

Commenced Publication in 1973

Founding and Former Series Editors:

Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, and Jan van Leeuwen

Editorial Board

David Hutchison

Lancaster University, UK

Takeo Kanade

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Josef Kittler

University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

Jon M. Kleinberg

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Alfred Kobsa

University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

Friedemann Mattern

ETH Zurich, Switzerland

John C. Mitchell

Stanford University, CA, USA

Moni Naor

Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel

Oscar Nierstrasz

University of Bern, Switzerland

C. Pandu Rangan

Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India

Bernhard Steffen

University of Dortmund, Germany

Madhu Sudan

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MA, USA

Demetri Terzopoulos

University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Doug Tygar

University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Gerhard Weikum

Max-Planck Institute of Computer Science, Saarbruecken, Germany

Roland T. Mittermeir Maciej M. Sysło (Eds.)

Informatics Education – Supporting Computational Thinking

Third International Conference on Informatics
in Secondary Schools – Evolution and Perspectives, ISSEP 2008
Torun, Poland, July 1-4, 2008
Proceedings

Volume Editors

Roland T. Mittermeir
Institut für Informatik-Systeme
Universität Klagenfurt
Klagenfurt, Austria
E-mail: roland@isys.uni-klu.ac.at

Maciej M. Sysło
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science
Nicolaus Copernicus University
Torun, Poland
E-mail: syslo@mat.uni.torun.pl

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008929575

CR Subject Classification (1998): K.3, K.4, J.1, K.8

LNCS Sublibrary: SL 1 – Theoretical Computer Science and General Issues

ISSN 0302-9743
ISBN-10 3-540-69923-6 Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York
ISBN-13 978-3-540-69923-1 Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

Springer is a part of Springer Science+Business Media

springer.com

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2008
Printed in Germany

Typesetting: Camera-ready by author, data conversion by Scientific Publishing Services, Chennai, India
Printed on acid-free paper SPIN: 12327676 06/3180 5 4 3 2 1 0

Preface

Informatics Education – Supporting Computational Thinking contains papers presented at the Third International Conference on Informatics in Secondary Schools – Evolution and Perspective, ISSEP 2008, held in July 2008 in Torun, Poland.

As with the proceedings of the two previous ISSEP conferences (2005 in Klagenfurt, Austria, and 2006 in Vilnius, Lithuania), the papers presented in this volume address issues of informatics education transcending national boundaries and, therefore, transcending differences in the various national legislation and organization of the educational system. Observing these issues, one might notice a trend. The proceedings of the First ISSEP were termed *From Computer Literacy to Informatics Fundamentals* [1]. There, broad room was given to general education in ICT. The ECDL, the European Computer Driving License, propagated since the late 1990s, had penetrated school at this time already on a broad scale and teachers, parents, as well as pupils were rather happy with this situation. Teachers had material that had a clear scope, was relatively easy to teach, and especially easy to examine. Parents had the assurance that their children learn “modern and relevant stuff,” and for kids the computer was sufficiently modern so that anything that had to do with computers was considered to be attractive. Moreover, the difficulties of programming marking the early days of informatics education in school seemed no longer relevant. Some colleagues had a more distant vision though. They already proposed in their papers to weave conceptual knowledge into the strictly application-focused instruction of how to handle computers; and how to handle widely used general application software.

A trend of the still young second millennium to be witnessed external to school is that personal computers have penetrated households and citizens are increasingly using the Internet not only as a professional resource but also privately as an information resource as well as an infrastructure for communicating with relatives and friends, along with companies and public authorities. Politicians encouraged this and publicized e-learning as “learning of the future.” As technical competence for e-learning was missing in the broad base of educators, e-learning was initially pushed into the domain of those who could handle computers, i.e., teachers of informatics. The proceedings of the Second ISSEP, *Informatics Education – The Bridge between Using and Understanding Computers* [2], reflect this situation in so far as they focus, next to discussions about the breadth of informatics education, on programming instruction and programming contests, but also on ICT and on e-learning.

The fact that informatics education, due to its relationship with technical devices, is bound to act swiftly in response to societal trends can be seen from the proceedings of the Third ISSEP. While the call for papers still voiced the theme “Informatics Education – Contributing Across the Curriculum”, it is well justified to label these proceedings *Informatics Education – Supporting Computational Thinking*. Placing a focus on “computing” might seem at first glance like returning to the roots of informatics education forced by some stubborn teachers, blindly excited about programming. It is not! It is a reaction (and to some extent an anticipation) of the fact that not only personal

computers have penetrated homes but quite often laptops have penetrated school bags. Even more important, the cell phone (mobile phone, in some countries referred to as “handy”), a device highly popular not only with children, can no longer be considered simply as a telephone, i.e., as a device for oral communication. It has gradually become a universal communication device. Its SMS facility makes it a teletype device, its camera a multi-media device, and its addressability an Internet access device. School is not needed to teach kids how to handle this highly powerful and therefore also quite complex device. Kids learn this from their peers. This phenomenon, however, places new challenges on informatics education.

Consequently, the basics of using computers can no longer benefit from the excitement of using sophisticated technical equipment. The mobile phone in the possession of children has already become a more sophisticated device for a spectrum of limited tasks than a mere PC. What remains? If informatics education is constrained to ICT-education, it is training about skills that are not terribly motivating for a substantial portion of a class. Studies have shown that too much ICT training does specifically turn off girls [3, 4]. A personal experience I had recently in this respect involved a young lady asking me on the basis of her school education in informatics “How can you be so excited about such a dull subject?”

Several authors in these proceedings respond to these challenges by addressing the issue of what informatics education has to offer young people beyond the skills of how to use computers. The answers have a broad range. Computing in the sense of algorithmic constructions are among them as well as focusing on physical constructions by building small robots. Others focus rather on the intellectual challenge of anticipation and combining critical thinking, motherhood, and possibly also some mathematics before venturing into a brute force (algorithmic) solution. In summary, one might see a trend toward “back to the roots” of algorithms and programming. But these concepts are not to be seen from the computer scientist’s perspective or from the perspective of preparing pupils for a computer science profession. They are rather to be seen from the teacher’s perspective, preparing students for a life in an environment loaded with information and information technology and for preparing them with problem-solving strategies that got cultivated in the computing domain but whose scope extends computing by far.

Due to the trends mentioned above as well as to effective training measures of in service teachers, e-learning got out of the focus of informatics teachers. The didactical challenges involved with e-learning still require further discussion. But these discussions better take place in didactical conferences of the respective discipline. Only some infrastructural issues remain in the realm of informatics experts, and these were discussed at the conference.

The 32 papers contained in this volume consist of 28 contributed papers, selected out of 63 submissions and 4 invited contributions. They were reviewed by at least three members of the Program Committee and can be grouped into the sections introduced below.

The section on “Informatics, a Challenging Topic” starts with the paper by Syslo and Kwiatkowska. In this opening lecture, the authors introduce readers to the development of informatics education in Poland. The paper nicely shows, with this national example of Poland, some of the observations mentioned above and urges informatics instruction to instill computational thinking on students. The fact that computing skills

have to be nurtured already with young pupils is alluded to in the paper by Dagiene and Futschek. They discuss tasks for the Bebras contest, addressed at pupils of grade 5 to 12, stratified into 3 age groups. Diks and Madey report in their keynote on work with Polish contestants at International Olympiads in Informatics (IOI). They show how students are prepared to perform well in such international competitions and how their career as informatics professionals progresses.

The next section focuses on informatics as a technical discipline in presenting “Didactical Merits of Robot-Based Instruction.” Programming is not seen as the way to instruct computers but as the way to move a technical device, the robot. The advantage with robot programming, which is of course computer programming in a special way, is not only that the effects of the program can be seen immediately – this would also apply, e.g., to spreadsheet programming – but that students have to think in terms of integrated systems.

Rhine and Martin describe a series of learning modules created in the context of an interactive robotics course. They focus specifically on the integrative aspects of mathematics, geometry, physics, and informatics. Wu, Tseng, and Huang report on different learning effects observed with students working with physical robots and those working just with robot simulators. Kamada, Aoki, Kurebayashi, and Yamamoto describe their (inexpensive) robot building kit and its programming language. In the following paper, members of this group, Kurebayashi, Aoki, Kamada, Kanemune, and Kuno, report on a learning unit using this robot construction kit for building a tri-axial robot. They report that students had a better understanding about automatically controlled systems after taking this course. Thus, they met their aims of knowledge transfer.

Issues concerning “Transfer of Knowledge and Concept Formation” is the linking theme of the next section. Knowledge transfer from solving abstract problems to concrete design issues is addressed in Ginat’s keynote. Departing from the statement that design is a fundamental skill in computer science, he analyzes students’ skills to find all simple non-intersecting polygons that can be drawn on a grid structure consisting of 3×3 equidistantly placed points such that the area enclosed equals a fixed amount (2 cm^2). He uses the relationship between forms identified by students and forms missed by them to hypothesize different skill deficiencies of the experimental subjects.

The paper by Sendova, Stefanova, Nikolova, and Kovatcheva reports on a course establishing ICT skills with teachers. It is placed in the transfer section, however, because the actual theme of this contribution is on the transfer of ideas to enhance motivation. This general concept can be successfully applied in any other kind of informatics instruction. Its essence is to motivate learners by integrating them into the educational process in such a way that they transcend the role of observers by becoming constituent members of the teaching venture in a form where teaching and learning flows into each other.

Schulte’s duality reconstruction also departs from an ICT vantage point. On the basis of analyzing a word processor, he introduces the notion of didactical lenses which allow students to perceive structural as well as functional aspects of the material covered. Thus, the perspective of the engineer and the perspective of the application specialist become visible and students can thus construct a multifaceted image of the discipline.

Romeike considers transfer issues from a motivational perspective. In school, students quite often are forced to solve problems that are too remote from their personal

problems to trigger motivation. The different performance children show in solving challenges of their daily life (such as using a mobile phone to its full extent) and in solving typical simple algorithmic problems lets the author conclude that instead of pre-canned artificial algorithmic problems, school should offer open challenges with a stepwise progression of difficulty. Gruber also looks at various approaches to raise the motivation of pupils, zooming in particularly on in-classroom differentiation.

The section on “Object Orientation and Programming” starts out with *Hubwieser’s* paper on an analysis of learning objectives in object-oriented programming. The motivation of the analysis resulted from the need of writing a textbook. However, the message conveyed transcends this immediate problem domain. Conducting a similar analysis might help in various situations to protect teachers from rushing into the most modern developments of the professional side of the discipline without considering didactical consequences and without considering whether students can be accompanied along the whole trip from showing them a concept and making them convincingly aware of the usefulness of this concept.

Weigend takes a modeling perspective in pleading to make a distinction between the existential aspects of a state and its possessive elements. Benaya and Zur’s deliberations are based on empirical results, studying the performance and problems faced by students, who already know how to program in an algorithmic language, in a course that introduced them to object-oriented programming in Java.

Yovcheva proposes what she refers to as a “spiral approach” of teaching programming. Departing from simple mathematical problems, a spiral of increasing complexity is defined in such a way that youngsters learn programming in small chunks, the bites being small enough to be comprehended and big enough to solve the problem at hand. A different angle of introducing students to algorithmic problem solving is presented by Haberman, Muller, and Averbuch. They recommend fostering critical thinking of students by dragging them away from starting programming too quickly. The authors challenged students with a core example backed up with variations. The problems are set such that the text of the examples varies only moderately, while the solution to the problems become, with some variations, almost trivial for those who apply good motherhood and some mathematical reasoning; in other cases, a slight modification of the problem substantially raises the complexity of the required solution.

The section closes with two papers following slightly different strands of ideas. Adamaszek, Chrzastowski-Wachtel, and Niewiarowska intend to help novice programmers stumbling over pointers and related concepts by introducing VIPER, a visual interpreter for Pascal. Blonskis and Dagiene report on an analysis of programs developed by students during their maturity exams.

The following section, “Strategies for Writing Textbooks and Teacher Education,” starts out with two contributions reporting the authors’ reflections and recommendations for textbooks introducing students to informatics. Freiermuth, Hromkovic and Steffen explain in a keynote lecture their way of teaching fundamental concepts using LOGO as didactical vehicle. In doing so, they also establish bridges between computer science and mathematics. Noteworthy is their remark that a systematic way of teaching avoids gender problems in programming courses. Kalas and Winczer also strive for an introductory text that should “build respect for informatics as a science and as a subject.” But they follow a different strategy. While the group from ETH is

liberal with space needed to express their ideas, the colleagues from Bratislava submit to the trend of short messages. They show how to fit 10 chapters into a total of 48 pages while still striving at a constructivist approach, following the progressive pattern of using, understanding, and creating information technology.

A totally different approach is presented in the paper by Nishida, Idosaka, Kofuku, Kanemune and Kuno. They strive to popularize Bell, Witten and Fellows' concept of "Computer Science Unplugged" and report the experience they obtained with this approach in three schools.

The section closes with papers on teacher training. Ragonis and Hazzan report on a course for preparing pre-service computer science teachers for Israeli high schools. It covers a broad spectrum of topics from an informatics didactics perspective. While in this course, programming, though addressed from various angles, is just one among several topics, the ensuing paper by Kolczyk focuses specifically on how informatics teachers should present algorithms. It departs from the vantage point that planning, i.e., proper anticipation of situations yet to come and reflecting about potential alternatives of reaction, is a key capability to be developed before programming. On this basis, the paper shows how planning may be trained in small progressive steps. This approach to programming starts already at the primary level and progresses to later phases of the curriculum. The paper by Grgurina reports on teacher training at the University of Groningen. After an explanation of the Dutch system of teacher formation, a concept of highly supervised training on the job is described.

Almost antithetic to the Dutch approach are the reports from Latvia and from Lithuania. Both apply e-learning technology to upgrade their teachers. The paper from the Latvian colleagues, placed in the e-learning section, specifically addresses the problem of smoothening the difference between Riga and the countryside. Dagiene, Zajančauskiene, and Žilinskiene focus on this technology as a means and an end in so far as they argue for e-learning as a powerful and purposeful way of motivating teachers to use the technology they are to familiarize students with for their own learning. The details of the targets to be achieved by this program are reported in the paper opening the next section.

The section on "National and International Perspectives on ICT Education" starts with a paper from Dagiene, reporting on the implementation of the national strategy for the introduction of information and communication technologies into the Lithuanian educational system. This contribution, reporting on a progressive strategy of introducing IT in grade 5 to 10, is followed by a report on a project assessing spreadsheet knowledge and skills of French secondary school students, presented by Tort, Blondel and Bruillard. The study shows that, when ICT is to be used in a mode remote from those domains where it has penetrated private life, formal education is still a necessity. This section closes with a paper by Micheuz, arguing for a harmonization of informatics education in Europe on the terminology level as well as on the level of concepts. The NCTM standard for mathematics is proposed as an example from a related discipline. Various initiatives aiming at structuring informatics education are mentioned.

The proceedings close with three papers dealing with "e-Learning" issues. This section starts with a contribution from Eibl and Schubert reporting on design criteria for e-learning systems considering security aspects. Damaševičius and Štuikys aim for

reusable learning objects, reporting their experience of producing generative components. Lavendels, Sitikovs, and Krauklis report on the use of information technologies for reducing the gap between teachers in the capital of Latvia and country-side teachers. It is noteworthy to mention that this is the initiative of a university, to broaden the base of their students by providing pupils from the countryside with access to modern education in informatics.

A conference like this is not possible without many hands and brains working for it or without the financial support of graceful donors. Hence, I would like to thank particularly the General Chair and the members of the Program Committee and all the additional reviewers for ensuring the quality of papers accepted. Among them, Carol Sperry deserves specific mention as she helped some authors to improve linguistic aspects of their text. Special thanks are due to the Organizing Committee led by Anna Beata Kwiatkowska and to Annette Lippitsch for editorial support for these proceedings.

The conference was made possible due to the support of several sponsors whose help is gratefully acknowledged. Finally, hosting of the conference by the Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun is gratefully acknowledged.

April 2008

Roland Mittermeir

References

1. Mittermeir, R.T. (ed.): ISSEP 2005. LNCS, vol. 3422. Springer, Heidelberg (2005)
2. Mittermeir, R.T. (ed.): ISSEP 2006. LNCS, vol. 4226. Springer, Heidelberg (2006)
3. Antonitsch, P., Krainer, L., Lerchster, R., Ukowitz, M.: Kriterien der Studienwahl von Schülerinnen und Schülern unter spezieller Berücksichtigung von IT-Studiengängen an Fachhochschule und Universität; IFF-Forschungsbericht, AAU-Klagenfurt (März 2007)
4. Schulte, C., Knobelsdorf, M.: Das informatische Weltbild von Studierenden. In: Schubert, S. (ed.) Didaktik der Informatik in Theorie und Praxis, Proc. INFOS 2007. LNI, vol. P 112, pp. 69–79. Springer, Heidelberg (2007)

Organization

ISSEP 2008 was organized by the Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland.

ISSEP 2008 Program Committee

Maciej M. Sysło (Co-chair)	Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland
Roland T. Mittermeir (Co-chair)	Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Andor Abonyi-Tóth	Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary
Peter Antonitsch	Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Juris Borzovs	University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia
Laszlo Böszörményi	Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Norbert Breier	Universität Hamburg, Germany
Mike Chiles	Western Cape Education Department, South Africa
Piotr Chrzastowski-Wachtel	Warsaw University, Poland
Bernard Cornu	CNED-EIFAD (Open and Distance Learning Institute), France
Valentina Dagienė	Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Lithuania
Krzysztof Diks	Warsaw University, Poland
Zide Du	China Computer Federation, China
Steffen Friedrich	Technische Universität Dresden, Germany
Karl Fuchs	Universität Salzburg, Austria
Patrick Fullick	University of Southampton, UK
Gerald Futschek	Technische Universität Wien, Austria
David Ginat	Tel-Aviv University, Israel
Bruria Haberman	Holon Institute of Technology and The Davidson Institute of Science Education at The Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel
Juraj Hromkovič	ETH Zürich, Switzerland
Peter Hubwieser	Technische Universität München, Germany
Feliksas Ivanauskas	Vilnius University, Lithuania
Ivan Kalaš	Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia
Susumu Kanemune	Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan
Ewa Kołczyk	University of Wrocław, Poland
Ala Kravtsova	Moscow Pedagogical State University, Russia
Anna Beata Kwiatkowska	Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland
Ville Leppanen	University of Turku, Finland
Jan Madey	Warsaw University, Poland
Peter Micheuz	Universität Klagenfurt and Gymnasium Völkermarkt, Austria
Joerg R. Mühlbacher	University of Linz, Austria

Zdzisław Nowakowski	Center for Lifelong Learning, Mielec, Poland
Ana Isabel Sacristan	Center for Research and Advanced Studies (Cinvestav), Mexico
Tapio Salakoski	Turku University, Finland
Sigrid Schubert	Universität Siegen, Germany
Aleksej Semionov	Moscow Institute of Open Education, Russia
Carol Sperry	Millersville University, USA
Oleg Spirin	Zhytomyr Ivan Franko University, Ukraine
Aleksandras Targamadzė	Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Armando Jose Valente	State University of Campinas, Brazil
Tom Verhoeff	Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
Anne Villems	University of Tartu, Estonia
Andrzej Walat	Center for Informatics Education and Applications of Computers, Warsaw, Poland

Additional Reviewers

Michał Adamaszek	University of Warsaw, Poland
Ernestine Bischof	Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Karin Freiermuth	ETH Zürich, Switzerland
Karin Hodnigg	Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Kees Huizing	Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
Toshiyuki Kamada	Aichi University of Education, Japan
Yasushi Kuno	University of Tsukuba, Japan
Shuji Kurebayashi	Shizuoka University, Japan
Yoshiaki Nakano	Senri Kinran University, Japan
Anna Niewiarowska	University of Warsaw, Poland
Tomohiro Nishida	Osaka Gakuin University, Japan
Björn Steffen	ETH Zürich, Switzerland
Takeo Tatsume	Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Japan

Organizing Committee

Anna Beata Kwiatkowska (Chair); Maria Berndt-Schreiber, Michał Dudkiewicz, Maciej Koziański, Wiesława Osińska, Grzegorz Osiński, Oliwia Piwińska, Mariusz Piwiński, Andrzej Polewczyński, Krzysztof Skowronek, Maciej M. Sysło, Danuta Zaremba; all UMK, Torun.

Main Sponsor

ISSEP 2008 and the publication of its proceedings were partly supported by the Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Torun, Poland.

Table of Contents

Informatics, a Challenging Topic

The Challenging Face of Informatics Education in Poland	1
<i>Maciej M. Sysło and Anna Beata Kwiatkowska</i>	
Bebras International Contest on Informatics and Computer Literacy: Criteria for Good Tasks	19
<i>Valentina Dagienė and Gerald Futschek</i>	
From Top Coders to Top IT Professionals	31
<i>Krzysztof Diks and Jan Madey</i>	

Didactical Merits of Robot-Based Instruction

Integrating Mathematical Analysis of Sensors and Motion in a Mobile Robotics Course	41
<i>Don Rhine and Fred Martin</i>	
Visualization of Program Behaviors: Physical Robots Versus Robot Simulators	53
<i>Cheng-Chih Wu, I-Chih Tseng, and Shih-Lung Huang</i>	
Development of an Educational System to Control Robots for All Students	63
<i>Toshiyuki Kamada, Hiroyuki Aoki, Shuji Kurebayashi, and Yoshikazu Yamamoto</i>	
Proposal for Teaching Manufacturing and Control Programming Using Autonomous Mobile Robots with an Arm	75
<i>Shuji Kurebayashi, Hiroyuki Aoki, Toshiyuki Kamada, Susumu Kanemune, and Yasushi Kuno</i>	

Transfer of Knowledge and Concept Formation

Design Disciplines and Non-specific Transfer	87
<i>David Ginat</i>	
Like a (School of) Fish in Water (or <i>ICT-Enhanced Skills</i> in Action)	99
<i>Eugenia Sendova, Eliza Stefanova, Nikolina Nikolova, and Eugenia Kovatcheva</i>	
Duality Reconstruction – Teaching Digital Artifacts from a Socio-technical Perspective	110
<i>Carsten Schulte</i>	

What’s My Challenge? The Forgotten Part of Problem Solving in
Computer Science Education 122
Ralf Romeike

Bringing Abstract Concepts Alive. How to Base Learning Success on
the Principles of Playing, Curiosity and In-Classroom Differentiation ... 134
Peter Gruber

Working with Objects and Programming

Analysis of Learning Objectives in Object Oriented Programming 142
Peter Hubwieser

To Have or to Be? Possessing Data Versus Being in a State – Two
Different Intuitive Concepts Used in Informatics 151
Michael Weigend

Understanding Object Oriented Programming Concepts in an Advanced
Programming Course 161
Tamar Benaya and Ela Zur

Spiral Teaching of Programming to 10–11 Year-Old Pupils After Passed
First Training (Based on the Language C++) 171
Biserka Boncheva Youcheva

Multi-facet Problem Comprehension: Utilizing an Algorithmic Idea in
Different Contexts 180
Bruria Haberman, Orna Muller, and Haim Averbuch

VIPER, a Student-Friendly Visual Interpreter of Pascal 192
*Michał Adamaszek, Piotr Chrzęstowski-Wachtel, and
Anna Niewiarowska*

Analysis of Students’ Developed Programs at the Maturity Exams in
Information Technologies 204
Jonas Blonskis and Valentina Dagiene

**Strategies for Writing Textbooks and Teacher
Education**

Creating and Testing Textbooks for Secondary Schools – An Example:
Programming in LOGO 216
Karin Freiermuth, Juraj Hromkovič, and Björn Steffen

Informatics as a Contribution to the Modern Constructivist
Education 229
Ivan Kalas and Michal Winczer

New Methodology of Information Education with “Computer Science Unplugged”	241
<i>Tomohiro Nishida, Yukio Idosaka, Yayoi Hofuku, Susumu Kanemune, and Yasushi Kuno</i>	
Disciplinary-Pedagogical Teacher Preparation for Pre-service Computer Science Teachers: Rational and Implementation	253
<i>Noa Ragonis and Orit Hazzan</i>	
Algorithm – Fundamental Concept in Preparing Informatics Teachers...	265
<i>Ewa Kolczyk</i>	
Computer Science Teacher Training at the University of Groningen.....	272
<i>Nataša Grgurina</i>	
Distance Learning Course for Training Teachers’ ICT Competence	282
<i>Valentina Dagienė, Lina Zajančauskienė, and Inga Žilinskienė</i>	

National and International perspectives on ICT Education

Teaching Information Technology and Elements of Informatics in Lower Secondary Schools: Curricula, Didactic Provision and Implementation	293
<i>Valentina Dagienė</i>	
Spreadsheet Knowledge and Skills of French Secondary School Students	305
<i>Françoise Tort, François-Marie Blondel, and Éric Bruillard</i>	
Harmonization of Informatics Education – Science Fiction or Prospective Reality?.....	317
<i>Peter Micheuz</i>	

E-Learning

Development of E-Learning Design Criteria with Secure Realization Concepts	327
<i>Christian J. Eibl and Sigrid E. Schubert</i>	
On the Technological Aspects of Generative Learning Object Development	337
<i>Robertas Damaševičius and Vytautas Štuikys</i>	
Informational Technologies for Further Education of Latvian Province Teachers of Informatics	349
<i>Jurijs Lavendels, Vjaceslavs Sitikovs, and Kaspars Krauklis</i>	
Author Index	357