

BugSpotter: Automated Generation of Code Debugging Exercises

Victor-Alexandru Pădurean
MPI-SWS
Saarbrücken, Germany
vpadurea@mpi-sws.org

Paul Denny
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand
paul@cs.auckland.ac.nz

Adish Singla
MPI-SWS
Saarbrücken, Germany
adishs@mpi-sws.org

Abstract

Debugging is an essential skill when learning to program, yet its instruction and emphasis often vary widely across introductory courses. In the era of code-generating large language models (LLMs), the ability for students to reason about code and identify errors is increasingly important. However, students frequently resort to trial-and-error methods to resolve bugs without fully understanding the underlying issues. Developing the ability to identify and hypothesize the cause of bugs is crucial but can be time-consuming to teach effectively through traditional means. This paper introduces BugSpotter, an innovative tool that leverages an LLM to generate buggy code from a problem description and verify the synthesized bugs via a test suite. Students interact with BugSpotter by designing *failing test cases*, where the buggy code's output differs from the expected result as defined by the problem specification. This not only provides opportunities for students to enhance their debugging skills, but also to practice reading and understanding problem specifications. We deployed BugSpotter in a large classroom setting and compared the debugging exercises it generated to exercises hand-crafted by an instructor for the same problems. We found that the LLM-generated exercises produced by BugSpotter varied in difficulty and were well-matched to the problem specifications. Importantly, the LLM-generated exercises were comparable to those manually created by instructors with respect to student performance, suggesting that BugSpotter could be an effective and efficient aid for learning debugging.

CCS Concepts

• **Social and professional topics** → **Computing education**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**.

Keywords

debugging, programming education, exercise generation, generative AI, LLMs, BugSpotter, test cases

ACM Reference Format:

Victor-Alexandru Pădurean, Paul Denny, and Adish Singla. 2025. BugSpotter: Automated Generation of Code Debugging Exercises. In *Proceedings of the 56th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1 (SIGCSE TS 2025)*, February 26-March 1, 2025, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3641554.3701974>

SIGCSE TS 2025, February 26-March 1, 2025, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive Version of Record was published in *Proceedings of the 56th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1 (SIGCSE TS 2025)*, February 26-March 1, 2025, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3641554.3701974>.

1 Introduction

Debugging is an essential skill for programming, yet there is little consistency in how it is taught [41]. A landmark review by McCauley et al. covered various educational perspectives on debugging, highlighting that it is both difficult for novices to learn and challenging for computer science educators to teach [25]. Similar work has explored common difficulties faced by students when learning debugging [12]. For example, Whalley et al. observed that novice programmers often employ vague and imprecise methods for hypothesis generation and verification, relying heavily on guesswork rather than using a systematic approach [41].

With large language models (LLMs) capable of automatically generating code, the ability for students to identify and debug errors becomes even more critical [11]. Educators must ensure that students are equipped with the skills to critically evaluate and correct LLM-generated code. Traditional debugging tasks typically involve presenting students with buggy code (i.e., code containing bugs) and asking them to identify and fix the issues. Frameworks for teaching debugging have also been proposed, providing more structured approaches to enhance debugging instruction [21]. Recent work by Ma et al. also highlights the importance of training students to hypothesize the causes of code errors, encouraging them to develop and test hypotheses about code defects systematically [23].

Creating a diverse range of debugging exercises that offer automated feedback could make debugging instruction more consistent and frequent. In this paper, we present a new tool called BugSpotter which is designed to generate debugging exercises using LLMs. BugSpotter generates buggy code from problem descriptions and verifies these bugs with a test suite. Students interact with the tool by designing failing test cases, which not only helps them practice debugging but also improves their ability to read and understand problem specifications. This method aligns with work on metacognitive scaffolding which has demonstrated the value of test case generation for helping with problem understanding [10].

Figure 1 illustrates a debugging exercise generated by BugSpotter, with more information about how these exercises are created in Section 3. We deployed BugSpotter in a large classroom setting and conducted a comparative analysis between LLM-generated debugging exercises and those manually created by instructors. We evaluate our experience of using BugSpotter by answering the following questions:

- **RQ1:** How do experts evaluate the quality of the debugging exercises generated by BugSpotter?
- **RQ2:** How does the difficulty of the generated exercises vary as measured by students' performance on the exercises and expert-classified difficulty?
- **RQ3:** How does student success on LLM-generated debugging exercises compare to that on instructor-designed exercises?

Sum Positive Values

Define a function called `SumPositiveValues()` which is passed two inputs: an array of integers, and an integer indicating how many elements are in the array. The function should return the sum of all positive integers in the input array.

(a) Problem specification

```


1 int SumPositiveValues(int values[], int length)
2 {
3     int sum = 0;
4     for (int i = 0; i < length; i++)
5     {
6         if (values[i] < 0)
7         {
8             sum += values[i];
9         }
10    }
11    return sum;
12 }

```

(b) Buggy code

Input: values[] Input: length Buggy Output Correct Output 

(c) Test case design

Figure 1: Illustration of a debugging exercise from BugSpotter for Problem 1, where a student’s objective is to design a failing test case. (a) shows the problem specification. (b) shows the buggy code. (c) shows a successfully designed failing test case. A failing test case is composed of the function’s input, its buggy output, and the correct output, according to the problem specification. In this case, the student successfully solved the exercise (tick ) by (1) providing a test case that leads to the buggy code generating a different output to the correct code, (2) providing the buggy output that matches what is obtained by executing the buggy code on the input, and (3) providing the correct output that matches what is obtained by executing the reference solution code on the input.

2 Related Work

The importance of debugging. Previous works have emphasized the importance of students acquiring debugging skills [4, 16, 41]. There are various strategies that students can use [12, 24, 27], yet they usually rely on guesswork [41]. Explicitly teaching students debugging strategies has been demonstrated to be an effective method for promoting a more systematic approach [17]. Despite this, both learning and teaching debugging remain challenging [41], thus novel frameworks for teaching debugging are necessary [21]. Notably, the process of fixing the bug when its location is known is easily carried out [12], but locating the bug and understanding the functionality of the buggy code are considered difficult tasks [25]. Our work focuses on automatically generating buggy codes for which students design failing test cases, practicing their skills for problem understanding, bug localization, and code comprehension.

Reducing educator workload. Reducing the workload of educators is an ongoing endeavor in the education literature. One early initiative at curating a large reusable repository of multiple-choice questions for computer science is the Canterbury QuestionBank [37]. Other approaches include student sourcing [9], or designing tools to help educators create a range of programming-related exercises [3, 22]. A recent line of research focuses on the automation of exercise creation, especially in introductory block-based visual programming domains [1, 13, 32, 33]. Finally, in the era of LLMs, a suite of new tools leveraging generative models have been proposed [14, 15, 35, 38]. For example, HypoCompass [23] makes LLMs act as novices seeking help, placing students in the role of tutors. In contrast, BugSpotter generates debugging exercises focusing on the creation of failing test cases, allowing students to practice problem and code comprehension, along with bug localization.

LLMs for programming education. Besides exercise creation, LLMs have been explored for other educational purposes [7, 26, 35], such as generating natural language feedback for students [18, 20, 34, 36]. Moreover, Nguyen et al. focus on generating buggy student attempts for block-based programming [28]. Recently, the concept of prompt problems was proposed as a paradigm shift in this field

[8, 39]. BugSpotter uses LLMs to address a less-explored topic: the generation of debugging exercises.

3 BugSpotter: Methodology and Tool

The BugSpotter tool aims to help students read and understand problem specifications, reason about buggy code, and design test cases that reveal bug(s). When interacting with BugSpotter, a student is shown a code debugging exercise, comprising a problem specification and a buggy code for the problem. To solve this, the student has to design a test case that will reveal the error in the code (see Figure 1). In the following, we introduce debugging exercises and then present our approach for generating such exercises using LLMs.

3.1 Code Debugging Exercises

We now describe the typical flow of a code debugging exercise generated with BugSpotter. Let us first define a problem P , a buggy code C_B , and its fixed version C_F . A problem P comprises a problem specification and a test suite. A buggy code C_B fails at least one test case in P ’s test suite. Its fixed version C_F can be obtained by making small modifications to C_B in order to pass P ’s entire test suite.

A student is presented with a specification of a problem P and corresponding buggy code C_B . The problem specification requires implementing a single function, and C_B represents a buggy version of this function. Figures 1a and 1b show the specification for the “Sum Positives” problem along with an example buggy code C_B . The student’s objective is to provide a *failing test case* that reveals why C_B is incorrect. The test case should include an input to the function in C_B , the incorrect output from the buggy function, and the expected correct output as defined by the problem specification. The student successfully solves the exercise if the following criteria are met:

- (1) the outputs of C_B and C_F are different when run on the provided input (i.e., the test case is indeed a failing test case);
- (2) the output of C_F when run on the provided input matches the provided correct output;
- (3) the output of C_B when run on the provided input matches the provided buggy output.




Figure 2: BugSpotter’s exercise generation pipeline.

Validation of the proposed failing test case is done automatically. Figure 1c shows an example where a student provides a test case meeting all required criteria. After completing the current exercise, the student can request another exercise. BugSpotter will then generate a new exercise based on the same problem, providing further opportunities for the student to identify different kinds of bugs. The process of generating a debugging exercise is detailed below.

3.2 Exercise Generation Pipeline

We now give details about BugSpotter’s debugging exercise generation process, which comprises two stages: (a) code generation using LLMs and (b) validation of the exercise through execution. The generation process starts with a problem P , encompassing its problem specification and its test suite, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Code generation stage. We leverage an LLM for generating the buggy code. We provide the LLM with P ’s problem specification, and prompt the LLM to reason about possible bugs that students may introduce while working on the problem’s solution code. We then ask the LLM to generate a buggy code C_B , its fixed version C_F , and an explanation of the bug. The motivation to ask for reasoning, explanation, and fixed code C_F draws inspiration from Chain-of-Thought [40], encouraging the LLMs to carefully reason about the buggy code and how it differs from a correct code. Additionally, C_F will also play a role during validation. We enforce JSON formatting for easily extracting the information from the LLM’s response. Figure 3 illustrates the prompt used in the tool for generating buggy codes.

Exercise validation stage. As we focus on delivering semantic bugs well-matched to problem specifications, the validation stage is aimed at filtering out syntactic bugs and buggy codes unrelated to the problem. First, we filter out instances where C_F or C_B do not successfully compile. Second, we check whether C_F can correctly solve the given problem using the test suite provided in P . The main intuition behind checking the correctness of C_F is to filter out the instances where the LLM was inconsistent and could not generate a fixed version, potentially leading to confusing buggy code that does not match the given problem. Third, we run C_B using the same test suite. For C_B to be valid for the debugging exercise, it should fail at least one of the test cases in the test suite, either by raising a runtime error or by producing an output different from the expected one. Otherwise, C_B would be a correct implementation and we will not use it as part of an exercise. Fourth, we filter out instances that run longer than a given time limit. Finally, if both C_F and C_B are successfully validated, we deliver the exercise as output.

Implementation details. It is desirable to have a diverse set of debugging exercises for a student to work on. For this, we ask the LLM to generate 10 tuples consisting of a buggy code, its fixed version, and corresponding explanation, as illustrated by the prompt shown in Figure 3. We use these tuples to create 10 exercises and keep only those that pass the validation stage. We deliver to the student the first exercise that passes validation, while caching the rest




Figure 3: Prompt for asking LLMs to generate buggy codes.

for subsequent requests. We use a temperature of 0.7 to introduce variability in the generated exercises, ensuring a diverse range of generations that simulate a wide array of potential bugs.

4 Evaluation Procedure

In this section, we describe our evaluation of BugSpotter which includes an expert assessment of generated exercises and a large-scale classroom deployment to compare exercises generated by BugSpotter with instructor-created exercises. The evaluation is done over 3 different problems, shown in Figures 1a, 7a, and 8a.

4.1 Expert Evaluation for RQ1

Our first research question, RQ1, involves expert-based assessment to evaluate the quality of exercises produced by BugSpotter. We assess the quality w.r.t. several attributes reflecting their suitability for being used in the classroom. For this, we created the following rubric grounded in literature [23, 35], though adapted to capture more features of the exercises generated with BugSpotter. *SuccOf10* (0 to 10) reports how many of the 10 generated exercises successfully pass validation. *DiverseCodes* (0 to 10) reports how many of the generated exercises that pass the validation stage contain unique bugs. *BugProbRelated* (binary) is 1 when the buggy code C_B is an attempt at solving problem P , and 0 when it is not related to P (i.e., trying to solve a different problem); we compute this attribute only for the exercises passing validation. *NbBugs* (positive number) reports the number of conceptually different bugs present in C_B ; we compute this attribute only for the exercises passing validation. *EditTokens* (non-negative number) captures the edit distance between strings obtained by tokenizing C_B and C_F using the Pygments library [2]; we compute this attribute only for the exercises passing validation. *BugType* (a one-hot encoded vector) characterizes the kind of behavior C_B exhibits when executed on problem P ’s test suite; we compute this attribute only for the exercises passing validation. In particular, *BugType* categorizes exercises into the following three types:

LLM:Problem	Metric	SuccOf10	DiverseCodes	BugProbRelated	NbBugs	EditTokens		BugType		
						Average	Median	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
GPT4o:Problem 1		6.33 (2.0)	5.67 (1.7)	1.00 (0.0)	1.04 (0.1)	3.13 (0.9)	1.83 (0.5)	0.57 (0.2)	0.39 (0.2)	0.04 (0.1)
GPT4o:Problem 2		4.00 (1.4)	3.67 (1.5)	1.00 (0.0)	1.00 (0.0)	12.39 (3.1)	9.67 (5.2)	1.00 (0.0)	0.00 (0.0)	0.00 (0.0)
GPT4o:Problem 3		5.67 (0.4)	5.33 (0.4)	1.00 (0.0)	1.29 (0.1)	12.37 (0.8)	8.17 (2.0)	0.94 (0.1)	0.00 (0.0)	0.06 (0.1)
GPT4o:All		5.33 (0.7)	4.89 (0.8)	1.00 (0.0)	1.11 (0.0)	9.29 (0.8)	6.56 (1.9)	0.84 (0.1)	0.13 (0.1)	0.03 (0.0)
GPT3.5:Problem 1		6.67 (0.4)	5.67 (0.4)	1.00 (0.0)	1.06 (0.1)	4.23 (2.2)	3.00 (1.2)	0.64 (0.1)	0.36 (0.1)	0.00 (0.0)
GPT3.5:Problem 2		4.67 (1.6)	3.50 (1.1)	1.00 (0.0)	1.00 (0.0)	23.00 (17.2)	22.17 (16.9)	1.00 (0.0)	0.00 (0.0)	0.00 (0.0)
GPT3.5:Problem 3		7.00 (3.1)	4.83 (2.1)	0.93 (0.1)	2.36 (0.3)	46.23 (3.9)	44.17 (5.1)	0.00 (0.0)	0.64 (0.2)	0.36 (0.2)
GPT3.5:All		6.11 (1.7)	4.67 (1.1)	0.98 (0.0)	1.47 (0.1)	24.49 (5.6)	23.11 (4.9)	0.55 (0.0)	0.33 (0.1)	0.12 (0.1)

Figure 4: Results of the expert-based quality assessment. BugSpotter leverages LLMs from OpenAI’s GPT family [31]. Evaluation was done across 3 different problems, over 3 independent runs, according to the rubric described in Section 4.

- *Type 1* means that buggy code C_B passes at least one test case from problem P ’s test suite, and does not result in a run-time error or division by 0 on any test case (see Figure 7).
- *Type 2* means that buggy code C_B does not pass any of the test cases from problem P ’s test suite, and does not result in a run-time error or division by 0 on any test case (see Figure 1).
- *Type 3* means that running buggy code C_B results in a run-time error or division by 0 on a test case (see Figure 8).

Metrics *SuccOf10*, *EditTokens*, and *BugType* can be computed automatically using scripts with no manual annotations. For the rest of the attributes, two human experts (evaluators) independently rated the generated exercises – these two evaluators are experts in programming, with one evaluator having experience tutoring introductory-level programming courses. We obtained a Cohen’s kappa reliability value greater than 0.7 for each rated attribute, indicating *substantial agreement* between evaluators [6]. All results are reported based on average across annotations of the two evaluators.

4.2 Classroom Evaluation for RQ2 and RQ3

Our next two research questions, RQ2 and RQ3, involve assessing students’ success on exercises generated with BugSpotter. We aim to understand the alignment between expert-classified difficulty of debugging exercises and the students’ performance on the same exercises. Furthermore, we analyze whether there are significant differences between exercises generated with BugSpotter and exercises designed by instructors. To enable this, we deployed a version of BugSpotter as part of a laboratory task in a large introductory C programming course involving 741 students, taught at the University of Auckland. Students in this course typically have no prior programming experience. The lab was conducted towards the end of the course, and students were assigned 3 debugging exercises based on the 3 different problems we used throughout our study.

For the classroom deployment, we first generated exercises with the BugSpotter pipeline employing various LLMs from the GPT family [31]. Then, we pre-selected 5 exercises (instead of using real-time generation) to control the generation quality and avoid impacting the students’ learning experience – the pre-selection was done to ensure all the exercises are of high-quality and diverse based on the rubric established above. For RQ3, an instructor created an additional 5 exercises by modifying reference solution code to include realistic bugs. As part of the deployment, students were assigned randomly to one of these 10 exercises (5 LLM-generated and 5 instructed-created). To explore the impact of both difficulty

and source of buggy code on student performance, we collected student responses (i.e., test cases) and automatically computed their success rates on debugging exercises for our evaluation.

5 Results

In this section, we discuss the results of the study centered around the research questions (RQs) introduced in Section 1.

5.1 RQ1: Expert-assessed Quality and Diversity

We present results in terms of quality and diversity of generated exercises. Figure 4 shows the performance of BugSpotter when using GPT3.5 [29] and GPT4o [30] as LLMs for generating buggy codes. We conduct 3 independent runs to report averaged results as *mean (stderr)* for all attributes based on annotations by two evaluators. Our results show that GPT3.5 is comparable with GPT4o in terms of creating a diverse set of debugging exercises that are well-matched to the problem. Furthermore, GPT3.5-generated exercises pass the validation step more often than those created by GPT4o. Next, we see that GPT4o predominantly creates exercises with buggy codes that pass at least one of the problem’s test cases (i.e., Type 1), while GPT3.5 has a higher tendency to create buggy codes that pass none or result in an error, bringing more diversity w.r.t. the types of produced bugs. In terms of diversity of exercises passing validation, both LLMs are comparable for creating sets of diverse buggy codes. Finally, we notice that GPT3.5 has a slightly higher number of conceptually different bugs per buggy program than GPT4o. This leads to GPT3.5-produced buggy code requiring more edits to fix, signaling bugs that are more difficult.

These results highlight that both LLMs are suitable for the debugging exercise generation pipeline. Surprisingly, GPT3.5, the cheaper alternative, can produce exercises comparable in quality to GPT4o. This means that GPT3.5 can be used to power BugSpotter as a scalable solution in terms of cost, without compromising quality.

5.2 RQ2: Expert-assessed Difficulty and Student Performance on Debugging Exercises

For each problem, we analyze the 5 pre-selected exercises generated by LLMs as described in Section 4. Difficulty is often a key factor in deciding whether exercises should be assigned to students [19], so it is important for BugSpotter to produce a range of difficulties from which students can choose. We study this diversity from both




Figure 5: Student success rates w.r.t. expert-assessed difficulty of exercises. Aggregated per problem, success rates are 67.2% for Problem 1, 40.5% for Problem 2, and 39.2% for Problem 3.

the perspective of an expert and empirically based on student performance. After ranking the 5 exercises from least difficult to most difficult, we label the first 2 as easy, the next 2 as medium, and the last as hard. Student performance is measured through success rates on exercises.

Figure 5 illustrates the correlation between success rates and expert-assessed difficulty. The results indicate that for all problems, exercises classified as easy have the highest success rates, followed by medium difficulty exercises, and then hard exercises. This pattern remains consistent when aggregating results across all problems. We believe that these results show a strong alignment between the expert assessment and student performance. More importantly, they show that LLMs can generate diverse sets of debugging exercises.

5.3 RQ3: LLM-Generated vs. Instructor-Created Debugging Exercises

Next, we compare students’ performance on the debugging exercises containing buggy codes generated by LLMs from the GPT family with those handcrafted by an instructor. We aim to explore whether there is any significant difference in students’ performance in solving debugging exercises, depending on the source of the buggy code. Again, we analyze students’ performance in terms of their success rate. Figure 6 shows students’ success rate for each problem and aggregated over all problems. The results show that the success rates for debugging exercises with codes created by the instructor are slightly higher, indicating that they are less difficult. To check whether this slight difference is significant, we compare students’ performance for LLM-generated exercises with instructor-created exercises via the χ^2 test [5], using contingency tables with two rows (source) and two columns (741 data points per problem mapped to successful/unsuccessful). As shown in Figure 6, all p-values exceed 0.05, with the lowest p-value being 0.065, indicating no significant difference between the two sources.

We believe that these results strongly suggest that debugging exercises generated with the help of LLMs are comparable in difficulty to those handcrafted by instructors. This shows the potential of using LLMs to automate the creation of such exercises in class, reducing the workload on educators. The slight difference in success rate, while not significant, may indicate that buggy codes created by the instructor are more naturalistic, aligning more closely with the types of errors students encounter while coding on their own.




Figure 6: Comparison between student success rates on LLM-generated debugging exercises compared to student success rates on instructor-created exercises.

5.4 Web Application

A free web application showing the capabilities of BugSpotter can be found at <https://bugspotter.netlify.app/>. This web application provides a demo similar to the format of the illustrative examples shown in Figures 1, 7 and 8. After providing a test case, a student can submit their answer for automatic validation. They can also request additional debugging exercises with the press of a button – after a short wait, BugSpotter delivers a new exercise. This demo application supports Python debugging exercises and we plan to add support for C debugging exercises in the future.

5.5 Limitations

Next, we discuss a few limitations of our study. Firstly, our classroom investigation was done using pre-selected exercises (instead of using real-time generation) to control the generation quality for the laboratory task. For future studies, it would be more informative to analyze students’ performance on buggy exercises generated with LLMs in real-time. Secondly, we did not correlate students’ success rates for debugging exercises with their long-term course performance. This would be a good indicator of the exercises’ suitability for being included in classroom assignments. Thirdly, our study did not capture how BugSpotter could help educators in terms of reducing their workload in creating debugging exercises. This would be needed to fully understand the practical utility of BugSpotter.

6 Concluding Discussion

We developed BugSpotter, a tool for debugging practice with LLM-generated buggy code for problems that require implementing a single function. We tested the generated exercises’ quality via both expert-based and classroom evaluations. As a first finding, our results show that with minor differences, both GPT4o and GPT3.5 produce diverse sets of buggy codes that can be leveraged by BugSpotter’s debugging exercise generation pipeline. Our second finding is that there is a high alignment between expert-assessed difficulty and students’ performance on generated exercises. This underlines that LLMs are suitable for generating diverse sets of exercises with varying difficulty. Our third finding obtained through further investigation of the classroom setting shows that exercises generated by LLMs are comparable in difficulty to those created by instructors. Statistical analysis shows no significant difference between the

Print Summary

Define a function called PrintSummary() which is passed one single input: an array of integers of unknown length. This function should determine whether there are more positive or more negative values in the array. You should only examine values in the array until the first occurrence of the value 0. If there are more positive than negative values, you should print the word "Positive". If there are more negative values than positive values, you should print the word "Negative". If there are an equal number of positive and negative values, you should print the word "Equal".


(a) Problem specification

```


1 void PrintSummary(int values[])
2 {
3     int i = 0, positive = 0, negative = 0;
4     while (values[i] != 0)
5     {
6         if (values[i] > 0)
7         {
8             positive++;
9         }
10        else if (values[i] < 0)
11        {
12            negative++;
13        }
14        i++;
15    }
16    if (positive >= negative)
17    {
18        printf("Positive");
19    }
20    else if (positive < negative)
21    {
22        printf("Negative");
23    }
24 }

```

(b) Buggy code

Input: values[] Buggy Output Correct Output 

(c) Test case design

Figure 7: Illustration of a debugging exercise for Problem 2. The exercise contains a Type 1 buggy code, as it passes some of the test cases in the problem’s test suite. In this example, the student’s attempt is wrong (cross ), as the provided buggy output does not match the actual output of the buggy code when run on the input, thus not meeting criterion (2) w.r.t. solving the exercise.

Print Average Rainfall

Define a function called PrintAverageRainfall() which is passed an array of integers representing daily rainfall amounts. The function should calculate and print the average rainfall. The daily rainfall amounts are occasionally corrupted, represented by negative values, so any negative value should be ignored from your calculation. The array also contains a special value, -999, to indicate the end of the valid rainfall data, so you should only examine values in the array up to the first occurrence of the value -999. Print the average of the valid rainfall data, rounded to 2 decimal places. If there are no valid rainfall values, then print "no rain".


(a) Problem specification

```


1 void PrintAverageRainfall(int values[])
2 {
3     int sum=0;
4     int count=0;
5     float average;
6     for (int i = 0; values[i] != -999; i++)
7     {
8         if (values[i] >= 0)
9         {
10            sum += values[i];
11            count++;
12        }
13    }
14    average = sum / count;
15    printf("%.2f", average);
16 }

```

(b) Buggy code

Input: values[] Buggy Output Correct Output 

(c) Test case design

Figure 8: Illustration of a debugging exercise for Problem 3. The exercise contains a Type 3 buggy code, as it does not check before dividing with a variable that may potentially be equal to 0. In this example, the student’s attempt is wrong (cross ), as the provided test case is not a failing test case, thus not meeting criterion (1) w.r.t. solving the exercise.

difficulty of LLM-generated and instructor-created exercises. We believe this signals great potential for using LLMs to automate the creation of debugging exercises.

There are several exciting directions for future work. Firstly, it would be useful to extend BugSpotter to generate debugging exercises for problem specifications that involve multiple functions and complex programming concepts, e.g., involving classes or I/O files. Another direction would be to fine-tune LLMs to produce bugs more similar to those made by students – such debugging exercises may better prepare students to tackle their own likely bugs. A broader direction is to add more types of debugging and test-writing exercises.

Students could write several test cases to capture multiple bugs, edit code to fix them, or even submit their own problems and test suites, which tools like BugSpotter can use to generate new exercises.

Acknowledgments

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

References

- [1] Umair Z. Ahmed, Maria Christakis, Aleksandr Efremov, Nigel Fernandez, Ahana Ghosh, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Adish Singla. 2020. Synthesizing Tasks for Block-based Programming. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [2] Georg Brandl, Matthäus Chajdas, and Jean Abou-Samra. 2006. Pygments. <https://pygments.org/>.
- [3] Serena Caraco, Nelson Lojo, Michael Verdicchio, and Armando Fox. 2024. Generating Multi-Part Autogradable Faded Parsons Problems From Code-Writing Exercises. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [4] Mei-Wen Chen, Cheng-Chih Wu, and Yu-Tzu Lin. 2013. Novices' Debugging Behaviors in VB Programming. In *Proceedings of the Learning and Teaching in Computing and Engineering (LaTiCE)*.
- [5] William G Cochran. 1952. The χ^2 Test of Goodness of Fit. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* (1952).
- [6] Jacob Cohen. 1960. A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* (1960).
- [7] Paul Denny, Sumit Gulwani, Neil T. Heffernan, Tanja Käser, Steven Moore, Anna N. Rafferty, and Adish Singla. 2024. Generative AI for Education (GAIED): Advances, Opportunities, and Challenges. *CoRR* abs/2402.01580 (2024).
- [8] Paul Denny, Juho Leinonen, James Prather, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, Thezyrie Amarouche, Brett A. Becker, and Brent N. Reeves. 2024. Prompt Problems: A New Programming Exercise for the Generative AI Era. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [9] Paul Denny, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, Ewan D. Tempero, and Jacob Hendricks. 2011. CodeWrite: Supporting Student-Driven Practice of Java. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [10] Paul Denny, James Prather, Brett A. Becker, Zachary Albrecht, Dastyni Loksa, and Raymond Pettit. 2019. A Closer Look at Metacognitive Scaffolding: Solving Test Cases Before Programming. In *Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research (Koli Calling)*.
- [11] Paul Denny, James Prather, Brett A. Becker, James Finnie-Ansley, Arto Hellas, Juho Leinonen, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, Brent N. Reeves, Eddie Antonio Santos, and Sami Sarsa. 2024. Computing Education in the Era of Generative AI. *Commun. ACM* (2024).
- [12] Sue Fitzgerald, Gary Lewandowski, Renée McCauley, Laurie Murphy, Beth Simon, Lynda Thomas, and Carol Zander. 2008. Debugging: Finding, Fixing and Flailing, a Multi-institutional Study of Novice Debuggers. *Computer Science Education* 18 (2008).
- [13] Ahana Ghosh, Sebastian Tschiatschek, Sam Devlin, and Adish Singla. 2022. Adaptive Scaffolding in Block-Based Programming via Synthesizing New Tasks as Pop Quizzes. In *Proceeding of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education AIED*.
- [14] Andre Del Carpio Gutierrez, Paul Denny, and Andrew Luxton-Reilly. 2024. Evaluating Automatically Generated Contextualised Programming Exercises. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [15] Mollie Jordan, Kevin Ly, and Adalbert Gerald Soosai Raj. 2024. Need a Programming Exercise Generated in Your Native Language? ChatGPT's Got Your Back: Automatic Generation of Non-English Programming Exercises Using OpenAI GPT-3.5. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [16] Yasmin B. Kafai, David DeLiema, Deborah A. Fields, Gary Lewandowski, and Colleen M. Lewis. 2019. Rethinking Debugging as Productive Failure for CS Education. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [17] Amy J. Ko, Thomas D. LaToza, Stephen Hull, Ellen A. Ko, William Kwok, Jane Quichocho, Harshitha Akkaraju, and Rishin Pandit. 2019. Teaching Explicit Programming Strategies to Adolescents. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [18] Nachiket Kotalwar, Alkis Gotovos, and Adish Singla. 2024. Hints-In-Browser: Benchmarking Language Models for Programming Feedback Generation. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*.
- [19] Martin Labaj and Mária Bieliková. 2014. Utilization of Exercise Difficulty Rating by Students for Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Web-Based Learning (ICWL)*.
- [20] Juho Leinonen, Arto Hellas, Sami Sarsa, Brent N. Reeves, Paul Denny, James Prather, and Brett A. Becker. 2023. Using Large Language Models to Enhance Programming Error Messages. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [21] Chen Li, Emily Chan, Paul Denny, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, and Ewan D. Tempero. 2019. Towards a Framework for Teaching Debugging. In *Proceedings of the Australasian Computing Education Conference (ACE)*.
- [22] Nelson Lojo and Armando Fox. 2022. Teaching Test-Writing As a Variably-Scaffolded Programming Pattern. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ItiCSE)*.
- [23] Qianou Ma, Hua Shen, Kenneth Koedinger, and Sherry Tongshuang Wu. 2024. How to Teach Programming in the AI Era? Using LLMs as a Teachable Agent for Debugging. In *Proceeding of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED)*.
- [24] Stephen MacNeil, Paul Denny, Andrew Tran, Juho Leinonen, Seth Bernstein, Arto Hellas, Sami Sarsa, and Joanne Kim. 2024. Decoding Logic Errors: A Comparative Study on Bug Detection by Students and Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the Australasian Computing Education Conference (ACE)*.
- [25] Renée McCauley, Sue Fitzgerald, Gary Lewandowski, Laurie Murphy, Beth Simon, Lynda Thomas, and Carol Zander. 2008. Debugging: A Review of the Literature from an Educational Perspective. *Computer Science Education* (2008).
- [26] Ismael Villegas Molina, Audria Montalvo, Benjamin Ochoa, Paul Denny, and Leo Porter. 2024. Leveraging LLM Tutoring Systems for Non-Native English Speakers in Introductory CS Courses.
- [27] Laurie Murphy, Gary Lewandowski, Renée McCauley, Beth Simon, Lynda Thomas, and Carol Zander. 2008. Debugging: the Good, the Bad, and the Quirky – A Qualitative Analysis of Novices' Strategies. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.
- [28] Manh Hung Nguyen, Sebastian Tschiatschek, and Adish Singla. 2024. Large Language Models for In-Context Student Modeling: Synthesizing Student's Behavior in Visual Programming from One-Shot Observation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM)*.
- [29] OpenAI. 2023. ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
- [30] OpenAI. 2024. Hello GPT-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>.
- [31] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI Platform Models. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>.
- [32] Victor-Alexandru Pădurean and Adish Singla. 2024. Benchmarking Generative Models on Computational Thinking Tests in Elementary Visual Programming. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*.
- [33] Victor-Alexandru Pădurean, Georgios Tzannetos, and Adish Singla. 2024. Neural Task Synthesis for Visual Programming. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)* (2024).
- [34] Tung Phung, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Tobias Kohn, Rupak Majumdar, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. 2023. Generating High-Precision Feedback for Programming Syntax Errors using Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM)*.
- [35] Tung Phung, Victor-Alexandru Padurean, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Tobias Kohn, Rupak Majumdar, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. 2023. Generative AI for Programming Education: Benchmarking ChatGPT, GPT-4, and Human Tutors. In *Proceedings of the Conference on International Computing Education Research (ICER) - Volume 2*.
- [36] Tung Phung, Victor-Alexandru Padurean, Anjali Singh, Christopher Brooks, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. 2024. Automating Human Tutor-Style Programming Feedback: Leveraging GPT-4 Tutor Model for Hint Generation and GPT-3.5 Student Model for Hint Validation. In *Proceedings of the Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference (LAK)*.
- [37] Kate Sanders et al. 2013. The Canterbury QuestionBank: Building a Repository of Multiple-Choice CS1 and CS2 Questions. In *Proceedings of the Working Group Reports of the Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ItiCSE)*.
- [38] Sami Sarsa, Paul Denny, Arto Hellas, and Juho Leinonen. 2022. Automatic Generation of Programming Exercises and Code Explanations Using Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on International Computing Education Research (ICER)*.
- [39] David H. Smith, Paul Denny, and Max Fowler. 2024. Prompting for Comprehension: Exploring the Intersection of Explain in Plain English Questions and Prompt Writing. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Learning @ Scale (L@S)*.
- [40] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [41] Jacqueline Whalley, Amber Settle, and Andrew Luxton-Reilly. 2021. Novice Reflections on Debugging. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*.