, for instance, when users attempt to move outside the board boundaries using invalid directions or apply an inappropriate pattern for a colouring command.

Upon validation, the code is executed, and real-time feedback is provided to the user, including the display of current progress on the colouring cross and the CAT score. If the interpreter detects errors, it handles them and provides users with error notifications and potential suggestions for correction.

3.3. Server and data handling

Considering the often limited availability of secure networks in educational settings, we implemented a technical framework to prioritise participant privacy and responsible data management [2]. To use this system, a local network infrastructure should be established using a router to connect all devices involved in the activity to a designated computer, which serves as the data collection point. Within this network, a database should be configured to securely receive and store the acquired data from the iPads. Afterwards, all collected data can be transferred from the local database to a dedicated repository through a private network connection.

4. Experimental

This section provides an in-depth overview of the formative evaluation conducted to evaluate the platform's usability, proficiency, and suitability.

We organised our pilot study as a participatory design involving three roles: a researcher, students and teachers [85]. Pupils were at the heart of the study, and their interactions with the platform were crucial for assessing our tool [21, 52, 95, 96]. The inclusion of children in the design and evaluation of their artefacts aimed at empowering them to take an active role in driving [38, 41, 46, 47] and critically reflecting on the developed tool, as well as making the process enjoyable and rewarding [11, 59, 60, 61]. In this phase, children are encouraged to share their evolving ideas as they perform the activity and test the tool [37, 39, 40, 102].

Teachers also played a vital role in facilitating the study, providing assistance as needed, and ensuring a smooth classroom experience.

The researcher, responsible for administering the activity, closely monitored pupil progress and interactions, collected empirical data on task performance and gathered

Table 3

Demographic analysis of students by school type, age category and gender. The table provides an overview of the gender distribution among students in different school types and age ranges. The Female and Male columns represent the number of female and male students, respectively, while the Total column displays the combined count. The mean age (μ) and standard deviation (\pm) are presented for each age range.

School	Age	Female	Male	Total
Preschool	3-6 years old ($\mu = 5.0 \pm 1.0$)	3	4	7
Secondary school	10-13 years old ($\mu = 11.3 \pm 0.6$)	18	6	24
Total		21	10	31

feedback from students and teachers. Multiple data elicitation techniques, including think-aloud and observation, are employed to gain insights into the usability and effectiveness of the design [33, 35].

We gathered empirical data through a combination of user-centred techniques, including think-aloud sessions for real-time verbalised feedback, note-taking to capture observations and essential points, and observational analysis to understand underlying phenomena and user reactions, all following Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) principles and UX design practices [22, 33, 35, 37, 54, 55].

4.1. Selection and participation

In March 2023, we conducted a pilot study to evaluate the virtual CAT as an assessment tool. It involved a sample of 31 students, 21 girls and 10 boys, from two schools in the Ticino canton (see Table 3). In each class, we conducted the activity with all the pupils who were prone to participate and were explicitly allowed by their parents.

To ensure a representative sample, we randomly selected schools, including a preschool class (4-6 ys) and two low secondary classes (11-12 ys), representing opposite ends of the compulsory education system in Switzerland. This aimed to demonstrate the platform's effectiveness for diverse school types, which can be extended to cover compulsory education.

Given the participation of young students, we strictly adhered to ethical guidelines and maintained transparent communication with pupils, parents, and schools [6, 71]. Initially, we obtained authorisation from school directors and teachers to conduct the research within their schools and classes. Next, we provided parents with an exhaustive document explaining the research project, data collection and storage procedures, and the personnel involved. We also requested their consent for their children's participation and publishing the collected data. Teachers obtained informed consent from parents without recording pupils' full names to safeguard privacy, ensuring data anonymity from the outset.

4.2. Training module

In our study, we recognised the importance of ensuring pupils' familiarity with the assessment tool. To achieve this, we designed and integrated a training module within the app that serves as a preparatory step for scholars, allowing them to become acquainted with the tool's interface and functionalities (see Figure A.2). This module included 15 sample cross-array schemas to solve. Additionally, a step-by-step guide to the app's features and functions was provided by a researcher during live, in-person sessions held in every class. During this phase, we fostered a collaborative and interactive environment to ensure pupil understanding of the activity. Teachers played a crucial role in assisting the researcher and guiding the class, ensuring they received clear guidance. The training sessions were held in groups based on device availability and lasted about 30-45 minutes. To ensure a respectful testing environment for children, we tailored the training approach to their developmental level, including age-appropriate guidance, particularly directing kindergarten pupils to use only the gesture interface [34]. This adaptation involved simplifying instructions, ensuring comfort, and pacing the test accordingly. No data collection occurred during this phase, allowing students to concentrate on becoming comfortable with the tool and its functions.

4.3. Validation module and data collection

In the pilot study, data collection occurred within the validation session, a module integrated into the app to mimic the original activity with the 12 schemas to solve. Session and student details must be manually input into the app to start the data collection process (see Figures A.4 and A.5). Specifically, we recorded the date, the canton, the school where data was collected, and the class's grade level. Pupils' details were limited to their gender and date of birth. To uphold anonymity, each student was assigned a unique identifier.

Throughout the entire activity, the application's log meticulously tracked every action performed by the pupils. This included recording the timestamp and type of operation carried out, such as adding, confirming, removing, or reordering commands, updating command properties like colours or directions, resetting the algorithm, changing the mode of interaction or visibility, confirming task completion, or surrendering. This comprehensive data collection was instrumental in assessing pupil performance, providing valuable insights for the study's analysis and findings.

We followed the current open science practice in Switzerland [89] and pseudonymised all the data. The data has been made available through Zenodo for public access [1] after removing any information that could identify the pupil (e.g., school and class).

5. Results

This section presents the results of our formative evaluation aimed at assessing the tool and the interface prototypes, shown in Section 2.3, all in the context of our educational objectives. Additionally, we explore the tool's practicality

Table 4

Definition of evaluation criteria. The table provides the definitions for the established criteria used to evaluate the tool and interface prototypes.

Criterion	Definition
Usability	Pupils ability to use all interfaces, regardless of age
Proficiency	Pupils proficiency in generating algorithms across all three dimensions, regardless of age
Suitability	Pupils success in completing all provided schemas, regardless of age
Feasibility	Platform practicality of large-scale administration, data collection and analysis

Table 5

Criteria evaluation measures. The table provides the specific measures to assess the tool and interface prototypes.

Criterion	Measures
Usability	Completion time for interaction dimensions and used interfaces
Proficiency	Developed algorithms
Suitability	Success rates of individual schemas
Feasibility	Time efficiency, resource requirements, automation and scalability

for assessing algorithmic skills among K-12 pupils on a large scale. For this assessment, we established specific criteria and defined corresponding measures, customised to our educational context, as detailed in Tables 4 and 5, drawing upon established usability standards in the literature [35, 63, 67].

We evaluate usability by analysing the completion time across different interaction dimensions. Table 6 reveals that the gesture interface, both with and without feedback, leads to quicker task completion times than the visual programming interface counterparts. This observation aligns with expectations, as the gesture interface represents a less complex dimension of the artefactual environment, making it more intuitive and efficient for students. However, it's interesting to note that when considering the maximum completion times, the gesture interface, particularly with feedback, recorded the longest time. One possible explanation is that less proficient students may gravitate towards the gesture interface, which could lead to longer completion times. This suggests that interface choice may not solely reflect usability but also user proficiency. It is important to note that students who rely on visual feedback take more time to complete their tasks on average. This could indicate that while feedback aids pupils in task comprehension, it might extend the overall interaction duration as they process and respond to the feedback.

Additionally, Figure 4 provides insights into younger and older pupils' strategies to solve the tasks based on the algorithmic and interaction dimensions. Pupils across different age groups display a balanced usage of multiple interfaces and autonomy levels on the platform. Notably,

Table 6

Analysis of activity completion time across interaction dimensions. The table presents a comprehensive overview of the time taken by students to complete all schemas using different interfaces, gestures (G) or visual programming (P), with and without visual feedback (F). The average, minimum, and maximum completion times, in minutes, are reported for each interface.

Interface	Avg time	Min time	Max time
GF	16 min	4 min	29 min
G	13 min	4 min	29 min
PF	18 min	8 min	28 min
P	17 min	7 min	28 min
Total	16 min	4 min	29 min




Figure 4: Algorithmic and interaction strategies. The table illustrates the distribution of algorithmic dimensions – 0D, 1D, 2D – across interaction dimensions – gesture interface and visual feedback (GF), gesture interface (G), visual programming interface and visual feedback (PF), and visual programming interface (P) – for younger and older pupils. Percentages represent the proportion of each combination within their respective age groups. It's worth noticing that the younger age category was not allowed to use the visual programming interfaces (PF and P).

pupils in the younger age group consistently used all available interfaces. In contrast, the distribution of interaction dimensions concerning the algorithm dimension in the older age category shows noteworthy variations. Older pupils tend to employ simpler algorithms more frequently with the gesture interface, while they conceive more complex algorithms with the visual programming interface. These differences highlight the nuanced ways in which students engage with different interfaces and how this impacts their problem-solving strategies. To evaluate proficiency, Figure 4 provides insights into younger and older pupils' strategies to solve the tasks. Pupils exhibit proficiency in generating algorithms across all three dimensions. In both age groups, 1D algorithms are the most used, consistent with findings from the unplugged CAT. Among younger pupils, about 31% employed straightforward 0D algorithms, while only a tiny portion used 2D algorithms, indicating a preference for simplicity. For older pupils, 1D algorithms were even more prevalent, with a higher percentage of pupils adopting this approach. Additionally, there was a reliance on 2D algorithms, demonstrating a combination of sequential and branching strategies in their problem-solving.

Table 7

Analysis of student performance across age categories and schemas. The table presents the number and percentage of students who attempted and solved each schema for each age category. The percentage of “solved” schemas is calculated only among pupils who attempted it.

Schema	Num. pupils who solved the schema		
	3-6 years old	10-13 years old	Total
1	3/6 (50%)	22/24 (92%)	25/30 (83%)
2	3/5 (60%)	21/24 (88%)	24/29 (83%)
3	4/6 (67%)	19/23 (83%)	23/29 (79%)
4	4/6 (67%)	17/20 (85%)	21/26 (81%)
5	6/6 (100%)	16/20 (80%)	22/26 (85%)
6	2/6 (33%)	21/22 (95%)	23/28 (82%)
7	1/5 (20%)	12/20 (60%)	13/25 (52%)
8	2/5 (40%)	18/21 (86%)	20/26 (77%)
9	3/4 (75%)	20/21 (95%)	23/25 (92%)
10	3/5 (60%)	18/19 (95%)	21/24 (88%)
11	2/4 (50%)	14/18 (78%)	16/22 (73%)
12	1/3 (33%)	14/17 (82%)	15/20 (75%)

To assess suitability, we investigate success rates in individual schemas for the two age groups. Not all pupils could complete all 12 proposed schemas during the activity due to various factors. The interruptions were primarily due to the allotted time for the experiment to end or other classroom-related factors necessitating them to move on to other activities. Additionally, some pupils voluntarily discontinued the assessment in the younger age group due to their limited attention spans, which is typical for young kindergarteners. To gain further insights into how students attempted the provided tasks, Table 7 reports the success rates in the 12 schemas. The average success rate for all schemas is approximately 75%, indicating that pupils of all ages could complete these tasks successfully. Schemas 9 and 10, in particular, recorded impressively high percentages of 92% and 88%, respectively. From the table, it is apparent that older students (10–13 years old) generally achieved higher success rates, while younger students (3–6 years old), on the other hand, demonstrated varying degrees of success. These varying success rates reflect the intentional design strategy to increase task difficulty as schemas progress. For example, Schema 7 posed a significant challenge across all age groups, registering the lower success rate. Interestingly, some students successfully tackled even more complex schemas. This demonstrates the platform’s flexibility and adaptability, demonstrating its capacity to accommodate a range of difficulty levels.

Finally, to assess the feasibility of the virtual CAT for large-scale assessment, a comparison with the unplugged CAT method was necessary. The original CAT, designed for one-on-one interactions between a student and a specialist, proved impractical for administering to an entire class with a single expert, resulting in a time-consuming and unsuitable choice for large-scale assessments. The virtual CAT introduced a pivotal shift in the administration process. Unlike the unplugged CAT, which necessitated a time-intensive individual administration process, totalling approximately

36 hours of data collection for all 109 participants, the virtual CAT’s administration is contingent on device availability. Providing each student with individual devices allows the activity to be orchestrated for the entire class simultaneously and seamlessly. This transition drastically reduces the overall time investment required. Moreover, it opens up the possibility of conducting assessments across multiple class groups. After the data collection with the virtual CAT, there was an additional significant advantage – the data collected was automatically digitised, eliminating the need for labour-intensive manual data entry required with the unplugged CAT, saving considerable time and effort. These features underscore the platform’s scalability and efficiency, demonstrating its feasibility for large-scale assessments. However, the current structure of the training module can be an obstacle to the actual large-scale implementation. The only obstacle to large-scale implementation currently lies in the structure of the training module. The presence of a human researcher during the data collection to illustrate the tool and its functionalities could result in varying explanations, especially if different persons provide the tutorial. This may introduce inconsistencies that can affect how other groups of pupils engage with the task, unintentionally influencing their behaviours and performance.

5.1. User-driven platform refinements

Delving into the process of refining the virtual CAT, in this section, we explore how active collaboration with teachers and pupils from different age groups and schools guided the improvement of the platform. In particular, by collecting feedback and documenting pertinent observations about the users’ interactions with the tool, including their command preferences and progress throughout the activity phases, we identified areas for refinement, leading to significant adjustments to enhance usability, proficiency and suitability. The final design of the user interfaces is visually depicted in Appendix A in Figures A.6, A.7 and A.8.

Collaborating with the students yielded invaluable insights for enhancing the platform. First, we noticed that as time was running out, concluding the activity required individually confirming each schema. This process was unnecessary and time-consuming. Moreover, it led to schemas being marked as failed instead of not attempted. In response, we introduced a surrender button, allowing users to skip specific schemas (see Figure 5). This feature also allows users if they feel stuck on a task and want to move on. Additionally, to satisfy the curiosity of some pupils who wanted to explore forthcoming schema, we included navigation arrows (see Figure 5). In response to feedback provided by some students who found the visual feedback button unclear and difficult to interpret, we took measures to improve it. We replaced the button with two new icons, one with an open eye indicating active visual feedback and one with a closed eye implying that visual feedback is turned off (see Figure 5).

During the course of the activities, some students showed interest in knowing the number of remaining schemas to be completed. For this reason, we decided to add a progress




Figure 5: Changes in the interface right column. The current schema score is added at the top. Below, navigation arrows provide a way to navigate schemas. The reset button is moved within the navigation controls. The surrender button is added at the bottom to skip the current schema.



Figure 7: Changes in the left column of the visual programming interface. Commands are reorganised into four coloured menus – moves, basic colouring, repetition-based colouring, and symmetry-based colouring.



Figure 6: Progress bar. Completed schemas are marked as correct, wrong, or skipped; the ongoing schema is in orange.

bar at the top of the central column of the interfaces (see Figure 6). This enhancement was aligned with the usability principle of “progress indicators” to help users plan and manage task sequencing while staying motivated and organised throughout the activities [35].

While observing the pupils engaging with the visual programming interface, we noticed that they did not employ all the available commands but only those that were readily visible. This was due to the fact that some commands were not immediately accessible and required scrolling down the column to see them. For this reason, we grouped commands into menus and revised their colours (see Figure 7). These adjustments align with usability principles emphasising the organisation and grouping of design elements to simplify content complexity, improve visibility, accessibility, intuitiveness, and streamline user experience [35].

Another observation we made was that some pupils occasionally forgot to select the colour parameter within the paint blocks. To make it easier for users to identify and adjust these parameters, we enclosed all customisable parameters within shaded boxes (see Figure 8). This design

enhancement aligns with usability principles that recommend indicating active defaults to suggest choices and values and guiding data entry in formatted fields [35].

Finally, despite having written instructions, some users found it difficult to understand how to fill nested blocks. To improve clarity and enhance user understanding, we added a transparent representation of the type of blocks that could be inserted within nested blocks, accompanied by more detailed and clearer instructions for each label (see Figure 9). This design improvement aligns with usability principles that emphasise assisting users in getting started with a task and providing them with comprehensive instructions to understand how to use different interface elements effectively [35].

While observing the users engaging with the gesture interface, we noticed some issues. For instance, some commands were found to be unintuitive, such as the fillEmpty button being used without first selecting the desired colour. To address this, we implemented a conditional activation and deactivation of buttons based on their appropriateness in a given context, aligning with usability principles that recommend disabling buttons or menu choices to prevent inappropriate choices and greying out unavailable options [35]. Furthermore, we implemented a visual feedback mechanism, which includes a shaking effect on the cross and flashing available commands when users perform actions against the intended workflow. This feature aims to guide




Figure 8: Changes in the custom parameter presentation. Shaded boxes distinguish customisable parameters.




Figure 9: Changes in the nested blocks. The updated design includes transparent representations of possible inner blocks within the main block.

pupils toward the correct actions, enhancing the overall user experience.

Finally, teachers also offered valuable insights. One noteworthy suggestion was to provide real-time feedback to help students monitor their progress and performance during the assessment. In response, we included a box that displays the current score for the ongoing schema (see Figure 5). Additionally, we introduced a final dashboard with a comprehensive summary of student performance across completed schemas (see Figure A.9).

All these refinements aim to enhance the platform’s usability, proficiency and suitability. To make the platform entirely feasible for large-scale data collection and assessment, we redesigned the training module. Rather than relying on a researcher to introduce the app, we’ve integrated in-app video tutorials to let users navigate the platform independently, thereby eliminating potential biases stemming from researcher explanations (see Figure A.3).

Our vision for future developments involves continuous refinement and expansion of the platform. To formally assess user experience, we have designed a brief survey to be incorporated at the end of the validation module (see Figure A.10) to collect subjective impressions from pupils about how they perceive the tool and their overall experience. This survey aligns with established UX design techniques for data elicitation [33, 35] and the Technology Acceptance Model [35, 92], which considers factors such as ease of use, perceived usefulness, attitude towards use, and behavioural intention to assess users’ acceptance of a system. The survey covers various aspects, including perceived usability, satisfaction, emotional impact, and overall acceptance of the platform. These factors are essential for understanding pupils’ attitudes and experiences with technology in an educational context. It delves into various facets of the user experience, from the initial enjoyment and familiarity with such apps to the clarity of the app’s rules and the user’s preferred mode of interaction. It also gauges the difficulty level of the exercises and the time taken to complete them. Towards the end, participants are prompted to reflect on whether they’d revisit the app. We also considered that our users span different age groups and literacy levels. To accommodate this diversity, we have incorporated a feature that reads the survey questions aloud, ensuring that even younger students who may not be proficient readers can effectively participate. The survey format is designed to be engaging and accessible to students. They can respond using emoticons (happy, neutral, sad), which is consistent with research indicating that child-specific data collection methods, like smileyometers, are valuable for assessing children’s subjective attitudes toward interactive products [25, 32, 77]. By collecting feedback through this well-structured survey, we aim to gain a deeper understanding of pupils’ perspectives and further enhance the platform to cater to their specific needs and preferences.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This research comprehensively evaluated the virtual CAT platform, primarily focusing on its usability, proficiency, and suitability for assessing algorithmic skills among K-12 students and its feasibility for large-scale data collection. The results of our study suggest several key findings and offer insights into the potential of this platform for broader applications in educational contexts. *Usability: balanced interface usage across age groups.* The first outcome of our investigation was the balanced usage of multiple interfaces within the virtual CAT platform across different age groups and backgrounds. This underscores the platform’s versatility and ability to cater to learners from diverse demographics, ensuring they can engage effectively with the assessment tasks. This aspect aligns with the usability criterion, reflecting the platform’s user-friendliness and adaptability.

Proficiency: diverse algorithmic approaches across age groups. Our analysis revealed that students from different age groups approached algorithmic tasks with varying levels

of complexity. This finding aligns with the proficiency criterion, showcasing the platform's ability to cater to a wide range of student abilities.

Suitability: high engagement and success across age groups. Our study found that students of all ages were highly engaged in the assessment tasks. This shows that the platform effectively encourages active participation among diverse pupils. Many students not only participated actively but also succeeded in completing their tasks. This combination of high engagement and success rates aligns with the suitability criterion, demonstrating that the platform is effective in motivating and helping students learn, regardless of their backgrounds and abilities.

Feasibility: large-scale assessment possible. Additionally, our study explored the potential for large-scale assessments, showing that the virtual CAT is well-equipped to handle extensive assessments efficiently. These findings align with prior research emphasising the potential of technology-enhanced assessments to yield rich data and facilitate formative assessment practices.

Our study encountered several limitations that should be acknowledged. The relatively small sample size of 31 students, while suitable for a pilot study, restricts the generalisability of the findings. Technical issues, such as server disconnections, data loss, and interruptions due to time constraints, class schedules, or student attention spans, might have impacted task attempts and success rates, particularly among younger pupils. The study primarily focused on Swiss educational settings, which limits the direct applicability of the findings in other countries with different curricula and teaching approaches.

In conclusion, despite these acknowledged limitations, our research suggests that the virtual CAT platform shows promise for assessing algorithmic skills across diverse educational settings and age groups. It provides a foundation for future improvements and applications, especially large-scale assessments.

Ethical approval

This study adhered to EPFL Human Research Ethics Committee's (HREC) ethical standards and received approval (HREC No: 048-2023). Participants and, for those under 12, their parents or legal guardians provided informed consent; those over 12 also gave assent. Following Swiss and international guidelines, data was handled confidentially, with pseudonymisation for participant protection.

Data availability

The data supporting this research is available in a Zenodo repository: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10018292>.

Software availability

The software components used in this study are open-source: virtual CAT platform (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10027851>), virtual CAT programming language

interpreter (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10016535>), virtual CAT data infrastructure (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10015011>).

Funding

This research was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) under the National Research Program 77 (NRP-77) Digital Transformation (No: 407740_187246).

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

We express our gratitude to Simone Piatti and Volodymyr Karpenko for contributing to implementing the CAT language interpreter and the virtual CAT application.

We extend our appreciation to the contributions of Lucio Negrini, Francesco Mondada, Francesca Mangili, Dorit Assaf, and Luca Maria Gambardella, members of this research project, and Jérôme Guillaume Brender and Giovanni Profeta. They generously devoted their time and expertise to testing the application and providing valuable feedback. Their insights and support have been highly valuable throughout the refinement and usability of the application.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work, the authors used ChatGPT and Grammarly to enhance language and readability. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the publication.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Giorgia Adorni: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data curation, Writing – original draft & review & editing, Visualization, Supervision. **Alberto Piatti:** Conceptualization, Validation, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

A. Revised platform interfaces



Figure A.1: Language selection.




Figure A.2: Module selection.

The virtual CAT



Figure A.3: Training module. An introductory video about the application is provided on the training screen, followed by a series of explanatory videos for all practice tasks in each interface. After watching the video, users can attempt to solve the schema using the provided instructions. When a schema is successfully solved, the video icon is marked with a green checkmark.

The screenshot shows a mobile application interface titled "Session data". At the top left is a back arrow icon, and at the top center is the text "Session data". Below this, there is a form with several input fields: "School:" with a dropdown menu and the text "Select the school"; "Canton:" with a dropdown menu and the text "Select the canton"; "HarmoS grade:" with a dropdown menu and the text "Select HarmoS grade"; "Section:" with a text input field and the text "Enter the section name"; "Supervisor:" with a dropdown menu and the text "Select the supervisor"; "Date:" with a text input field containing "26/8/2023"; and "Notes:" with a large text area. At the bottom of the form, there is a "Continue" button.

Figure A.4: Session form in the validation module.

The virtual CAT

The screenshot shows a tablet interface titled "Student data". At the top, it says "Session: 1". Below that, there are two input fields: "Gender: Enter the student gender" and "Birth date: 26/8/2023". A "Continue" button is centered below the second field. The rest of the screen is a light blue-grey area.

Figure A.5: Student form in the validation module.

The screenshot shows a complex tablet interface for a visual programming task. At the top, there's a progress bar with numbers 1 to 12, where '1' is highlighted in orange. On the left, there are several stacked green panels with text commands and input fields: "GO TO in which direction?" with "right" selected, "of how many dots?" with "1" selected, "CHOOSE DOT dot" with "C1" selected, "COLOURING" with a color palette, "COLOUR REGULAR PATTERN" with "right" and "2" selected, and "COLOUR IRREGULAR PATTERN" with "where?" selected. In the center, a green box says "CHOOSE DOT dot" with "C1" selected. On the right, there's a grid of blue dots labeled A1-A6 and D1-D6, a grid of grey dots, and a trophy icon with "0". At the bottom right, there are red 'X' and green checkmark icons.

Figure A.6: CAT visual programming interface (CAT-VPI) with textual commands.

The virtual CAT




Figure A.7: CAT visual programming interface (CAT-VPI) with symbolic commands.




Figure A.8: CAT gesture interface (CAT-GI).

The virtual CAT




Figure A.9: Results dashboard. It comprehensively summarises pupils' performance across all schemas. This dashboard includes a visual representation of reference schemas alongside those resulting from student instructions, the pupil's score, an indication of whether each schema was completed correctly, incorrectly, or skipped, and the time taken to complete the schema.

Did you enjoy this activity?	Yes, very much	So-so	No, not at all
Have you ever used an app like this to do exercises and learn?	Yes	I don't remember	Never
Was the app easy to use?	Easy	Normal	Difficult
Were the rules of the activity easy to understand?	Easy	Normal	Difficult
Which resolution mode did you prefer to use?	Blocks and text	Blocks and symbols	Gestures
Were the exercises easy to solve?	Easy	Normal	Difficult
How long did you take to complete the exercises?	A little	Normal	So long
Would you do this experience again?	Yes of course	Maybe	No, never

Go to the results

Figure A.10: Pupil feedback survey. The voice-assisted questions evaluate user interactions with the app. Each question is accompanied by three distinct emoticon-style response options: a contented smiling face, a neutral face, and a discontented frowning face. A concluding button invites users to view aggregated results.

References

- [1] G. Adorni. Dataset for algorithmic thinking skills assessment: Results from the virtual CAT pilot study in Swiss compulsory education (1.0.0), 2023. Zenodo Dataset. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10018292>.
- [2] G. Adorni and V. Karpenko. virtual CAT data infrastructure (1.0.0), 2023. Zenodo Software. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10015011>.
- [3] G. Adorni and V. Karpenko. virtual CAT programming language interpreter (1.0.0), 2023. Zenodo Software. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10016535>.
- [4] G. Adorni, S. Piatti, and V. Karpenko. virtual CAT: An app for algorithmic thinking assessment within Swiss compulsory education (1.0.1), 2023. Zenodo Software. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10027851>.
- [5] G. Adorni, S. Piatti, and V. Karpenko. Virtual cat: A multi-interface educational platform for algorithmic thinking assessment. *SoftwareX*, 27:101737, 2024. ISSN 2352-7110. [10.1016/j.softx.2024.101737](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2024.101737).
- [6] R. E. Aebi-Müller, I. Blatter, J. Brigger, E. C. Constable, N. Eglin, P. Hoffmeyer, C. Lautenschütz, A. Lienhard, C. Pirinoli, M. Röthlisberger, and K. M. Spycher. Code of conduct for scientific integrity. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4707560>, 2021.
- [7] N. A. N. Ahmad and M. Hussaini. A usability testing of a higher education mobile application among postgraduate and undergraduate students. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, 15(09):88, May 2021. [10.3991/ijim.v15i09.19943](https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v15i09.19943).
- [8] R. Amini, L. A. Stolz, J. Z. Kartchner, M. Thompson, N. Stea, N. Hawbaker, R. Joshi, and S. Adhikari. Bedside echo for chest pain: An algorithm for education and assessment. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, page 293, 2016. [10.2147/amep.s103083](https://doi.org/10.2147/amep.s103083).
- [9] R. M. Baecker. *Readings in Human-Computer Interaction: toward the year 2000*. Elsevier, 2014.
- [10] V. Barr and C. Stephenson. Bringing computational thinking to k-12: What is involved and what is the role of the computer science education community? *ACM Inroads*, 2(1):48–54, feb 2011. ISSN 2153-2184. [10.1145/1929887.1929905](https://doi.org/10.1145/1929887.1929905).
- [11] R. Bogdan and S. K. Biklen. *Qualitative research for education*. Allyn & Bacon Boston, MA, 1997. URL http://math.buffalostate.edu/dwilson/MED595/Qualitative_intro.pdf.
- [12] N. Borgers, E. de Leeuw, and J. Hox. Children as respondents in survey research: Cognitive development and response quality 1. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 66(1):60–75, Apr. 2000. [10.1177/075910630006600106](https://doi.org/10.1177/075910630006600106).
- [13] K. Brennan and M. Resnick. New frameworks for studying and assessing the development of computational thinking. In *Proceedings of the 2012 annual meeting of the American educational research association, Vancouver, Canada*, volume 1, page 25, 2012. https://web.media.mit.edu/~kbrennan/files/Brennan_Resnick_AERA2012_CT.pdf.
- [14] V. Campbell-Barr, M. Lavelle, and K. Wickett. Exploring alternative approaches to child outcome assessments in children's centres. *Early Child Development and Care*, 182(7):859–874, July 2012. [10.1080/03004430.2011.590937](https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2011.590937).
- [15] J. M. CARROLL, M. K. SINGLEY, and M. B. ROSSON. Integrating theory development with design evaluation. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 11(5):247–255, Sept. 1992. [10.1080/01449299208924345](https://doi.org/10.1080/01449299208924345).
- [16] C. K. Coursaris and D. J. Kim. A meta-analytical review of empirical mobile usability studies. *J. Usability Studies*, 6(3):117–171, may 2011. URL <http://uxpajournal.org/a-meta-analytical-review-of-empirical-mobile-usability-studies/>.
- [17] M. Csernoch, P. Biró, J. Máth, and K. Abari. Testing algorithmic skills in traditional and non-traditional programming environments. *Informatics in Education*, 14(2):175–197, 2015. [10.15388/in-fedu.2015.11](https://doi.org/10.15388/in-fedu.2015.11).
- [18] V. Dagienė and S. Sentance. It's Computational Thinking! Bebras Tasks in the Curriculum. In *International conference on informatics in schools: Situation, evolution, and perspectives*, pages 28–39. Springer, Springer, Cham, 2016. [10.1007/978-3-319-46747-4_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46747-4_3).
- [19] W. Dick, L. Carey, and J. O. Carey. *The systematic design of instruction*. CiteSeer, 2005. URL <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=671f411d07f151f589184da7d3dbad1d4630d63a>.
- [20] A. Druin. Cooperative inquiry: developing new technologies for children with children. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems the CHI is the limit - CHI '99*, pages 592–599. ACM Press, 1999. [10.1145/302979.303166](https://doi.org/10.1145/302979.303166).
- [21] A. Druin. The role of children in the design of new technology. *Behaviour and information technology*, 21(1):1–25, 2002. URL <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?amp=&doi=10.1.1.134.4492&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- [22] A. Druin, J. Hammer, A. Kruskal, A. Lal, T. P. Schwenn, L. Sumida, R. Wagner, H. Alborzi, J. Montemayor, and L. Sherman. How do adults and children work together to design new technology? *ACM SIGCHI Bulletin*, 32(2):7–8, Apr. 2000. [10.1145/360405.360411](https://doi.org/10.1145/360405.360411).
- [23] N. O. Ezeamuzie and J. W. Leung. Computational thinking through an empirical lens: a systematic review of literature. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 60(2):481–511, 2021. [10.1177/073563312111033158](https://doi.org/10.1177/073563312111033158).
- [24] G. Futschek. Algorithmic thinking: The key for understanding computer science. In *Informatics Education – The Bridge between Using and Understanding Computers*, pages 159–168. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006. [10.1007/11915355_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/11915355_15).
- [25] M. Giannakos, P. Markopoulos, J. P. Hourcade, and A. N. Anle. 'lots done, more to do': The current state of interaction design and children research and future directions. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 33:100469, Sept. 2022. [10.1016/j.ijcci.2022.100469](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2022.100469).
- [26] Google and community. Flutter framework. <https://flutter.dev/>, 2017. [Accessed 5 July 2023].
- [27] J. D. Gould and C. Lewis. Designing for usability: key principles and what designers think. *Communications of the ACM*, 28(3):300–311, Mar. 1985. [10.1145/3166.3170](https://doi.org/10.1145/3166.3170).
- [28] J. Greenbaum and M. Kyng. *Design at work: Cooperative design of computer systems*. CRC Press, 2020.
- [29] A. D. Greig, M. J. Taylor, and T. MacKay. *Doing research with children*. Sage, 2007.
- [30] A. D. Greig, J. Taylor, and T. MacKay. *Doing research with children: A practical guide*. Sage, 2012.
- [31] S. Grover and R. Pea. Computational thinking in k-12: A review of the state of the field. *Educational researcher*, 42(1):38–43, 2013. [10.3102/0013189X12463051](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12463051).
- [32] A.-M. Guran, G.-S. Cojocar, and A. Turian. Towards preschoolers' automatic satisfaction assessment. an experience report. In *2020 IEEE 14th International Symposium on Applied Computational Intelligence and Informatics (SACI)*. IEEE, May 2020. [10.1109/saci49304.2020.9118824](https://doi.org/10.1109/saci49304.2020.9118824).
- [33] B. Hanington and B. Martin. *Universal methods of design expanded and revised: 125 Ways to research complex problems, develop innovative ideas, and design effective solutions*. Rockport publishers, 2019.
- [34] L. Hanna, K. Ridsen, and K. Alexander. Guidelines for usability testing with children. *Interactions*, 4(5):9–14, Sept. 1997. [10.1145/264044.264045](https://doi.org/10.1145/264044.264045).
- [35] R. Hartson and P. S. Pyla. *The UX book: Agile UX design for a quality user experience*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2018.
- [36] K. Holtzblatt and H. Beyer. *Contextual design: defining customer-centered systems*. Elsevier, 1997. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/book/10.5555/2821566>.
- [37] J. P. Hourcade. Interaction design and children. *Foundations and Trends® in Human-Computer Interaction*, 1(4):277–392, 2007. [10.1561/1100000006](https://doi.org/10.1561/1100000006).
- [38] N. Iivari and M. Kinnula. Empowering children through design and making. In *Proceedings of the 15th Participatory Design Conference: Full Papers - Volume 1*. ACM, Aug. 2018. [10.1145/3210586.3210600](https://doi.org/10.1145/3210586.3210600).

- [39] O. S. Iversen and C. Dindler. A utopian agenda in child–computer interaction. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 1(1):24–29, Jan. 2013. [10.1016/j.ijcci.2012.08.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2012.08.002).
- [40] O. S. Iversen and R. C. Smith. Scandinavian participatory design: dialogic curation with teenagers. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, June 2012. [10.1145/2307096.2307109](https://doi.org/10.1145/2307096.2307109).
- [41] O. S. Iversen, R. C. Smith, and C. Dindler. Child as protagonist: Expanding the role of children in participatory design. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, pages 27–37. ACM, 2017. [10.1145/3078072.3079725](https://doi.org/10.1145/3078072.3079725).
- [42] J. Jocz, K. A. Peterson, and D. Pfeif. Motivating youth to learn STEM through a gender inclusive digital forensic science program. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(1), 2023. [10.1186/s40561-022-00213-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-022-00213-x).
- [43] Y. B. Kafai, C. C. Ching, and S. Marshall. Children as designers of educational multimedia software. *Computers & Education*, 29(2-3): 117–126, Nov. 1997. [10.1016/s0360-1315\(97\)00036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0360-1315(97)00036-5).
- [44] Y. Kali and T. R. Fuhrmann. Teaching to design educational technologies. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 6(1): 4, 2011. [10.1504/ijlt.2011.040147](https://doi.org/10.1504/ijlt.2011.040147).
- [45] P. K. Keith, F. R. Sullivan, and D. Pham. Roles, collaboration, and the development of computational thinking in a robotics learning environment. In *Computational Thinking Education*, pages 223–245. Springer Singapore, 2019. [10.1007/978-981-13-6528-7_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6528-7_13).
- [46] M. Kinnula and N. Iivari. Manifesto for children’s genuine participation in digital technology design and making. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 28:100244, June 2021. [10.1016/j.ijcci.2020.100244](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2020.100244).
- [47] M. Kinnula, N. Iivari, T. Molin-Juustila, E. Keskitalo, and T. Leinonen. Cooperation, combat, or competence building - what do we mean when we are ‘empowering children’ in and through digital technology design? In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems - Transforming Society with Digital Innovation, ICIS 2017, Seoul, South Korea, December 10-13, 2017*. Association for Information Systems, 2017. <http://aisel.isnet.org/icis2017/TransformingSociety/Presentations/15>.
- [48] J. Kolkko. Moving on from requirements. *Interactions*, 22(6):22–23, Oct. 2015. [10.1145/2824754](https://doi.org/10.1145/2824754).
- [49] S.-C. Kong, H. Abelson, and M. C. Lai. *Introduction To Computational Thinking Education*, pages 1–10. Springer Singapore, 2019. [10.1007/978-981-13-6528-7_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6528-7_1).
- [50] Ö. Korkmaz and X. Bai. Adapting Computational Thinking Scale (CTS) for Chinese High School Students and Their Thinking Scale Skills Level. *Participatory Educational Research*, 6(1):10–26, 2019. [10.17275/per.19.2.6.1](https://doi.org/10.17275/per.19.2.6.1).
- [51] Ö. Korkmaz, R. Çakir, and M. Y. Özden. A validity and reliability study of the computational thinking scales (cts). *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72:558–569, 2017. [10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.005).
- [52] S. Kujala. User involvement: A review of the benefits and challenges. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 22(1):1–16, Jan. 2003. [10.1080/01449290301782](https://doi.org/10.1080/01449290301782).
- [53] B. Kules. Computational thinking is critical thinking: Connecting to university discourse, goals, and learning outcomes. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 53(1):1–6, 2016. [10.1002/prae.2016.14505301092](https://doi.org/10.1002/prae.2016.14505301092).
- [54] F. K. Lehnert, J. Niess, C. Lallemand, P. Markopoulos, A. Fischbach, and V. Koenig. Child-computer interaction: From a systematic review towards an integrated understanding of interaction design methods for children. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 32:100398, June 2022. [10.1016/j.ijcci.2021.100398](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2021.100398).
- [55] P. Markopoulos and M. Bekker. Interaction design and children. *Interacting with Computers*, 15(2):141–149, 2003. [10.1016/s0953-5438\(03\)00004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0953-5438(03)00004-3).
- [56] P. Markopoulos, M. Bekker, et al. How to compare usability testing methods with children participants. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop "Interaction Design and Children", Eindhoven, The Netherlands, August 28-29, 2002*, volume 2, pages 153–158. Shaker-Verlag, 2002. URL https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228889371_How_to_compare_usability_testing_methods_with_children_participants.
- [57] M. L. Martínez, O. Lévêque, I. Benítez, C. Hardebolle, and J. D. Zufferey. Assessing computational thinking: Development and validation of the algorithmic thinking test for adults. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 60(6):1436–1463, 2022. [10.1177/07356331211057819](https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331211057819).
- [58] K. I. McCormick and J. A. Hall. Computational thinking learning experiences, outcomes, and research in preschool settings: a scoping review of literature. *Education and Information Technologies*, pages 1–36, 2022. [10.1007/s10639-021-10765-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10765-z).
- [59] M. J. Muller and S. Kuhn. Participatory design. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(6):24–28, June 1993. [10.1145/153571.255960](https://doi.org/10.1145/153571.255960).
- [60] M. J. Muller, D. M. Wildman, and E. A. White. “equal opportunity” PD using PICTIVE. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(6):64, June 1993. [10.1145/153571.214818](https://doi.org/10.1145/153571.214818).
- [61] M. J. Muller, D. M. Wildman, and E. A. White. Participatory design through games and other group exercises. In *Conference companion on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '94*. ACM Press, 1994. [10.1145/259963.260530](https://doi.org/10.1145/259963.260530).
- [62] F. Nayebi, J.-M. Desharnais, and A. Abran. The state of the art of mobile application usability evaluation. In *2012 25th IEEE Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (CCECE)*. IEEE, Apr. 2012. [10.1109/ccece.2012.6334930](https://doi.org/10.1109/ccece.2012.6334930).
- [63] J. Nielsen. *Usability engineering*. Elsevier, 1993. [10.1016/c2009-0-21512-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/c2009-0-21512-1).
- [64] J. Nielsen. Usability inspection methods. In *Conference companion on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '94*. ACM Press, 1994. [10.1145/259963.260531](https://doi.org/10.1145/259963.260531).
- [65] J. Nielsen. Scenarios in discount usability engineering. In *Scenario-Based Design: Envisioning work and technology in system development*, pages 59–83. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1995. <https://doi.org/10.5555/209227.209233>.
- [66] OECD. *PISA 2018 Results (Volume VI): Are students ready to thrive in an interconnected world?* OECD: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2020. [10.1787/d5f68679-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/d5f68679-en).
- [67] I. S. . E. of Human-System Interaction (Subcommittee). *Ergonomic Requirements for Office Work with Visual Display Terminals (VDTs): Guidance on Usability*. International Organization for Standardization, 1998. <https://www.iso.org/standard/63500.html>.
- [68] N. V. Olkhova. Development of algorithmic thinking in primary school students when studying computer science. *Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University. Series Pedagogy and Psychology*, 8(2):25–32, 2022. [10.52534/msu-pp.8\(2\).2022.25-32](https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.8(2).2022.25-32).
- [69] A. Oluk and Ö. Korkmaz. Comparing students’ scratch skills with their computational thinking skills in terms of different variables. *International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science*, 8(11):1–7, 2016. [10.5815/ijmecs.2016.11.01](https://doi.org/10.5815/ijmecs.2016.11.01).
- [70] S. S. Oyelere, F. J. Agbo, and I. T. Sanusi. Developing a pedagogical evaluation framework for computational thinking supporting technologies and tools. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 2022. ISSN 2504-284X. [10.3389/educ.2022.957739](https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.957739).
- [71] V. Petousi and E. Sifaki. Contextualising harm in the framework of research misconduct. findings from discourse analysis of scientific publications. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 23(3/4):149, 2020. [10.1504/ijisd.2020.115206](https://doi.org/10.1504/ijisd.2020.115206).
- [72] A. Piatti, G. Adorni, L. El-Hamamsy, L. Negrini, D. Assaf, L. Gambardella, and F. Mondada. The CT-cube: A framework for the design and the assessment of computational thinking activities. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 5:100166, 2022. ISSN 2451-9588. [10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100166](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100166).
- [73] M. Pilotti, E. Nazeeruddin, N. Mohammad, I. Daqqa, H. Abdelsalam, and M. M. Abdullah. Is initial performance in a course informative? machine learning algorithms as aids for the early detection of at-risk students. *Electronics*, 11(13):2057, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11132057>.

- [74] E. Polat, S. Hopcan, S. Kucuk, and B. Sisman. A comprehensive assessment of secondary school students' computational thinking skills. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(5):1965–1980, 2021. [10.1111/bjjet.13092](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjjet.13092).
- [75] E. Poulakis and P. Politis. *Computational Thinking Assessment: Literature Review*, pages 111–128. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021. [10.1007/978-3-030-64363-8_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64363-8_7).
- [76] Y. Qian and J. D. Lehman. Using technology to support teaching computer science: a study with middle school students. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education*, 14(12), 2018. [10.29333/ejmste/94227](https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/94227).
- [77] J. C. Read and S. MacFarlane. Using the fun toolkit and other survey methods to gather opinions in child computer interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2006 conference on Interaction design and children*. ACM, June 2006. [10.1145/1139073.1139096](https://doi.org/10.1145/1139073.1139096).
- [78] J. C. Read, S. MacFarlane, and P. Gregory. Requirements for the design of a handwriting recognition based writing interface for children. In *Proceedings of the 2004 conference on Interaction design and children: building a community*. ACM, June 2004. [10.1145/1017833.1017844](https://doi.org/10.1145/1017833.1017844).
- [79] M. Román-González, J. Moreno-León, and G. Robles. Complementary Tools for Computational Thinking Assessment. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computational Thinking Education (CTE 2017)*, S. C Kong, J Sheldon, and K. Y Li (Eds.). The Education University of Hong Kong, pages 154–159, 2017. <https://www.eduhk.hk/cte2017/doc/CTE2017%20Proceedings.pdf>.
- [80] M. Román-González, J. Moreno-León, and G. Robles. Combining assessment tools for a comprehensive evaluation of computational thinking interventions. *Computational thinking education*, pages 79–98, 2019. [10.1007/978-981-13-6528-7_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6528-7_6).
- [81] M. Romero, A. Lepage, and B. Lille. Computational thinking development through creative programming in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1):1–15, 2017. [10.1186/s41239-017-0080-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0080-z).
- [82] M. Román-González, J.-C. Pérez-González, and C. Jiménez-Fernández. Which cognitive abilities underlie computational thinking? criterion validity of the computational thinking test. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72:678–691, 2017. [10.1016/j.chb.2016.08.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.08.047).
- [83] M. Scaife, Y. Rogers, F. Aldrich, and M. Davies. Designing for or designing with? informant design for interactive learning environments. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCHI Conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pages 343–350, 1997. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/258549.258789>.
- [84] R. Scherer, F. Siddiq, and B. S. Viveros. The cognitive benefits of learning computer programming: a meta-analysis of transfer effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(5):764–792, 2019. [10.1037/edu0000314](https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000314).
- [85] D. Schuler and A. Namioka. *Participatory design: Principles and practices*. CRC Press, 1993. [10.1201/9780203744338](https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203744338).
- [86] M. Scriven. The methodology of evaluation. In Tyler, R., Gagne, R., Scriven, M. (Ed.): *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1972. [10.25656/01:1423](https://doi.org/10.25656/01:1423).
- [87] D. Seehorn, S. Carey, B. Fuschetto, I. Lee, D. Moix, D. O'Grady-Cunniff, B. B. Owens, C. Stephenson, and A. Verno. *CSTA K–12 Computer Science Standards: Revised 2011*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2011. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/2593249>.
- [88] V. R. Simmering, L. Ou, and M. Bolsinova. What technology can and cannot do to support assessment of non-cognitive skills. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2019. [10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02168](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02168).
- [89] SNSF. Open Science. <https://www.snf.ch/en/dah3uC2QX95tfPNd/topic/open-science>, 2021. [Accessed 26 August 2023].
- [90] J. Stanja, W. Gritz, J. Krugel, A. Hoppe, and S. Dannemann. Formative assessment strategies for students' conceptions—the potential of learning analytics. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54(1):58–75, 2022. [10.1111/bjjet.13288](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjjet.13288).
- [91] D. Sun, F. Ouyang, Y. Li, and C. Zhu. Comparing learners' knowledge, behaviours, and attitudes between two instructional modes of computer programming in secondary education. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 8(1), Sept. 2021. [10.1186/s40594-021-00311-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00311-1).
- [92] P. Surendran. Technology Acceptance Model: A Survey of Literature. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 2(4): 175–178, August 2012. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/a/mir/mirbus/v2y2012i4p175-178.html>.
- [93] J. Tidwell. *Designing interfaces: Patterns for effective interaction design*. O'Reilly Media, 2010.
- [94] M. J. Tsai, J. C. Liang, and C. Y. Hsu. The computational thinking scale for computer literacy education. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 59(4):579–602, 2020. [10.1177/0735633120972356](https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633120972356).
- [95] S. Valguarnera and M. Landoni. Design with and for children: The challenge of inclusivity. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 171–184. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023. [10.1007/978-3-031-35681-0_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35681-0_11).
- [96] S. Valguarnera, C. M. Sylla, and M. Landoni. The IDC research and design challenge throughout the years: achievements, reflections and next steps. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference*. ACM, June 2023. [10.1145/3585088.3589382](https://doi.org/10.1145/3585088.3589382).
- [97] J. Voogt and N. P. Roblin. A comparative analysis of international frameworks for 21st century competences: Implications for national curriculum policies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 44(3):299–321, 2012. [10.1080/00220272.2012.668938](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2012.668938).
- [98] F. Wickey da Silva Garcia, S. Ronaldo Bezerra Oliveira, and E. da Costa Carvalho. Application of a teaching plan for algorithm subjects using active methodologies: An experimental report. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Ijet)*, 17(07):175–207, 2022. [10.3991/ijet.v17i07.28733](https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i07.28733).
- [99] R. Williges. Evaluating human-computer software interfaces. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Occupational Ergonomics*, pages 81–87, 1984.
- [100] J. M. Wing. Computational thinking. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(3):33–35, 2006. [10.1145/1118178.1118215](https://doi.org/10.1145/1118178.1118215).
- [101] A. Yadav, C. Mayfield, N. Zhou, S. E. Hambruch, and J. T. Korb. Computational thinking in elementary and secondary teacher education. *Acm Transactions on Computing Education*, 14(1):1–16, 2014. [10.1145/2576872](https://doi.org/10.1145/2576872).
- [102] S. Yarosh, I. Radu, S. Hunter, and E. Rosenbaum. Examining values: an analysis of nine years of idc research. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, June 2011. [10.1145/1999030.1999046](https://doi.org/10.1145/1999030.1999046).
- [103] C. D. Yildiz. Ideal classroom setting for english language teaching through the views of english language teachers (a sample from turkey). *English Language Teaching*, 13(3):31, 2020. [10.5539/elt.v13n3p31](https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n3p31).