

World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education (WTE&TE)

CONTENTS		
Home		
WTE&TE		
Mission		
Background	Front Cover	
Topics	Inside Pages	89-92
Notes for Contributors	Z.J. Pudlowski	Editorial 93
Instructions for Authors	T.P. Tsai, J. Lin, L.C. Lin & J. Li	A blended learning lesson design for an EPUB3 e-book-based course 94
Call for Articles		
Editorial Advisory Board		
Articles	Nizaruddin, Muhtarom & Sugiyanti	Improving students' problem-solving ability in mathematics through game-based learning activities 102
Contact Us	K. Breznik & H. Rezk	The mission statements of public research centres in Egypt 108
	L.S. Riza, R. Awaludin, H. Sutarno, Munir & A.P. Wibawa	A model for auto generating sets of examination items in educational assessment by using fuzzy c-means 114
	A. Gero, Y. Stav & N. Yamin	Use of real world examples in engineering education: the case of the course <i>Electric Circuit Theory</i> 120
	T.Y.E. Siswono, A.W. Kohar, A.H. Rosyidi & S. Hartono	Primary school teachers' beliefs and knowledge about mathematical problem-solving and their performance in a problem-solving task 126
	M. Ayub & O. Karnalim	Predicting outcomes in <i>Introductory Programming</i> using J48 classification 132
	Y. Luo, X. Li & R. Yin	The dictionary use strategy for writing in English by engineering students - a case study 137
	H. Hendriana	Teachers' hard and soft skills in innovative teaching of mathematics 145
	M.A. Mizar, M. Amin, M. Ashar & Marsono	Performance test of machine groundnuts husk peeling using a rotary multi-disc system - a case study 151
	Y. Zhu, Y. Chen, T. Pan & H. Liu	SPIED: an international maker education practice of China, Japan and Korea 157
	R.D. Mahande & Jasruddin	Utilisation study of mobile technology at a vocational high school 162
	Y. Zu & M. Xu	Research on the teaching reform of a <i>Single Chip Microcomputer</i> course based on the concept of CDIO 169
	N. Amaliyah, Sapriya & E. Maryani	A trans-disciplinary approach and inquiry-based learning model of social studies 174

Ratnadewi, R.P. Adhie, Y. Hutama, J. Christian & D. Wijaya	Implementation and performance analysis of AES-128 cryptography method in an NFC-based communication system	178
M. Kuimova, D. Burleigh, X. Maldague & D. Startseva	Academic exchange programmes to enhance foreign language skills and academic excellence	184
S. Maf'ulah, D. Juniati & T.Y.E. Siswono	The aspects of reversible thinking in solving algebraic problems by an elementary student winning National Olympiad medals in science	189
H. Upu, Djadir & S. Asyari	The fifth graders' mathematisation process in solving contextual problems	195
Index of Authors		200



Largest guest posting network

Guest post on huge news sites

We write and publish a guest post about your brand to over 200 high authority news sites

brandpush.co

OPEN

World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education

COUNTRY

Australia



Universities and research institutions in Australia

SUBJECT AREA AND CATEGORY

Engineering
Engineering (miscellaneous)

Social Sciences
Education

PUBLISHER

World Institute for Engineering and Technology Education (WIETE)

H-INDEX

14

Call for Papers

Q1 Scopus Elsevier

Call for Papers for Multidisciplinary St

hivt.be

OPEN

PUBLICATION TYPE

Journals

ISSN

14462257

COVERAGE

2009-2020

INFORMATION

[Homepage](#)

[How to publish in this journal](#)

zenon.pudlowski@wiete.com.au

Call for Papers

Q1 Scopus Elsevier

Call for Papers for Multidisciplinary Sub

hivt.be

OPEN

SCOPE

The WIETE's World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education seeks to advance continued growth and evolution in knowledge and understanding in engineering and technology education by publishing strictly refereed international articles in the field, thereby, benefiting humankind by providing the next generation of engineers and technologists with greater knowledge in educational methods.

Join the conversation about this journal

🔍 ×

Impact Factor Journal

Thieme Medical Publishers

Open

📄 Quartiles
📄

FIND SIMILAR JOURNALS ⓘ

options ⋮


1 Global Journal of Engineering Education AUS 69% similarity	2 International Journal of Technology and Design NLD 7% similarity	3 International Journal of Engineering Education IRL 6% similarity	4 Journal of Technology Education USA 6% similarity	5 Journal of Engineering Education USA 5% similarity
--	--	--	---	--

🔍 ×

Impact Factor Journal

Thieme Medical Publishers

Open



World Transactions on Engineering and Technology...
 Engineering (miscellaneous)
 Q2
 best quartile
 SJR 2020
 0.39
 powered by scimagojr.com

← Show this widget in your own website
 Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

SCImago Graphica
 Explore, visually communicate and make sense of data with our new free tool.
 Get it

Impact Factor Journal

Thieme Medical Publishers

[Open](#)

Metrics based on Scopus® data as of April 2021

Yanti 2 years ago
 Hallo
 reply

Melanie Ortiz 2 years ago
 Dear Yanti, thanks for your participation! Best Regards, SCImago Team

Abbas Thajeel 2 years ago
 Madam / sir
 I have a research in electrical and communication engineering
 How long does it take to evaluate the research? Issuance of acceptance of publication?

How much is the posting fee?
greetings to you all

Abbas Thajeel
eng.abbas11@gmail.com

reply



Melanie Ortiz 2 years ago

SCImago Team

Dear Abbas,
thank you for contacting us.
We are sorry to tell you that SCImago Journal & Country Rank is not a journal. SJR is a portal with scientometric indicators of journals indexed in Elsevier/Scopus.
Unfortunately, we cannot help you with your request, we suggest you to visit the journal's homepage or contact the journal's editorial staff , so they could inform you more deeply.
Best Regards, SCImago Team

Leave a comment

Name

Email
(will not be published)

 I'm not a robot reCAPTCHA
Privacy - Terms

Submit

The users of Scimago Journal & Country Rank have the possibility to dialogue through comments linked to a specific journal. The purpose is to have a forum in which general doubts about the processes of publication in the journal, experiences and other issues derived from the publication of papers are resolved. For topics on particular articles, maintain the dialogue through the usual channels with your editor.

Developed by:



Powered by:



Follow us on @ScimagoJR

Scimago Lab, Copyright 2007-2020. Data Source: Scopus®

EST MODUS IN REBUS
Horatio (Saturne 1.1, 106)

Predicting outcomes in *Introductory Programming* using J48 classification

Mewati Ayub & Oscar Karnalim

Maranatha Christian University
Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: In a computer science (CS) major, *Introductory Programming* becomes a substantial course, which determines whether students can complete that major or not. This study evaluates the correlation between student data with the students' capacity to pass that course. Such correlation is exploited according to a data mining technique called J48. For each student, the work incorporates personal, prior education, admission and assessment data. Based on an evaluation of 41 pieces of student data, the national test score for mathematics in Indonesia presents the most promising attributes, followed by the admission test score. The results of this study are expected to provide a brief insight for CS lecturer and the university, so that they can handle emerging issues in CS education, especially, the low retention rate.

INTRODUCTION

Introductory Programming is a course, which becomes a key factor for computer science (CS) students, especially first-year students who have just completed high school and wish to continue their journey through the CS major. After spending several weeks on the Introductory Programming class, some students realise that they can hardly understand programming logic and syntax due to their lack of computational thinking ability. Consequently, it may generate an issue in student retention in the CS major. Some students tend to give up on their CS major since they think that they have not assimilated such skills. In addition, despite the fact that most students may pass the course, they are not guaranteed to pass advanced programming courses in the next semester, if they do not pass this course with distinguished results. Recognising the difficulty of programming, a course is proportional to the assigned semester of a given course. The higher its assigned semester is, the more difficult its course material is.

There have been several pieces of research, which aimed to identify the issues experienced by students in learning programming, especially in the introductory programming course. Byrne and Lyons [1], and Bergin and Reilly [2] have studied some of the factors, which influence the success of novices in the introductory programming course; namely, previous computing experience and prior academic performance. According to Rountree et al, decision tree classifier is used to identify combinations of factors that interact to predict success or failure in the introductory programming course [3]. Also, a study by Wiedenbeck et al has shown that self-efficacy and the mental model have a direct effect on overall success in an introductory programming course [4]. A study by Wilson indicates that a formal class in programming and game playing *...promote success in an introductory computer science course, there is a significant gender difference particularly for game playing* [5].

In this study, prediction attributes that determine the success of novice students in computer programming will be explored further. Such prediction will be conducted using data mining technique, particularly the J48 classification technique. As a case study, this work incorporates student data from the Introductory Programming course, which was held in the Computer Science (Informatics) major, at Maranatha Christian University. The attributes cover four aspects, which are personal, prior education, admission and assessment data. The result of this study is expected to become a supplementary data source for handling the student retention issue. For instance, providing a more-sophisticated learning method or course syllabus based on high-valued prediction attributes. Moreover, these data can also be used by university admissions in terms of student recruitment. They can filter the students recruited, based on given prediction patterns.

CLASSIFICATION IN DATA MINING

The data mining task can be divided into two categories, descriptive and predictive [6]. The classification method is a predictive data mining task, which is defined as a predictive method that is used to classify unseen data [6][7].

The predictive model is generated based on the analysis of a training data set. Prediction of a new data should be done using the model. There are some techniques that can be used for classification, such as decision tree induction, Bayes classification or rule based classification [6]. In this study, the authors applied decision tree induction as a classification technique; namely, J48 classification. The J48 classification is Weka's implementation of C 4.5 decision tree learner. Weka implements a later and slightly improved version, which called C4.5 revision 8 [7].

For each leaf in a decision tree derived from the J48 classification, there are two numbers (n/m), which mean that n instances reach the leaf, but m instances are classified incorrectly [7]. The percentage of correctly classified instances will determine whether the generated model is sufficiently good. When the amount of data for training and testing is limited, stratified tenfold cross validation techniques can be used to ensure the performance of the classifier [7].

Rules in the IF-THEN form can be extracted from a decision tree. Each path from the root to a leaf node can be written as one rule. The rule antecedent (IF-part) is formed by combining the splitting criterion along a given path using the AND connection. The leaf node which contains the class prediction forms the rule consequent (THEN-part) [6].

METHODOLOGY

The class under study was a first-year course; namely, Basic Programming. It is based on the Python programming language in procedural style programming. All students had entered the course directly from high school. After the students have completed the course, they should be able to specify, design, code and test a computing solution. The course was composed of two sessions: theory of 150 minutes' duration and laboratory practice of 210 minutes' duration. These sessions were conducted once a week during that semester. In term of course material, Basic Programming was divided into logic and advanced-technique material.

Logic material was taught in the first seven weeks (before a mid-test). It covered data types, variables, conditional statements and looping. On the other hand, advanced-technique material was taught during the last seven weeks (after the mid-test). It covered many advanced techniques that are frequently used in programming. Such techniques include functions, arrays, searching and sorting. The assessment of this course consists of a mid-semester written examination (25% marks), a final written examination (25% marks), mid-semester and final laboratory examinations (25% marks), and 12 weekly laboratory assignments (25% marks).

In this case, the data set has been extracted from 41 students who have a minimum 75% of attendance for the Basic Programming course. Each piece of student data consists of personal, admission, prior education and assessment data. Pre-processing for these data was done by resolving inconsistencies, and transforming data to obtain quality data that are feasible for classification.

As described in Table 1, a group of attributes has been selected for student classification. These attributes consist of:

- a) personal data, such as gender and student's home town (province);
- b) prior education data, such as high school major, national test score for mathematics (NTM);
- c) admission data, such as admission test score (ATS);
- d) assessment data from basic programming course, such as final written examination score (WES) and final laboratory examination score (LES). The gender, province, major, NTM, ATS attributes will be utilised to predict WES or LES.

Table 1: Student data set.

Attribute name	Description	Possible values
Gender	Student's gender	[M=male, F=female]
ATS	Admission test score	[E : excellent, G : good, F : fair]
Province	Student's home town	[J = Java, L = outside Java]
Major	High school major	[1 = major A, 2 = outside major A]
NTM	National test score for mathematics	[E : excellent, G: good, F : fair]
WES	Written examination score	[E : excellent, G : good, N : not passed]
LES	Laboratory examination score	[E : excellent, G : good, N : not passed]

Based on the student data set, this study explored the final examination scores as class attributes against personal data, prior education data and admission data through classification technique. The experiment was performed twice, one for final written examination scores and the other for final laboratory examination scores.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Table 2, the data set is grouped according to gender, major, province, ATS and NTM. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviation) for each group are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics.

Grouping		n	WES		LES	
			Means	SD	Means	SD
Gender	Male	33	56.12	24.88	53.45	19.54
	Female	8	48.75	18.07	43.00	19.73
Major	Major A	28	59.00	20.65	55.00	17.54
	Outside major A	13	45.38	27.83	43.69	22.75
Province	Java	31	56.13	25.33	53.68	20.75
	Outside Java	10	50.20	18.07	44.40	15.23
ATS	Excellent	13	67.23	23.85	61.77	20.34
	Good	25	52.68	19.36	49.08	16.69
	Fair	3	17.00	10.58	26.00	16.37
NTM	Excellent	4	88.75	13.15	76.50	19.28
	Good	20	61.30	18.82	56.35	15.34
	Fair	17	38.88	18.44	39.71	17.20

To examine the differences between WES and LES for each of the group attributes, the authors used a *t*-test for gender, major and province. For example, the WES mean for male students was compared to the WES mean for female students. In carrying out the *t*-tests, assumptions of normality and equality of variances were confirmed. In each group, the *t*-tests suggested no significant differences between any of the factors and the final examination scores.

The authors inspected the differences between final examination scores for the ATS group and the NTM group using the one-way Anova test. The results of the Anova tests showed that there was a significance difference (*p*-value < 0.01) between the attributes' value in both groups. Table 3 indicates the F-value for each group with a critical F-value of 5.21. They used MaxStat Lite version 3.6 to calculate descriptive statistics, *t*-tests and Anova tests.

Table 3: F-value of Anova tests for ATS and NTM.

Grouping	WES	LES
	F-value	F-value
ATS	7.59	5.40
NTM	14.62	9.82

This study further explored the relationship between final examination scores with the group attributes using the J48 classification of the students' data set using WEKA version 3.8.1 as a data mining toolkit. The first classification was done using written examination score (WES) as the attribute class. The second classification used laboratory examination score (LES) as the class. Because of limited data, this study utilised a ten-folds cross validation to ensure the validation of the results.

The result of the first classification is shown in Figure 1 in the form of a J48 pruned tree with 70.73% accuracy in WES predicting. There are 29 correctly classified instances and 12 incorrectly classified instances. Figure 1 indicates that the NTM attribute is the most affective attribute in predicting written examination score (WES). The result of WES is accordingly determined based on NTM. If NTM is excellent, then, WES is excellent. Similarly, if NTM is fair, then, WES is not passed. However, if NTM is good, major and gender attributes also contribute to predict the WES. Table 4 resumes the rules generated from the J48 decision tree in Figure 1.




Figure 1: J48 pruned tree for WES predicting.

Table 4: Rule for WES.

Rule #	Rule's premise	WES		
		Percentages of instances		
		Excellent	Good	Not passed
1	IF NTM = Good and Major = 1 and Gender = Male	-	71.43%	-
2	IF NTM = Good and Major = 1 and Gender = Female	-	-	50%
3	IF NTM = Good and Major = 2	-	-	50%
4	IF NTM = Fair	-	-	88.23%
5	IF NTM = Excellent	75%	-	-




Figure 2: J48 pruned tree for LES predicting.

The result of the second classification is shown in Figure 2 in the form of the J48 pruned tree with 58.54% accuracy percentage of LES predicting. There are 24 correct classified instances and 17 incorrectly classified instances. Figure 2 indicates that the NTM attribute is also the most affective attribute in predicting the laboratory examination score (LES). The result of LES is accordingly determined based on NTM. If NTM is excellent, then, LES is excellent. Similarly, if NTM is fair, then, LES is not passed. Nearly the same as predicting WES, if NTM is good, gender attributes also contribute to predict the LES. Table 5 reports on the rules generated from the J48 decision tree in Figure 2.

Table 5: Rule for LES.

Rule #	Rule's premise	LES		
		Percentages of instances		
		Excellent	Good	Not passed
1	IF NTM = Good and Gender = Male	-	68.75%	-
2	IF NTM = Good and Gender = Female	-	-	75%
3	IF NTM = Fair	-	-	70.59%
4	IF NTM = Excellent	50%	-	-

CONCLUSIONS

Student success or failure in the Introductory Programming course will influence the continuity of their study in computer science. In this study, five attributes were used to predict outcomes in introductory programming: gender, student home town (province), high school major, national test score for mathematics (NTM) and admission test score (ATS).

Written examination score (WES) and laboratory examination score (LES) are used as class attributes. The statistical test results of this study show two predictive factors in the following order of importance: national test score for mathematics and admission test score. Using J48 classification, the authors obtained a confirmation that the national test score for mathematics becomes the most impactful prediction attribute. From the J48 decision tree, the combination of factors to predict success or failure can be resumed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Maranatha Christian University Research Committee, by means of the Maranatha Christian University Grant.

REFERENCES

1. Byrne, P. and Lyons, G., The effect of student attributes on success in programming. *Proc. ITiCSE 6th Annual Conf. on Innovation and Technol. in Computer Science Educ.*, New York, USA, 49-52 (2001).
2. Bergin, S. and Reilly, R., Programming: factors that influence success. *Proc. 36th SIGCSE Technical Symp. on Computer Science Educ.*, Missouri, USA, 411-415 (2005).
3. Rountree, N., Rountree, J., Robins, A. and Hannah, R., Interacting factors that predict success and failure in a CS1 course. *Proc. ITiCSE Conf. on Innovation and Technol. in Computer Science Educ.*, Leeds, United Kingdom, 101-104 (2004).
4. Wiedenbeck, S., Labelle, D. and Kain, V.N.R., Factors affecting course outcomes in introductory programming. *Proc. 16th Annual Workshop of the Psychology of Programming Interest Group*, Carlow, Ireland, 97-110 (2004).
5. Wilson, B.C., A study of factors promoting success in computer science including gender differences. *Computer Science Educ.*, 12, **1-2**, 141-164 (2002).
6. Han, J., Kamber, M. and Pei, J., *Data Mining Concepts and Techniques*. Waltham: Elsevier Inc. (2012).
7. Witten, I.H., Frank, E. and Hall, M.A., *Data Mining Practical Machine Learning Tools and Techniques*. Burlington: Elsevier Inc. (2011).