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#### Abstract

The paper discusses the issue of supporting informatics (computer science) education through competitions for lower and upper secondary school students (8-19 years old). Competitions play an important role for learners as a source of inspiration, innovation, and attraction. Running contests in informatics for school students for many years, we have noticed that the students consider the contest experience very engaging and exciting as well as a learning experience. A contest is an excellent instrument to involve students in problem solving activities. An overview of infrastructure and development of an informatics contest from international level to the national one (the Bebras contest on informatics and computer fluency, originated in Lithuania) is presented. The performance of Bebras contests in 23 countries during the last 10 years showed an unexpected and unusually high acceptance by school students and teachers. Many thousands of students participated and got a valuable input in addition to their regular informatics lectures at school. In the paper, the main attention is paid to the developed tasks and analysis of students' task solving results in Lithuania.
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## 1 Introduction

Competition makes teaching of informatics (computer science, computing) more attractive for children. During contests students have the possibility to test their skills among peers from different schools or even countries and to make friends in a field that they have interests. The contest on informatics and computer fluency named 'Bebras' (it is a Lithuanian word for 'beaver') may be the key to the potential of informatics science knowledge and an attractive way to bind up technology and education.

Bebras is an international initiative whose goal is to promote informatics and computational thinking especially among teachers and students of all ages, but also to the public at large. The big challenge of Bebras is to organise easily accessible and highly motivating online contests in many countries. The contest was established in 2004 by Lithuanian suggestion (Dagiene, 2006). It is involving massively growing numbers of students and countries. Lithuania celebrated its 10th year's anniversary of running the Bebras contest in November last year. Since 2004, the Bebras contest has quickly spread across Europe and now is a really international motion. Overall, more than 0.7 million students participated in the Bebras contest in 2013 (Table 1).

The Bebras contest is design to promote informatics fundamentals for both boys and girls and equally attract their attention. The result is quite good: quite a big number of girls have taken part in last year's contest; some countries even have equal or almost equal participants of both genders (Italy, Japan, Taiwan, see Table 1).

Table 1: Numbers of participants distrusted by country and gender in 2013 contest

| Country | Total | Girls | Boys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | 12154 |  |  |
| Belgium | 848 |  |  |
| Bulgaria | 551 | 188 | 636 |
| Canada | 4229 |  |  |
| Czech R. | 34454 | 15386 | 19068 |
| Estonia | 3517 |  |  |
| Finland | 4423 | 1846 | 2577 |
| France | 171932 |  |  |
| Germany | 206430 |  |  |
| Hungary | 6246 |  |  |
| Ireland | 3141 | 1375 | 1470 |
| Italy | 3288 | 1644 | 1644 |
| Israel | ~2000 |  |  |
| Japan | 4371 | 2082 | 2289 |
| Latvia | 1038 | 434 | 604 |
| Lithuania | 25909 | 10817 | 15092 |
| The Netherlands | 12592 |  |  |
| New Zealand | 217 |  |  |
| Poland | 15933 | 11534 | 4399 |
| R. of South Africa | 1111 |  |  |
| Russian F. | 17584 | 8203 | 9381 |
| Slovakia | 55017 | 24217 | 30800 |
| Slovenia | 12040 | 5152 | 6.36 |
| Spain | 711 |  |  |
| Sweden | 1869 | 695 | 1446 |
| Switzerland | 9832 |  |  |
| Taiwan | 9526 | 4842 | 4684 |
| Ukraine | 86266 | 41077 | 45189 |
| United Kingdom | 21473 |  |  |

In Lithuania, similarly to other participating countries, we strive to implement the contest as a nationwide and efficient event for sending the message about informatics to students and teachers. Under agreements of the involved countries, the second week of November is announced as a Bebras week each year.

The contests are made of a set of short questions or tests usually called $B e$ bras tasks. These tasks can be answered without prior knowledge about informatics, but are clearly related to fundamental informatics concepts. To solve those tasks, students are required to think in and about information, discrete structures, computation, data processing, data visualisation, but they also must use algorithmic as well as programming concepts. Each Bebras task can both demonstrate an aspect of informatics and test the talent of the participant, regarding understanding of informatics.

The Bebras initiative is based on two main events: 1) an international workshop which takes place between May and June and is organised in order to discuss the task set for the coming contest; and 2) national contests organised in all participating countries in autumn during the Bebras week. Additional activities take place around those two main events. Many countries run a second round for the Bebras contest, some countries organise Bebras-tasks training workshops for teachers or summer camps for students. Many more activities are set within countries all through the year: participants' awarding celebration, seminars about Informatics concepts, collecting data and writing research papers, etc.

The main aim of the paper is to give a general overview of students' performance in the Bebras contest of 2013 in Lithuania and discuss how students (including primary) and upper secondary education cope with it.

## 2 Contest as a Promoter of Informatics Education

The Bebras contest is organised by each participating country locally (Dagiene, Futschek, 2008). Usually there are national committees or organisations established which aim to run the Bebras contest. For running the contest, countries are using different technologies mainly based on online contest management systems.

Each country chooses tasks from a Bebras task pool approved by the annually organised international Bebras task workshop. There are however some mandatory tasks that all countries are obliged to use. There are different task sets for different age students. Five age groups have been used (Table 2).

Table 2: Age groups

| Groupe name | Grade, age | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mini (Little Beavers) | 3 and 4, age 8-10 | Only few countries have <br> this group: Czech Republic, <br> Finland, Lithuania, Poland, <br> Slovakia, Sweden |
| Benjamin | 5 and 6, age 11-12 | Some countries have merged <br> Benjamins and Cadets |
| Cadet | 7 and 8, age 13-14 |  |
| Junior | 9 and 10, age 15-16 |  |
| Senior | 11 and 12, age 17-19 | Some countries have grade 13 <br> as well |

Some countries have been using slightly different distributions of groups. For example, Estonia has run the contest in three age groups: grades 6,7 , and 8 are used for cadets, 9 and 10 for juniors and the rest for seniors. In Lithuania we have all five age groups as it is shown in Table 2. Most participants are from grades 5 to 9 , the other grades have a lower number of participants (Fig. 1).


Figure 1: Numbers of contestants distributed by grades (from 3rd to 12th) in Lithuania in 2013

Running contests, however, is used essentially to attract students and teachers. The fundamental goals are to promote informatics as a science among youth, to show how fascinating it is, to think about and to solve informatics problems, and to demonstrate that, on principle, informatics is approachable by everyone. The central tools to achieve these goals are the Bebras tasks. Not only are they used in the contests, but also spread among teachers in order to provide them
with a wealth of teaching items that can flexibly be incorporated in informatics lessons, school-wide informatics promotional activities or any other occasion to show the attraction of informatics in an entertaining way.

The Bebras contest essentially focuses on informatics concepts. Understanding and handling the basics and foundations of informatics is more important than knowing technical details. The use and interpretation of results comes prior to being able to prove results. Controlling computations, calculations and estimations is more significant than being able to do computations by ourselves. A computer has to be understood at many levels, including: as a fundamental culture item and not as a collection of buttons and instructions; as a development of ideas and not a finished work; as an explanation of the concepts, etc. All these topics we keep in mind while organizing contests and working on task preparation.

The informatics curricula in Lithuanian lower and upper secondary schools, the evaluation schemes and even the denominations have been changed; nevertheless Informatics has remained a separate subject, now called "information technologies (IT)". Besides, one of the most important components of IT is to make students of comprehensive schools digitally literate. In Lithuanian lower secondary schools the IT courses are compulsory for the 5th-10th grades (student age 12-17 years) for approximately 1 hour per week, respectively 35 hours per year. There are some optional modules as well (e.g. a programming module in grade 9 or 10). Students of upper secondary schools (11th and 12th grades) can choose advanced optional modules and have to learn the content defined in the course curriculum.

However, there is no common international agreement on an accepted framework for informatics and information technologies courses in general education, although there are several discussions on this issue (Dagiene, Futschek, 2010; Micheuz, 2008; Hromkovic, 2006; Micheuz, 2005; Schubert, 2004). However a number of key concepts arise repeatedly in informatics: languages, machines, and computation; data and representation; communication and coordination; abstraction and design; the wider context of computers (Computing at School Working Group, 2012).

Almost a common opinion is that fundamentals of algorithms and programming are the key concepts in school informatics education. Then, what concepts should we include in informatics education apart from algorithms and programming? What is the ratio of programming concepts and information technology concepts and their application?

The basic concepts of informatics are mentioned in many scientific papers but they are not well defined or commonly accepted. There exist attempts to
define the more powerful term "fundamental idea" as an educational principle. Fundamental ideas fulfil the four criteria of the paper (Schwill, 1997):

- Horizontal criterion (applicable in multiple ways in different areas)
- Vertical criterion (may be learned on every intellectual level)
- Criterion of time (observable in the historical development and will be relevant in the longer term)
- Criterion of sense (meaning in everyday life and related to ordinary language)
A. Schwill identified three fundamental master ideas within the software development life cycle: algorithmization, structured dissection and language. In the context of our contest we use the term concept of informatics since we can involve in our short tasks only aspects of fundamental ideas. But we have the four criteria for fundamental ideas in mind to create tasks that involve concepts that are hopefully interesting for a long term, can also be understood without too much pre-knowledge, can be used also in other areas and can be understood at different intellectual levels.


## 3 Bebras Tasks for Transmission of Informatics Concept to Learners

Interesting, attractive tasks on informatics concepts are crucial for Bebras contests. About 200 new challenging tasks are needed each year. Teachers should learn how to explain what is behind one or another Bebras task. Also teachers should learn how to develop Bebras tasks. So for workshops and conferences the target groups are teachers.

Each countrywide contest is a collection of small, interesting questions that can be answered without prior knowledge about informatics, but are clearly related to informatics concepts and require thinking in and about informational, discrete structures as well as algorithmic, programming concepts.

The key idea behind each task presented to contestants is not to ask for already learned facts but to give problems that allow students to learn something about concepts (on informatics, computer science, computing) that may be new for them.

Every year, new Bebras tasks are developed in a cooperative effort of all countries involved: the Bebras international Task Workshop. Each country provides a set of task proposals, and the whole pool of proposals is then discussed at the annual International Task Workshop. There, proposals may be
rejected, refined, or simply accepted for use in that year's Bebras contests. A task pool is the result of this workshop. The national organisers make up their national task set from this pool. However, at the workshop, a subset of the task pool, which has been growing over the years, is determined to be "mandatory" and hence is used in all national Bebras contests.

When preparing for the actual year of the contest we drew on the characteristics of appropriate tasks from (Dagiene, Futschek, 2008). To be able to deeply analyse students' solutions and properly interpret resulting observations, we have developed the following six task types:

- Information: conception of information, its representation (symbolic, numerical, graphical), encoding, encrypting;
- Algorithms: action formalization, action description according to certain rules;
- Computer systems and their application: interaction of computer components, development, common principles of program functionality, search engines, etc.;
- Structures and patterns: components of discrete mathematics, elements of combinatorics and actions with them;
- Social effect of technologies: cognitive, legal, ethical, cultural, integral aspects of information and communication technologies;
- Informatics and information technology puzzles: logical games, mind maps, used to develop technology-based skills.

The descriptions of these task types also involve concepts of informatics although this was not the goal of this classification. It gives anyway a rough idea what kinds of problems and what topics of computer science we have in mind for Bebras contests.

In the short Bebras tasks we can include concepts of informatics like algorithms and programs: sequential and concurrent; data structures like heaps, stacks and queues; modelling of states, control flow and data flow; humancomputer interaction; graphics; etc. Using a proper problem statement nearly all aspects of computer science and ICT can be a topic of a Bebras task.

While analysing students' solutions of the Slovakian contest in 2009, Kalas and Tomcsanyiova have proposed a new categorization of tasks into four components of informatics education (Kalas, 2009):

## 1. Digital literacy

- Basic knowledge and concepts of informatics and computers
- Computer literacy, working with applications
- Ethical and legal issues, security, history of computing and informatics

2. Programming

- Formal description of a solution, process, behaviour, progress
- Understanding, analysing, interpretation and assembling such descriptions
- Algorithms, algorithmic thinking


## 3. Problem solving

- Logical reasoning, justification, argumentation
- Puzzles, riddles, problems
- $\quad$ Strategies for problem solving


## 4. Data handling

- Representations, coding, patterns, structures
- Mathematical basics of informatics, combinatorics
- Data and data structures, information and data processing

The quality of tasks is crucial for the success of all task-based competitions. The tasks must reflect the goals of the competition and should be adequate to the applicants. In educational competitions, the tasks should attract students and drive them to learn and explore as well as to develop skills in the particular area.

When teaching informatics through problem solving, it is very important to choose interesting tasks. Therefore, one should try to present problems from various areas of science and life, with a lot of data. Processing large amounts of data becomes one of the most important aspects when learning programming.

The cognitive domain involves knowledge and the development of intellectual skills (Bloom, 1956). This includes the recall or recognition of specific facts, procedural patterns, and concepts that serve in the development of intellectual abilities and skills. There are six major categories, starting from the simplest behaviour to the most complex. The categories can be thought of as degrees of difficulty.

Let us analyse a task set used in the Bebras contest last year in regard to the informatics concepts. Each task is characterised by main informatics concepts, which are included with the aim to bring them to the students (see Annex I). We have classified what kind of cognitive skills must be applied by students for solving each Bebras task. Task classification is based on Bloom's revised categories (Anderson et al., 2000) and on Kalas' developed schema
(Kalas, 2009). We label tasks using a first letter according to age groups: M for Mini (Primary), B for Benjamins, C for Cadets, J for Juniors, and S for Seniors. Some tasks were used in more than one age group; these tasks have several letters. Bebras tasks are spread in all revised Bloom's categories; most tasks are in domains of Understanding, Applying, Analysing and Evaluating (Table 3).

Table 3: Classification of tasks used in Lithuanian Bebras contest 2013

| Cognitive skills applied | Tasks |
| :---: | :---: |
| Remembering general facts, basic concepts | M2; B7 |
| Understanding (simple) given language and commands, comprehending the meaning | M11+B5; B12+C5; M3; M4; J12 |
| Understanding (complex) description of processes, rules of behaviour and methods | M6+B2; M17; B6; C11; M7; B11; B15; J11; S14; S21 |
| Applying given generative rule(s) or method(s) to an initial state, input or situation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1; M5+B1; B17; C12+J3; C14+J5; } \\ & \text { C21+J15; B9; M13; M18+C4; B21+S8; } \\ & \text { S20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Applying - interpret given instructions or program | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M10+B4; B19+C9; C19+J9; J21+S13; } \\ & \text { M14; B14; J17+S15; S7; S17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Analysing situation and processes | M9+B3+C2; J13+S5; J19+S11; B10; S6 |
| Analysing - matching several descriptions with several behaviours | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M} 12+\mathrm{B} 8+\mathrm{C} 3 ; \mathrm{C} 15 ; \mathrm{J} 18+\mathrm{S} 10 ; \mathrm{M} 16 ; \mathrm{C} 6 ; \\ & \mathrm{C} 17+\mathrm{J} 6 ; \mathrm{S} 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| Evaluating - comparing different situations or solutions by certain criterion | C20+J10+S4 |
| Evaluating - deducing possible result, final state or final product | $\mathrm{M} 8+\mathrm{C} 1 ; \mathrm{B} 16 ; \mathrm{B} 20+\mathrm{C} 10+\mathrm{J} 8+\mathrm{S} 2 ; \mathrm{C} 7+\mathrm{J} 2$; C13+J4; J16; J20+S12; B13+C8+J1+S1; C16; S16; S19 |
| Creating - compiling information together | B18; J14+S9; M15; C18+J7+S3 |

So that the reader could better understand our conception of informatics education and also the analysis of the tasks offered in the Annex, herein we present complete wordings of three tasks. The first of them fits into programming and was solved by both Mini and Benjamin groups; the second one belongs to data handling and operation abstraction and was mandatory for all age groups except the youngest (Mini); the third one was assigned to Juniors and Seniors and focuses on top-down analysis.


Figure 2: Three task examples taken from the Bebras contest 2013

## 4 Analysing Solutions of Contestans

We have studied the differences among the informatics tasks at the level of cognitive skills, which students had to apply while solving them. We will show the results of different age and gender groups. We analysed the data, which we obtained before and during the contest. We recorded which tasks were solved by each student and which of four given choices they indicated as correct.

Last year 25909 students took part in the contest in Lithuania, out of them 2176 Mini, 7022 Benjamins, 6550 Cadets, 6490 Juniors, and 3671 Seniors. Figure 4 shows total numbers of boys and girls in these age groups, together
with the distributions of their total scores. Horizontal axis represents all possible scores (between 0 and 90 for Mini group, and between 0 and 105 for all others); vertical axis represents numbers of boys and girls who got corresponding score.






Figure 3: How successful were boys and girls when solving tasks - the distributions of their scores in all five age groups

We consider the total scores excellent: $62.35 \%$ of contestants got more than $1 / 3$ of the points; $22.92 \%$ of contestants got more than half of the points; $5 \%$ got more than $2 / 3$ of the points; $0.33 \%$ got more than 90 points (or 80 for the Mini group). This proves that the main goal of the event was accomplished - to provide an attractive opportunity to deliver informatics education to a group of students as wide as possible, without any preference of any particular group(s).

Attendance of the girls in these two categories significantly exceeded our expectations. As we can see from the charts the girls of all groups except

Senior are doing very well with minimal difference between boys and girls. In our opinion these results disprove the misconception that informatics is a boyish subject.

Figures 5 and 6 show the dependency of the number of correct and incorrect solutions (separately for boys and girls) on student age for tasks presented in section 3.


Figure 4: Distribution of solution of the task "Ice cream machine"


Figures 5: Distribution of solutions of the tasks "Spinning toy" (left) and "Visiting friends" (right)

Figure 5 shows that girls of the ages 9 to 12 did slightly better than boys for the task "Ice cream machine", their scores are better and there are less wrong answers (guessing). However the task "Spinning toy" was exceptionally hard for girls of all ages from 11 to 18 . Why? This task requires deep abstract thinking and imagination. Abstraction is one of the main three components of computational thinking. Our schools should focus more on developing abstract thinking of students and especially girls.

The task "Visiting friends" is very hard for both boys and girls (Figure 6 (right)). In order to solve this task students need to be able to do top-down
analysis and observe the periodicity from the simulation, also abstraction thinking is needed.

## 5 Conclusion

Competitions play an important role as a source of motivation students to learn informatics (or computer science, or computing) in a non-formal way. Our ten-year experience running the Bebras contest has shown that both students and teachers can gain deeper skills and understanding of informatics concepts. Well-organized informatics contests with conceptual-based, exciting, playful tasks invite students to use computer reasoning and to explore understanding of technology.

The international task workshop is organized annually for developing informatics tasks and producing a task pool, from which each country is obliged to choose tasks for their national contest. Preparation and selection of tasks are very important processes. Lithuania is using the same task set as Austria, Germany, Switzerland, The Netherlands, and almost overlapping with tasks in Finland and Sweden.

It is not easy to estimate how difficult a task will be for a particular age group when developing the task. Our analysis has shown that last year's task set was balanced well enough at least for Lithuanian students: we got a distribution of scores very close to the normal distribution (the Bell curve). A few students do very well and a few do very poorly. A bunch of scores end up clumped around the mean score.

The large and multifaceted data collected in the Bebras contests make it possible to analyse many interesting aspects related to e.g. students' understanding, difficulties and misconceptions based on different factors. In this paper, we have looked into tasks and assign them to cognitive skills domains according to the revised Bloom's taxonomy. We found that the Bebras tasks are well-balanced according the cognitive skills' domains: at the most tasks are in the high categories Understanding (15), Applying (20), Analysing (12) and Evaluating (12).

An international contest on informatics Bebras involves more than twenty countries, cultures and languages. Clearly, these are all factors that make it challenging to create unambiguous and clear tasks.
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## Annex

| Short number | Idea from | Title | What student can learn from the task |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{M 1}{ }^{5}$ | Slovakia | The Necklace Machine | algorithm; programming; sequence; repeat; pattern |
| M2 | Slovakia | Tools | understanding a tool |
| M3 | Slovakia | Beings | logics |
| M4 | Slovakia | Train | logics |
| M5+B1 | Slovakia | In the Forest | finding a path; graph; tracing; finding a solution backwards |
| M6+B2 | Hungary | Ice cream machine | detecting an algorithm; machine work; loop |
| M7 | Lithuania | Towns | graph theory |
| M8+C1 | Czech R. | Rotation tool | understanding a tool, what it is able to do and what not, rotate a tool, transformation |
| M $9+\mathrm{B} 3+\mathrm{C} 2$ | Canada | More Candy | longest common subsequence; dynamic programming |
| M10+B4 | Slovakia | Bee Hive | algorithm; robot navigation; follow sequence of instructions |
| M11+B5 | Slovakia | Jeremy in the Bushes | algorithm; robot navigation; tracing |
| $\mathbf{M 1 2 + B 8 + C 3 ~}{ }^{6}$ | Russia | Balls Trigger | logics; trigger, logical gate |
| M13 | Bulgaria | Follow the squirrel | turning; instructions; sequences of instructions |
| M14 | Slovenia | Labyrinth | route planning |
| M15 | Latvia | The making of a panoramic view picture | panorama view; puzzle |
| M16 | Russian | Beavers in an elevator | optimization problem |
| M17 | Slovakia | Ladybug Dotty | program; condition; tracing |
| $\underline{\text { M18+C4 }}$ | Germany | Loading trucks | optimization |
| B6 | Japan | Drumming | iteration; repetition; loops; following instructions |
| B7 | Germany | Homework | e-mail etiquette |
| B9 | Lithuania | Cities | representation of information: linking several types of information |
| B10 | Japan | Zebra Tunnel | to follow instructions; algorithm analysis; data structures: FIFO (queue) and LIFO (stack) |

[^0]| B11 | France | Swapping | implicit, directed, graph |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B12+C5 | Sweden | The importance of an instruction | instruction; human machine instruction |
| B13+C8+J1+S1 | Japan | Signal Fire | graphs; shortest path problem; breadth-first search |
| B14 | Lithuania | Taking pictures | panorama view |
| B15 | Sweden | Frog trouble | shortest path; breadth-first search |
| B16 | Austria | The takeaway | memory; management of data structure; stack |
| B17 | Belgium | Rescue action | tree traversal; recursive definition; optimisation problem |
| B18 | Germany | Soda Machine | finite stet automata; coding |
| B19+C9 | Slovenia | The Highest Tree | search algorithm; local optimisation; global optimum |
| B20+C1+J8+S2 | Slovenia | Spinning Toy | binary tree representation; tree traversal; operations abstraction |
| B21+S8 | Switzerland | Build the bridges! | minimum spanning tree, Kruskal's algorithm, Prim's algorithm, graph theory |
| C6 | Slovenia | Gossiping | graph theory |
| C7+J2 | Slovenia | Necklace | shortest path to reach the end |
| C11 | Hungary | Gift boxes | algorithm; recursion; breaking the problem down into smallest problems |
| C12+J3 | Austria | Airport | applying rules; structure; scheduling; limited resources |
| C13+J4 | Japan | Bebras Rowing | binary number; bit; numeral system |
| C14+J5 | Austria | Helping grandpa beaver creating his password | e-mail; security; password enforcement; applying rules |
| C15 | Netherlands | Triangle code | encryption; decryption; description algorithm |
| C16 | Canada | Putting people in line | Bubble-sort; sorting techniques; algorithm running time |
| $\underline{\text { C17+J6 }}$ | France | Sort by weight | sorting algorithm |
| $\underline{\mathrm{C} 18+\mathrm{J} 7+\mathrm{S} 3}$ | Germany | Movie seating | graph theory; optimal; relation |
| C19+J9 | France | Beaver the hobbit | graph; shortest paths; brute force approach |
| C20+J10+S4 | Switzerland | Serial Transmission | RS232; serial transmission; bits; bytes |
| $\underline{\mathrm{C} 21+\mathrm{J} 15}$ | Switzerland | Flowchart computing | flowchart; computer program representation; visualization |
| J11 | Japan | Storehouse | Binary search |
| J12 | Slovakia | Dice | following a list of commands; procedure; imperative programming |


| $\underline{\mathrm{J} 13+\mathrm{S} 5}$ | Switzerland | Domino circles | Eulerian path; graphs; largest Eulerian subgraph; modelling graph |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J14+S9 | Germany | Random Pictures | computer graphics; nondeterminism; programming; variables |
| J16 | Japan | Shortest Path | division a task in smaller parts; dynamic programming |
| $\underline{\mathrm{J} 17+\mathrm{S} 15}$ | Netherlands | Turn the cards | logic reasoning implication |
| J18+S10 | Netherlands | River inspection | algorithm; flow problem; planar directed graph; maximal cut; sweeping line |
| J19+S11 | Taiwan | Visiting Friends | counting; top-down analysis; modulo operations; patterns; observing the periodicity from the simulation |
| J20+S12 | Austria | No turning left! | graph; shortest path; algorithm; determine a path with minimum effort |
| J21+S13 | Austria | From A to C | perform instructions; algorithm |
| S6 | Taiwan | Delicious Dinner | job scheduling |
| S7 | Austria | Apple in the basket | patterns; invariants |
| S14 | Netherlands | Treasure hunt | Binary search, divide and conquer |
| S16 | Belgium | Old computing machine | programming; assembly language; abstraction |
| S17 | Germany | Colored Necklaces | syntax diagrams |
| S18 | Netherlands | Hotel key | encoding; combinatorics |
| S19 | Belgium | The magic machine | Petri net; graph; algorithm |
| S20 | Italy | Beaver Student back home | algorithms; constraints; programming |
| S21 | Latvia | Raid arrays | Raid array; data redundancy |
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[^0]:    5 Underline font indicates interactive task.
    6 Bold font indicates Bebras mandatory tasks which must be included by all countries in their contests.

