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Abstract
In 2001 the “McCracken group”, through a multi-institutional study, concluded that many students finishing their introductory programming courses could not program due to a lack of problem solving skills. In 2004 Lister established that students have a fragile grasp of skills to read and interpret code. Humphrey suggests that educators must shift their focus from the programs that the students create to the data of the processes the students use. This paper addresses the problem of poor performing students through an investigation of their quality appraisal techniques and development processes. Firstly, a case study was conducted to determine the current software development practices used by a group of undergraduate Computer Science students. Numeric data collected by means of a survey revealed that the current practices used by the majority of students would not be sufficient to produce quality programs. Secondly, an experiment was conducted to determine students’ perceptions on the use of process measurement data to improve their current software development practices. Analysis of numeric and narrative data revealed that performance measurement data could provide students with useful information to adopt proper development practices.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
K.3.2 [Computers and Education]: Computer and Information Science Education – Computer Science education.

General Terms
Measurement, Performance, Design.

Keywords
Problem Solving, Code Reviews, Design, Personal Software Process, Undergraduate Education.

1. INTRODUCTION
Despite all the efforts of Computer Science educators to train students to develop software programs of the highest standard the programming performance of undergraduate students is often worse than expected. This can be attributed to the lack of problem solving skills [8] as well as poor code reading and interpretation skills [7]. Humphrey [3] created the Personal Software Process (PSP) that guides developers in the use of process measurement and quality appraisal techniques to improve the quality of their programs. He [3] suggests that educators must shift their focus from the programs that the students create to the data of the processes the students use. Various researchers conducted studies on the incorporation of PSP quality appraisal techniques into Computer Science courses [5] [6] [11].

The aim of this paper is twofold:
1. To discover which quality appraisal techniques and software development practices are used by undergraduate Computer Science students at a selected University of Technology.
2. To investigate the role of process measurement data as a contributor to the use of quality appraisal techniques.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
In 2001 the “McCracken group” [8] conducted a multi-national, multi-institutional study in the United States of America (USA) and other countries during which they assessed the programming competency of Computer Science students who completed their first or second courses. They found that the majority of the students’ programming performance was much worse than expected. Students indicated “the lack of time to complete the exercise” [8] as the major reason for poor performance. The research group also found that students struggle to abstract the problem from the exercise description [8] and therefore lack the ability to do problem solving. The group argues that students might have inappropriate (bad) programming habits because they treat program code as text and simply try to fix syntax instead of focussing on the task to be accomplished by the code. They suggest that future research should analyse narrative data gathered from students to gain better insight into development processes and problem solving behaviour.

Lister et al. [7] conducted a follow-up study on the McCracken group’s research to investigate alternative reasons for poor programming performance. Their findings indicate that many students have “a fragile grasp of both basic programming principles and the ability to systematically carry out routine programming tasks, such as tracing (or ‘desk checking’) through code” [7]. According to Perkins et al. [9], students’ code reading and interpretation skills can be linked to their ability to review and debug code.

Software quality can be defined as software that conforms to the user requirements [1]. Software review methods are widely used
in the industry to improve the quality of software programs [2] [12]. Testing alone is seen as a very ineffective and time-consuming debugging strategy [12]. According to Humphrey [4], effective defect management is essential to managing cost and schedule during software development and also contributes to software quality. Humphrey states that testing alone is not the most effective way to remove defects. He proposes the inclusion of additional quality appraisal techniques such as inspections, walkthroughs and personal reviews. An inspection is a kind of structured team peer review process that was introduced by Mike Fagan [2]. Walkthroughs are less formal with fewer steps than inspections [12]. Fagan [2] concludes that a developer’s productivity increases when he uses inspections because less time is spent on unit testing. Schach [12] indicates the advantages in time, cost and essentially project success when defects are picked up early in the development life cycle.

Humphrey [4] regards inspections and walkthroughs as teamwork quality techniques. He proposes that individual developers should review their work before peer inspection, hence the term “personal reviews”. He indicates that despite all the literature that guides developers on “good” practices and effective methods, the only generally accepted short-term priority for a software engineer is “coding and testing”.

Humphrey [3] claims that one of the biggest challenges in software development is to persuade software engineers to use effective methods. Engineers tend to stick to a personal process that they develop from the first small program they have written and it is difficult to convince them to adopt better practices. Humphrey [4] created a PSP course in which a software engineer gradually learns to adopt his/her software practices according to personal measurements. The aim of the course is to improve program quality through personal reviews and to enable an engineer to make more accurate estimations based on personal historical performance data (collected by the individual). Analysis of thousands of PSP students’ measurement data indicate that personal reviews improve program quality and that students spent less time in the testing phase if they use quality appraisal techniques. The course data also indicate an improvement on predictions based on historical data. Humphrey [3] states that PSP trained students in an educational environment will only use these methods if the educator grade them on the use thereof, and that most students will fall back on a process of coding and testing. He suggests that Computer Science educators must shift their focus from the programs that the students create to the data of the processes the students use. A number of studies have experimented with the incorporation of personal software process techniques in educational environments.

Jenkins and Ademoye [5] conducted a pilot and follow-up experiment in which students used personal code reviews to improve the quality of their individual programs. Since the pilot study indicated that students found it difficult to use the provided checklist, the follow-up study used a different approach by first training the students in tutorials how to use the checklists. As a result these students found it easier to use the checklist reviews. According to the students, the major problem they experienced with the provided checklist for code reviews was the time spent to do reviews. In both experiments the narrative feedback from the students indicate that they believe the process of using code reviews improved the quality of their programs although there are no concrete evidence to support this statement.

Rong, Li, Xie and Zheng [11] designed an experiment in which first year students used checklists to conduct personal reviews in order to ascertain whether checklist based reviews can effectively be used by inexperienced students. The authors concluded that checklists are helpful to guide beginner programmers during code reviews with the resulting review rates close to the suggested 200 lines of code (LOC)/hour benchmark prescribed by Humphrey [4]. They, however, found no concrete evidence that code reviews with checklists will improve the efficiency of the reviews. The study also showed that on average only 33% of the defects found during code reviews were found with the aid of the checklist — an indication that the checklist used were ineffective. For future research, the authors suggest finding methods to improve the effectiveness of checklists and investigating other factors that might influence the efficiency of code reviews.

Kemerer and Paulk [6] investigated the effect of review rate on defect removal effectiveness and the quality of software products. They analysed data collected by PSP course students and found that review rate is a significant factor for defect removal effectiveness. They also found the recommended review rate of 200 LOC/hour or less to be effective for individual reviews.

3. METHODOLOGY

This research study followed a mixed method approach based on the Framework of Integrated Methodologies (FraIM) as suggested by Plowright [10]. The context of this study was the Information Technology department at a selected South African University of Technology. The study was divided into two cases in order to distinguish between the two main sources of data [10].

In Case 1 a case study was conducted to gather information regarding undergraduate Computer Science students’ perceptions of the quality appraisal techniques and software development processes they normally use when developing programs. The research population for this case included all first, second and third year Computer Science students at the selected institution. Data was collected by means of “asking questions” in a paper-based self-completion survey containing closed questions [10]. The survey was distributed and completed during normal lectures. A total of 251 students (the sample) completed the survey. This sample included 74 first year, 113 second year and 64 third year students. The numerical data collected through the survey was analysed in MS Excel and the results grouped according to the year-level of the respondents.

In Case 2 an experiment was conducted to gain a deeper understanding of students’ development processes through the collection of actual process data. The population for this case included all third year Computer Science students at the selected institution. These students were selected since they already had intermediate programming skills and experience in software defect removal strategies. From this population six students were randomly selected to participate in the practical experiment. Data collection included observations, asking questions (post-activity survey and interviews) as well as artefact analysis (Process Dashboard® data) [10].

The Case 2 experiment consisted of four steps as summarised in Table 1. The instructor first conducted a tutorial activity to teach students how to log and interpret performance measurement data using the Process Dashboard® software. During this tutorial students were required to do an exercise in which they had to log time, size and defect measurements in different phases of the software development life cycle. The various defect types and examples of defects categorised into types were also discussed. After the tutorial the students completed an individual
programming exercise during which they had to capture performance data using the Process Dashboard\textsuperscript{2} software. For this programming exercise the students had to implement the code to simulate the “Quick Pick Option” of the South African National Lottery (LOTTO\textsuperscript{3}) draw\textsuperscript{1}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructor presents</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Teach students to do process measures and interpret process data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutorial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Students do programming</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Capture process measures while doing programming exercise (Student).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Record student behaviour and questions asked (Instructor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor makes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students complete</td>
<td>15 – 20  min</td>
<td>Explore the students' perceptions of process measuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-activity survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Instructor conducts</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Gain deeper insights into students' development processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews with students.</td>
<td>(per student)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students received an extensive background document on how “LOTTO” draws work. In the “Quick Pick Option” a user of the system first had to select the number of player lotto rows that should be generated. The requested number of rows then had to be generated randomly, sorted and written to a text file. Students could use any resources, including the Internet, to complete this activity. While the students worked on the individual programming exercise the instructor moved around the students and recorded his observations as well as all questions from the students. After this exercise the students had to complete a post-activity survey that consisted of mostly open-ended questions. The purpose of this survey was to explore the students' perceptions on the capturing and interpreting of process measurement data. In the final activity of Case 2 the instructor conducted interviews with all six students. During these interviews open-ended questions were used to gather narrative data regarding the students’ development processes.

4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 Case 1: Pre-survey

Students first had to indicate how much of their development time is spent in each of the provided phases (see Figure 1). On average, students spent 25% of their development time on planning and design. They also indicated that most of their development time is spent on coding and contributes to 50% of the total development time. They spent 25% of their time on testing and debugging, which is roughly half the time that they spent on coding. Students of all year levels indicated almost similar results, which is an indication that a first year student and a third year student make use of similar development practices. It should be noted that the reported times are mostly estimates (individual perceptions) since only 16% of the students indicated that they record the actual time that they spent in the different development phases. The majority (88%) of students indicated that they do not use any time estimation techniques.

![Figure 1: Estimated time spent in development phases](https://example.com/figure1.png)

The next section of the survey focused on defect removal strategies. Students reported that they primarily use debugging for fixing defects as opposed to design and code reviews (see Figure 2). The use of design and code reviews increment slightly (10%) from first to third year students. Only 30% of the students indicated that they keep record of the defects they make.

![Figure 2: Use of defect removal strategies](https://example.com/figure2.png)

Students were also asked to give an indication of the average mark they obtain for their programming assignments. As indicated in Figure 3 the reported average marks form a normal distribution curve around 59.5%.

![Figure 3: Average marks for programming assignments](https://example.com/figure3.png)

Students then had to select (from three provided options) the main reason why they do not score full marks in all their programming assignments. The data analysis revealed distinct differences between the responses from the students in the different year levels (see Figure 4). The majority of first year students (54%) believe that their lack of programming skills is the major cause of poor results. Second year (47%) and third year (62%) students mostly put the blame on their inability to identify defects.

---

1 https://www.nationallottery.co.za
Towards the third year fewer students (16%) regard their “lack of skill” as the major reason for failure. Although the students in all year levels regard “time” as a stumbling block to their success it is not seen as the major contributor (with values ranging between 17% and 27%).

![Figure 4: Main reason for not scoring 100% for assignments](image)

When students were asked to indicate their preferred software development life cycle model the majority of second year (68%) and third year (63%) students selected “Code-and-Fix” (see Figure 5). It is not surprising that all the first year students selected the “Don’t know” option since the first Software Engineering course is part of the second year curriculum. The senior students’ reliance on code-and-fix strategies serves as an indication that they lack a thorough design phase in their development process.

![Figure 5: Preferred Software Life Cycle](image)

Without a process that accommodates designs, students would spend little time on design reviews and therefore would not be able to identify defects early in the development life cycle. The students therefore have to rely on code reviews and debugging as their primary technique for finding and fixing defects. When using code-and-fix strategies the “thinking” process of “how to solve a problem” would occur during the coding phase – not during the design phase – which explains why students spent most of their time in the coding phase. Since the students indicated “debugging” as their primary technique for fixing defects (see Figure 2) it is no surprise that they struggle to identify defects. They treat the consequence of a defect, which makes it a lot more difficult and takes more time to find the actual defect. This also explains why students see the “identification of defects” as a major contributor to poor results (see Figure 4). This effect will increase towards the third year when assignments are larger – therefore making it more difficult to identify defects. The student, however, will not realise this because he/she is using exactly the same process that worked for him/her from the first year. This explains why there is almost no difference in the time spent in phases from first to third year (see Figure 1).

### 4.2 Case 2: Programming experiment

The discussion in this section considers the data that was collected during Steps 2, 3 and 4 of the programming experiment.

#### 4.2.1 Instructor Observations

The instructor made the following main observations while the students were completing the exercise:

- Students searched the Internet to find solutions for the exercise.
- No designs were created to solve the exercise problem.
- Some students forgot to start and stop the Process Dashboard\(^\circ\) timer when switching phases.
- Some defects were not logged.
- Students struggled to distinguish between the “coding” and the “testing” phase.
- Students struggled to describe their logged defects.

The students did not log the re-work coding in the correct phase. Most of them logged that time under coding, which explains why re-work or testing time was lower than coding time (also see Section 4.2.2). More precise measurements would result in much higher testing times.

#### 4.2.2 Process Dashboard\(^\circ\) performance data

The six students on average spent 135 minutes to create the program. This time frame included all phases of development: planning, design, coding and testing. Not one of the students in the group produced a fully functional program (according to the given specifications) during the allotted time frame. Two of the students had an almost working program (90% complete) while the rest of the students’ programs could be graded 50% and less. The instructor decided to end the programming exercise after two and a half hours as enough useful experimental data was accumulated. At that time the students also indicated that they would not be able to identify and fix all defects even without a time limit.

On average the students spent their time as follows:

- 17% on planning;
- 1% on design;
- 0% on design reviews;
- 45% on coding;
- 1% on code reviews; and
- 36% on testing or debugging.

The actual time that these students captured while working shows a good correlation with the times reported in the pre-survey (see Figure 1). The actual testing or debugging time, however, would be much higher if these students had to continue to produce fully functional programs. On average 45 lines of code were produced by the students which resulted in a productivity of 20 lines of code per hour. Each student recorded an average of five defects with 90% of these defects injected during coding. The limited time spent on designs also serves as an indicator that most defects would be injected during coding. Ninety five per cent of the defects were removed in the testing phase – an indicator that debugging was used as the primary technique for defect removal. Given that only 1% of the time was spent in reviews would yield few defects (2%) to be found during reviews. No design reviews were conducted because of the lack of designs and only 1% of the
time spent on the design phase. This resulted in defects being discovered late in the development life cycle (testing), which makes it more difficult to identify them.

4.2.3 Post-activity survey
Students indicated that capturing time measurement data in the correct phases was easy but identifying and describing defects were difficult. For process improvement some students indicated that they would spend more time on creating effective designs and need to learn the skill to do effective reviews to pick up defects earlier in the life cycle. Most students were surprised by how much time they spent on testing and indicated that debugging might not be the most effective way to find and fix defects.

4.2.4 Interviews
An interview was conducted with each student in order to gain a deeper understanding of the development processes each one followed to create the program. The only artefacts that were created by the students (in addition to the captured Process Dashboard measurement data) were the actual code. The students did not create designs and therefore these interviews focussed on what each student did during the problem solving process.

The students all indicated that their first step in solving the problem was to do an Internet search for possible solutions. They all found code that they thought could possibly solve the problem. They copied the code and then tried to change it to solve the problem. According to the students, this is the method they usually follow when completing their programming assignments.

In retrospect all the students indicated that they should rather have started by first solving the problem logically (using flowcharts or pseudo code) and then searching for code snippets to accomplish specific tasks. They also indicated that they do not find it easy to write pseudo code to solve problems and therefore prefer to search for code solutions where the logical thinking has already been done. Generally, they find it “hard to start” solving a problem.

5. CONCLUSION
In this paper various attributes contributing to the poor quality of student programmes have been mentioned. The findings of Case 1 revealed that most students rely on a process of code-and-fix, as predicted by Humphrey [3]. Code-and-fix remains the predominant process of choice from first to third year level which indicates no process improvement through the years of study. Students also regard “testing” as the most effective strategy to remove defects. After a selected group of third year students participated in a practical experiment (Case 2) they – through the use of process measurement data – realised that they have to improve their design skills in order to create better quality programs. These students also realised that quality products are produced through quality processes that include quality appraisal techniques. We can therefore conclude that undergraduate students need more extensive training to reach a level where reviews would become an effective defect management strategy. The various methods and tools that can be used to teach students how to perform effective reviews need further investigation. The students’ personal reviews indicated that they also lack design and problem solving skills. This provides further verification for the findings of McCracken et al.’s study [8]. Future research could therefore also focus on methods that can be used to teach proper problem solving and design skills. It is also recommended that instructors enforce effective design techniques from the first programs that students write to ensure that they will not fall back on a “code-and-fix” life cycle. This study has shown that the effect of process measurement data should be regarded as a valuable contributor to any process improvement changes educators want to enforce on students. The ultimate ideal is that students would be able to adapt their processes according to their personal data.
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