

# Ideas for Automatic Programming-Task Generation Based on Generating Sample Code

Oliver Westphal    Janis Voigtländer

*University of Duisburg-Essen*

# Handwritten Tasks

Usual Haskell IO task we give our students:

```
{- Write a program which first reads a positive  
- integer n from the console, and then reads n  
- integers one after the other and finally outputs  
- their sum.  
-}  
main :: IO ()  
main = undefined
```

- ▶ Underlying specification of intended behavior
- ▶ Automatic checking of solutions against appropriate random inputs
- ▶ Currently: Description and behavior are handwritten

# Automatic Task Generation

Every task has two components:

- ▶ A goal or solution requirement
- ▶ A description communicating that goal

**How to generate both automatically?**

# Automatic Task Generation

Every task has two components:

- ▶ A goal or solution requirement
- ▶ A description communicating that goal

## **How to generate both automatically?**

- ▶ Specification language to express requirements
- ▶ Ideally: Generate verbal description from specification
- ▶ Here: Communicate requirements through generated program code

# Task Example

```
{- Give the output of the following  
- program for input 7!  
-}  
main = do  
  v <- readLn  
  let loop 1 = print 1  
      loop x = do  
        print x  
        if even x  
          then loop (x div 2)  
          else loop (x + 1)  
  loop v
```

- ▶ Task description independent from expected solution
- ▶ Lots of possibilities for (generating) tasks

# Specifying Task Goals

# Specification Language

- ▶ **Read** values and storing them in list-valued variables
- ▶ **Output** result of computation over variables
- ▶ Access variables either as **complete list** or **last read value**
- ▶ Basic **branching** and **iteration**

$$[\triangleright n]^{\mathbb{N}} \cdot ([\triangleright x]^{\mathbb{Z}} \angle len(x_A) = n_C \triangleright \mathbf{E})^{\rightarrow \mathbf{E}} \cdot [sum(x_A) \triangleright]$$



*“Read a positive integer  $n$  from the console, and then read  $n$  integers one after the other and finally output their sum.”*

# Task Descriptions

# Code as Description

## Advantages:

- ▶ More precise than verbal description
- ▶ Easily understandable if kept simple
- ▶ Can be generated/transformed automatically

## Disadvantages:

- ▶ Might already be a valid solution
- ▶ Requires knowledge of respective programming language
- ▶ No verbal description only tasks

# Generating Programs

# Direct Interpretation

- ▶ Idea: Build programs based on an interpreter for specifications

```
▶ [[·]] :: Specification -> Semantics ()
[[[>x]τ]] = do v <- readLn
           modify (store v x)

[[[{t}>]] = print =<< gets (evalTerm t)
[[sE]] = let loop = do [[S]]
                  loop
         in catchError loop (\Exit -> return ())

[[E]] = throwError Exit
[[S1 ∩ C ∩ S2]] = ifM (gets (evalTerm c)) [[S2]] [[S1]]
[[S1 · ... · Sn]] = do { [[S1]]; ... ; [[Sn]] }
...
newtype Semantics a = Semantics { runSemantics ::
  Environment -> IO (Either Exit a, Environment) }
```

# Direct Interpretation - Example

- ▶ For:  $[\triangleright n]^{\mathbb{N}} \cdot ([\triangleright x]^{\mathbb{Z}} \angle len(x_A) = n_C \Delta \mathbf{E})^{\rightarrow^{\mathbf{E}}} \cdot [sum(x_A) \triangleright]$
- ▶ Correct, but confusing for students

```
p :: IO ()
p = void $ runSemantics p' [("n",[]),("x",[])]
p' :: Semantics ()
p' = do
  v <- readLn
  modify (store v "n")
  let loop = do ifM (gets (evalTerm (len(x_A) = n_C)))
                (throwError Exit)
                (do v <- readLn
                    modify (store v "x"))
          loop
  catchError loop (\Exit -> return ())
  print =<< gets (evalTerm (sum(x_A)))
```

# Direct Interpretation

- ▶ Haskell's encapsulation of side-effects leads to verbose programs
- ▶ Contrast this with a direct interpretation in Python:

```
n_A = []
x_A = []

n_A += [int(input())]
while True:
    if len(x_A) == n_A[-1]:
        break
    else:
        x_A += [int(input())]
print(sum(x_A))
```

- ▶ Same principle but much more readable

# Ongoing Work

- ▶ Improve generation of idiomatic Haskell programs
- ▶ Ways to obtain different “solutions” from the same specification
- ▶ Possible directions:
  - ▶ Use GHC pipeline to simplify programs (inlining etc.)
  - ▶ Custom static analysis
  - ▶ Rewrite based on common patterns
  - ▶ Template Haskell
  - ▶ Intermediate language

# Tasks Ideas

# Assumptions

- ▶ We can translate specifications into several different program representations
- ▶  $[\triangleright n]^{\mathbb{N}} \cdot ([\triangleright x]^{\mathbb{Z}} \angle len(x_A) = n_{C \Delta} \mathbf{E})^{\rightarrow^E} \cdot [\{sum(x_A)\} \triangleright]$  could yield these programs (or a Python version thereof)

```
p1 = do
  n <- readLn
  let loop xs =
        if length xs == n
        then return xs
        else do
            v <- readLn
            loop (xs ++ [v])
  xs <- loop []
  print (sum xs)
```

```
p2 = do
  n <- readLn
  loop 0 n

loop s m =
  if m == 0
  then print s
  else do
    v <- readLn
    loop (s + v) (m - 1)
```

# Assumptions

- ▶ Additionally we assume we can generate random specifications
- ▶ Control complexity of generated specifications
- ▶ Mutate a base specification into several related but different specifications

# Basic Task Recipe

1. Take a base specification
2. Derive multiple artifacts like
  - ▶ Program representation(s)
  - ▶ Execution traces
3. Give students some of these artifacts
4. Ask them to “recreate” the others

*These task are also automatically checkable!*

# Task Types

- ▶ Three types of tasks, where students have to
  - ▶ make a decision
  - ▶ give execution traces of some program
  - ▶ write a program
- ▶ Testing the ability to read, understand and produce programs
- ▶ We currently use only the third type

# **Task Type 1: Make a Decision**

# Example

```
{- Which execution traces can the given program produce?  
- Here ?u stands for reading u and !v for printing v  
- a) ?2 ?7 ?4 !11  
- b) !3 ?6 ?2 ?9 !17  
- c) ?4 ?15 ?(-3) ?8 ?1 !20  
-}
```

```
main = do  
  n <- readLn  
  loop 0 n  
  
loop s m =  
  if m == 0  
  then print s  
  else do  
    v <- readLn  
    loop (s + v) (m - 1)
```

# Other Options

- ▶ **Given:** Two programs  
**Task:** Do these programs have the same behavior?  
(Yes/No)
- ▶ **Given:** Program with compiler error(s).  
**Task:** Mark all lines that contain errors.

*E.g.: Introduce errors with hand-designed rules that resemble common student mistakes.*

# **Task Type 2: Give Execution Traces**

# Example

```
{- Find an input sequence for which the two programs
- below behave differently.
-}

p1 = do
  n <- readLn
  let loop xs =
        if length xs == n
        then return xs
        else do
            v <- readLn
            loop (xs ++ [v])
  xs <- loop []
  print (sum xs)

p2 = do
  n <- readLn
  loop 0 n
  loop s m = do
    v <- readLn
    if m == 0
    then print s
    else
      loop (s + v) (m - 1)
```

# Other Options

- ▶ **Given:** Some program  
**Task:** Give an execution trace that the program can produce

*Possible to impose additional conditions (maximizing coverage etc.)*

# **Task Type 3: Write a program**

# Example

```
n_A = []
x_A = []

n_A += [int(input())]
while True:
    if len(x_A) == n_A[-1]:
        break
    else:
        x_A += [int(input())]
print(sum(x_A))
```

```
{- Write a Haskell program that has the same behavior as  
- as the given Python program.  
-}
```

```
main :: IO ()
main = undefined
```

# Example

Alternatively: Force solution style

```
{- Write a Haskell program that has the same behavior as  
- as the given Python program.  
-}  
main :: IO ()  
main = do  
  n <- readLn  
  let loop s m = undefined  
      loop o o
```

Only allow replacing `undefined`

# Other Options

- ▶ **Given:** Haskell program using (not using) a certain feature or abstraction  
**Task:** Rewrite the program such that it does not (does) use that feature or abstraction
- ▶ **Given:** Any full or partial program  
**Task:** Change/complete the program such that it
  1. can produce a specified set of traces.
  2. matches a reference program (Haskell or otherwise).
  3. simply compiles.

# Conclusion

- ▶ The combination of fixed verbal description + program code offers lots of interesting ideas for exercise tasks
- ▶ Being able to generate the necessary ingredients opens up a huge range of automatically generatable exercises.
- ▶ It is definitely worthwhile to explore actually creating these
- ▶ We are open to suggestions on how this can be done best