An Investigation of Potential Success Factors for an Introductory Model-Driven Programming Course

Jens Bennedsen, IT University West, Denmark jbb@it-vest.dk

Michael Caspersen, Dept. of Computer Science University of Aarhus, Denmark mec@daimi.au.dk

Goal

- Improve the course design of a CS1 model-driven programming course.
- Improve the knowledge of the success of object-first CS1 courses and compare it to "traditional" CS1 courses
- Find new factors
- · Not to predict the grade



Results

- Math and course activity has <u>a positive</u> <u>correlation</u> with the exam score
- Gender, intended major, years at the university, team had <u>no</u> correlation with the exam score

Success

- · Grade at the final exam
 - Normally binary pass/fail
 - We post-marked the exams
 - Scale: 00, 03, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13
 - Six or above means pass -> all post marked exercises with six or above did also pass
- No other grades count
 - No assignment or other during the course

Model driven CS1 course

- First half of a CS1 course
- 7 weeksGoals
 - use conceptual modelling in relation to preparing simple object-oriented programs,
 - implement simple OO-models in a modern programming language,
 - use fundamental elements in a modern programming language,
- use selected class libraries.
- Progression according to complexity of the underlying class model.

Exam

- 20 students are tested concurrently.
- The test takes place in a lab.
- Nine small progressive programming tasks,
- 1 hour in total, approx. 30 min of actual programming
- All exercises are instances of the same generic exercise



Research questions

- What is the relationship of mathematical ability to model-based CS1?
- What is the relationship of **gender** to model-based CS1?
- What is the relationship of **major/intended major** to model-based CS1?
- What is the relationship of **course work** to modelbased CS1?
- What is the relationship of years at the university to model-based CS1?
- What is the relationship of the team to model-based CS1?

Method

- · Data sources: Adm-sys, TA's, web-site
- Multiple regression analysis
- Start with a model including all variables and interaction variables
 - 34.4% explanation power
 - Eliminate one by one insignificant variables at the 95% confidence interval.
 - End up with a model with two variables explaining 24,4% of the variation of the exam score

The students

Approximately 235 students

- from a variety of study programmes
 - computer science,
 - mathematics,
 - geology,
 - nano science,
 - economy,
 - multimedia,
- 40% are majors in computer science.

Math

- The students score from their high school exam.
 - Three levels: A, B, C A is required.
- Result
 - the math score from high school has a positive impact on the exam grade
 - math grade alone accounts for over 15% (15,4%) of the variance of the final grade.

Course work

- During the course, the students are required to complete five out of six weekly
- The TA's evaluate the exercises and the score for each exercise is encoded as one of the numbers 1, 2, or 4.
 - 1. Perfect, no significant errors
 - 2. OK, small errors
 - 4. Not accepted/Not handed in
- In case a student got a "4", he had the possibility of resubmitting the exercise once.

Course work - results

- It has a positive impact on the exam grade.
- Course work alone accounts for 7% of the variance of the final grade
 - only half the impact of the math grade from high school.

Study age

- The number of years the student has been enrolled at the university. Integer value from 0 – 20. Students enrolled in 1984 or earlier were coded as 20.
- Not significant neither at the 95% confidence interval
 - 90 %: the variable is not significant in itself but in combination with the math grade, it has a positive impact; with course work, it has a negative impact. These two combinations of variables accounts for 2% of the variation each

Gender

- It is not significant, neither at the 95% confidence interval nor at the 90% confidence interval.
- We can therefore not accept the hypothesis that gender has an impact on the exam score.

Major

- 4 variables: COMPSCIENCE, GEOLOGY, MATHEMATICS, NANOSCIENCE
- None are significant at the 95 % conf. interval
- We can reject the hypothesis about students majoring in comp. science perform better.
- 90% confidence interval: COMPSCIENCE and GEOLOGY were significant.
 - At this level we can accept the hypothesis of a positive impact of majoring in computer science (it accounts for 3,6% of the variance),
 - GEOLOGY is significant, NANOSCIENCE and MATHEMATICS are not → we can not say anything about the students not majoring in computer science.

Team

- There is an a priori correlation between team and intended major because of the way students are allocated to teams
- Since intended major is not significant, the same is true for team.

Regr	essio	n form	nula
GRADE = 1	1.118 +		
).589*N	/IATH +	
0 and 13).341*C	OURSE	WORK
Variable	Unstanda coefficie	ardised nts	Significance
Variable	Unstanda coefficie B	ardised nts Std. Error	Significance
Variable COURSEWORK	Unstand: coefficie B 0.341	ardised nts Std. Error 0.097	Significance

Discussion

- Math L
- Course work J
- 24,4 % explanation power => lot of other factors
- Conclusions: Hard to give since it is based on our course (and so is all the other studies)

Future work

- Motivation.
- Effort.
- Power of abstraction.
- Prior programming experience.
- Emotional health/well-being

Ad

- Research on pedagogical patterns please take survey sent to the SIGCSE mailing list
 - If you are not on the mailing list let me know