

EYEMULATOR: Improving Code Language Models by Mimicking Human Visual Attention

Yifan Zhang Vanderbilt University Nashville, USA yifan.zhang.2@vanderbilt.edu	Chen Huang NUS Singapore huang_chen@nus.edu.sg	Yueke Zhang Vanderbilt University Nashville, USA yueke.zhang@vanderbilt.edu	Jiahao Zhang Vanderbilt University Nashville, USA jiahao.zhang@vanderbilt.edu
Toby Jia-Jun Li University of Notre Dame South Bend, USA toby.j.li@nd.edu	Collin McMillan University of Notre Dame South Bend, USA cmc@nd.edu	Kevin Leach Vanderbilt University Nashville, USA kevin.leach@vanderbilt.edu	Yu Huang Vanderbilt University Nashville, USA yu.huang@vanderbilt.edu

ABSTRACT

Code language models (so-called CodeLLMs) are now commonplace in software development. As a general rule, CodeLLMs are trained by dividing training examples into input tokens and then learn importance of those tokens in a process called machine attention. Machine attention is based solely on input token salience to output token examples during training. Human software developers are different – humans intuitively know that some tokens are more salient than others. While intuition itself is ineffable and a subject of philosophy, clues about salience are present in human visual attention – people tend to look at more salient words more often. In this paper, we present EYEMULATOR, a technique for training CodeLLMs to mimic human visual attention while training for various software development tasks. We add special weights for each token in each input example to the loss function used during LLM fine-tuning. We draw these weights from observations of human visual attention derived from a previously-collected publicly-available dataset of eye-tracking experiments in software engineering tasks. These new weights ultimately induce changes in the attention of the subject LLM during training, resulting in a model that does not need eye-tracking data during inference. Our evaluation shows that EYEMULATOR outperforms strong LLM baselines on several tasks such as code translation, completion and summarization. We further show an ablation study that demonstrates the improvement is due to subject models learning to mimic human attention.

ACM Reference Format:

Yifan Zhang, Chen Huang, Yueke Zhang, Jiahao Zhang, Toby Jia-Jun Li, Collin McMillan, Kevin Leach, and Yu Huang. 2025. EYEMULATOR: Improving Code Language Models by Mimicking Human Visual Attention. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2025 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) are becoming so popular that they are becoming a cultural cliché. LLMs used for software development (CodeLLMs) now perform many tasks recently considered as only the domain of human experts: code generation, test generation, bug localization, automatic documentation generation, and many others. And while “vibe coding” and other AI-based programming concepts proliferate, educational, commercial, and government institutions are grappling with the potential consequences of LLM use in software engineering.

Yet, behind this hype sits a surprisingly small set of technologies: the Transformer neural network architecture, internet-scale code and text datasets for training, a handful of preprocessing and tokenization techniques, and loss functions used during training. Many CodeLLMs are now available and their success has vindicated the strategy of training via big data input followed by human feedback: first, CodeLLMs are trained to produce desired outputs from examples drawn from large code repositories, and later, they are finetuned with exemplars curated or edited by people.

Informally, when training LLMs, (1) training examples are split into sequences of tokens, and (2) the LLM’s neural architecture learns that certain tokens in input examples are salient to tokens in output examples. Given an arbitrary input sample after training, the model generates output tokens one at a time that it learned are salient to tokens in the input. This process is often called “machine attention” and is a metaphor for human attention. Models learn which input tokens are salient regulated by a loss function during training that computes a similarity score between the model’s generated tokens and the example output tokens. This similarity is used to update model weights, in turn leading the LLM to learn salience with respect to input and output example tokens.

But human developers are different. Human attention is based on intuition learned from life experience. The process that people follow to read and understand code is called “program comprehension” [18, 37, 45, 58] and has been studied for decades. Surveys by O’Brien [37], Harth and Dugerdil [18], and others [46, 58] characterize program comprehension as reading source code and related documents, forming a mental model of program behavior, and then comparing actual program behavior against the expectations in their mental model. Errors in the mental model require investigation by further reading of software artifacts. Over time, people develop an intuitive sense about what is salient in code samples they

read. The effect of this intuition is measurable with eye-tracking technology and has been the basis for studies of human visual attention for many years — people tend to read more salient tokens more often and for more time [5, 23, 43, 48, 50, 53–55].

In this paper, we present EYEMULATOR, an approach to improve CodeLLMs by causing them to mimic human attention during training. EYEMULATOR leverages a previously-released dataset of eye-tracking measurements in which people read code to solve programming problems [69]. We extract *scan paths* from this eye-tracking data, which reflects the order in which tokens are read by humans [4]. We use these scan paths to assign attention weights to each token in the input samples used to train an LLM. Then, we finetune an LLM with a custom loss function based on categorical cross entropy (CCE) that rewards the model when it emphasizes the same tokens as a person would in a given input. A key advantage of EYEMULATOR is that it requires no architectural changes to the LLM and is used only during finetuning — it is applicable to most LLMs, does not rely on any specific model or product, and does not require retraining LLMs from scratch.

We evaluate EYEMULATOR using three representative software engineering tasks: code translation, summarization, and completion. Our results demonstrate that the injection of human attention patterns substantially boosts model performance, surpassing strong baseline LLMs. Different human attention patterns have distinct, significant impacts on model attention, improving its focus on relevant code structures. Furthermore, ablation studies verify that all three components (semantic salience priors, gaze-transition tables, and token-level preference optimization) contribute meaningfully to these gains.

We claim the following contributions:

- EYEMULATOR, a lightweight, model-agnostic approach that leverages eye-tracking data to induce human attention into LLM attention during finetuning without requiring neural architectural changes or retraining.
- A comprehensive evaluation of the performance of LLMs with EYEMULATOR applied, showing marked improvement over state-of-the-art baselines consisting of code translation, completion, and summarization.
- An analysis of how model attention affects focus on tokens when EYEMULATOR is applied.
- An open-source release of our software artifacts and datasets (*currently available to reviewers in the submission*).

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we establish notation and review foundational techniques: formalizing eye-tracking data as fixations, saccades, and scan paths; modeling token-level salience via Bayesian Beta inference; and integrating gaze-derived priors into LLM training through supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and a token-level variant of Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) that directly embeds human attention patterns.

2.1 Eye-tracking in Software Engineering

Eye-tracking offers direct insight into developers’ cognitive processes by recording where and for how long they look at code [14, 51]. We use three core concepts:

- **Fixations** (\mathcal{F}): brief pauses (100–300 ms) during which visual information is processed. Each fixation f_i is characterized by its start time t_i and duration d_i [27].
- **Saccades** (\mathcal{S}): rapid eye movements (40–50 ms) between fixations that reposition the gaze without significant processing [52].
- **Scan path** (\mathcal{P}): the ordered sequence of fixations, capturing the flow of attention through the code [28, 51].

According to the immediacy assumption, most cognitive processing occurs during fixations, while saccades simply move the gaze to the next point of interest [27]. Representing eye movements as \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{S} , and \mathcal{P} provides a human-centered foundation for our artifact extraction and modeling in Section 3.

2.2 Bayesian Salience Modeling

Bayesian inference provides a principled way to model token-level attention salience with uncertainty. A Beta distribution $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ serves as the conjugate prior for Bernoulli processes, with density

$$\text{Beta}(\theta; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{\theta^{\alpha-1}(1-\theta)^{\beta-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)}, \quad \theta \in [0, 1],$$

where $B(\alpha, \beta)$ is the Beta function. Given k salient fixations out of n observations and a prior $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$, the posterior is $\text{Beta}(\alpha + k, \beta + n - k)$. Its mean $(\alpha + k)/(\alpha + \beta + n)$ quantifies the expected salience. We leverage this framework to derive the semantic salience priors used for token-level attention weighting in our subsequent training stages in Section 3.

2.3 Model Adaptation Techniques

SFT and reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) are standard approaches for adapting pretrained LLMs to code tasks. In SFT, a model P_ϕ is trained on a dataset $D = \{(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\}$ by minimizing the cross-entropy loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}}(\phi) = - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^{|y^{(i)}|} \log P_\phi(y_t^{(i)} | y_{<t}^{(i)}, x^{(i)}),$$

where x and y denote input–output pairs for completion, translation, or summarization [25]. Parameter-efficient methods such as adapter layers and low-rank adaptation (LoRA) help limit compute and preserve general capabilities [21, 22].

RLHF refines model behavior by learning a reward model from human preference pairs and optimizing via PPO [7, 38, 44], but this pipeline is complex and sensitive to reward quality [2]. DPO streamlines RLHF by directly optimizing pairwise preferences without an explicit reward model:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_w, y_l)} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \left[\log \frac{\pi_\phi(y_w|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w|x)} - \log \frac{\pi_\phi(y_l|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l|x)} \right] \right) \right],$$

where π_{ref} is a fixed reference policy, σ the sigmoid, and β the KL-penalty weight [41]. DPO offers stable alignment with fewer hyperparameters. We adopt DPO in our methodology to integrate pseudo-preferences derived from human-attention signals in Section 3.

3 APPROACH

As illustrated in Figure 1, our pipeline comprises three components: ① an eye-tracking stage that captures fixations and saccades while




Figure 1: End-to-end workflow for harvesting human gaze signals and injecting them into an attention-aware data pipeline. ① Eye-tracking captures fixations and saccades while programmers read or write code. ② Fixations are mapped to AST tokens to extract semantic attention patterns and sequential n -gram statistics. ③ The resulting priors guide contextual code augmentation, producing weighted training examples for large-language-model fine-tuning.




Figure 2: Overview of the open-source EyeTrans dataset [69], showing the eye-tracking setup (a) and Java code snippets (b). We post-process the raw gaze recordings to align fixations with AST tokens and split sessions into reading (c) and writing (d) modes for independent analysis of semantic salience and sequential attention patterns.

programmers read and write code; ② an artifact-extraction stage that parses source into an AST, aligns each gaze fixation to leaf tokens, and distills semantic salience priors (Beta distributions) and n -gram gaze-transition tables; and ③ a contextual-augmentation and fine-tuning stage that generates pseudo monograms, bigrams, and trigrams for code augmentation and performs attention-aware supervised fine-tuning of LLMs with under 1 MB of overhead.

3.1 Developer Gaze Data Transformation

To ground our approach in authentic developer behavior, we first transform raw gaze recordings into clean, token-aligned attention data. This preprocessing step segments continuous eye-tracking streams into standardized fixations, saccades, and scan paths, and aligns them to AST leaf tokens, ensuring reliable inputs for downstream artifact extraction.

We leverage the open-source EyeTrans corpus [69], which provides raw eye-tracking recordings from 27 intermediate-to-advanced programmers (mean 20 ± 2 CS semesters) performing distinct *reading* and *writing* tasks on single-function Java snippets (Figure 2). Data were captured at 120 Hz with a mean angular error below 0.4° .

Raw gaze samples were segmented into fixations and saccades using a dispersion-threshold (I-DT) algorithm:

- **Fixations (\mathcal{F})** are intervals of stable gaze within a 1° dispersion window lasting at least 100 ms.
- **Saccades (\mathcal{S})** are rapid eye movements (40–50 ms) between fixations.
- Blinks and noise outliers were removed prior to analysis.

Each Java snippet was parsed into an AST and instrumented in an IDE to record screen-space bounding boxes for every leaf token. A fixation f_i is aligned to token t_j if its (x, y) coordinates fall inside t_j 's box; unmapped fixations (approximately 3%) were discarded. From these mappings, we extracted a total of 1,565 scan paths (\mathcal{P}), with 914 from reading sessions and 651 from writing sessions, each representing a time-ordered sequence of fixations on AST leaf tokens.

3.2 Attention Pattern Extraction

We convert token-aligned fixations into two types of statistical artifacts, semantic salience priors and sequential gaze-transition distributions, through three stages: distribution construction, pseudo-attention mask sampling, and pseudo scan path generation.

Distribution Construction. We first derive monogram counts $c_1(s)$ by counting fixations on tokens of each semantic class s . Let n_s^{tok} be the total number of tokens in class s . We fit a Beta distribution with parameters

$$\alpha_s = c_1(s) + 1, \quad \beta_s = n_s^{\text{tok}} - c_1(s) + 1,$$

so that the posterior mean

$$\mathbb{E}[\theta_s] = \frac{\alpha_s}{\alpha_s + \beta_s}$$

provides a smoothed estimate of the probability that a token of class s attracts attention.

To capture transition dynamics, we parse each scan path—a time-ordered sequence of fixations on tokens—and count bigrams $c_2(s_a, s_b)$ and trigrams $c_3(s_a, s_b, s_c)$. We convert these to conditional probabilities

$$P(s_b | s_a) = \frac{c_2(s_a, s_b)}{\sum_{s'} c_2(s_a, s')}, \quad P(s_c | s_a, s_b) = \frac{c_3(s_a, s_b, s_c)}{\sum_{s'} c_3(s_a, s_b, s')},$$

and prune any n -gram whose count is fewer than five to reduce noise.

Sampling Pseudo-Attention Masks. For an example with n tokens, we sample a saliency ratio ρ from the combined Beta distribution over classes. We compute the total number of attended tokens as $m = \lfloor \rho n \rfloor$ and allocate per-class quotas $m_s = \max(1, \lfloor p_s m \rfloor)$, where $p_s = c_1(s) / \sum_{s'} c_1(s')$. Token positions are shuffled and selected to satisfy these quotas, yielding a binary mask of length n .

Pseudo-Attention Path Generation. Starting from the sorted list of masked token indices, we build a sequence of n -grams to approximate the developer's gaze path:

- (1) Trigram matching: consider three consecutive masked positions t_i, t_{i+1}, t_{i+2} . Accept this as a trigram if their line-number span $\ell_{t_{i+2}} - \ell_{t_i} \leq L$ (e.g. 3 for reading, 5 for writing, 4 for combined) and the class tuple $(s_{t_i}, s_{t_{i+1}}, s_{t_{i+2}})$ exists in the trigram table. If matched, emit the trigram and advance by 3.
- (2) Bigram matching: otherwise, consider the pair (t_i, t_{i+1}) . If $\ell_{t_{i+1}} - \ell_{t_i} \leq L$ and the class pair appears in the bigram table, emit the bigram and advance by 2.
- (3) Monogram fallback: if neither larger n -gram matches or at the list end, emit the single token class and advance by 1.

Each emitted n -gram, whether a monogram, bigram, or trigram, is recorded in a global index dictionary seeded with all semantic classes and extended with every observed bigram and trigram. As we greedily match tokens, we assemble a pseudo scan path

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \langle g_1, g_2, \dots, g_K \rangle,$$

where each g_k is the k th emitted n -gram. We also capture its index $\text{idx}(g_k)$, enabling the model to distinguish higher-order patterns from simple monograms when computing rarity bonuses and encoding input. This line-aware procedure produces $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, a pseudo-attention path that reflects both semantic transitions and code locality. Figure 3 shows a simplified monogram example; in practice, higher-order n -grams are emitted whenever available. These paths, together with the semantic-saliency priors, feed into the weight projection and fine-tuning stages.

3.3 Subword Weight Projection

Having distilled developer attention into AST-level saliency weights in the previous section, we next need to align those weights with the token units the LLM actually processes. Tokenizers break each source token (and its corresponding AST node) into several subword shards, so a direct one-to-one transfer is not possible. To preserve the full effect of each AST weight, we assign every shard the same score as its parent.

Formally, let

$$\text{Shards}(T_i) = [s_{i,1}, \dots, s_{i,k_i}]$$

be the k_i subword tokens generated for AST token T_i . We propagate the AST token's saliency weight w_i^{AST} uniformly:

$$w_{i,j}^{\text{shard}} = w_i^{\text{AST}} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k_i.$$

Concatenating these shard weights in the order of the tokenized input produces

$$\mathbf{w} = [w_{1,1}^{\text{shard}}, \dots, w_{1,k_1}^{\text{shard}}, \dots, w_{M,1}^{\text{shard}}, \dots, w_{M,k_M}^{\text{shard}}].$$

By construction, the length of \mathbf{w} matches the LLM's input sequence exactly. During fine-tuning, each weight w_ℓ multiplies the corresponding cross-entropy term, ensuring that shards derived from high-saliency AST tokens have proportionally greater influence on the model's parameter updates.

3.4 Gaze-Informed Fine-Tuning

Before fine-tuning, we compute per-token weights w_j by combining three components:

$$w_j = w_{\text{base}} + \frac{1}{\log(\text{freq}(g_j) + 2)} + \mathbb{E}[\theta_{s_j}],$$

where

- w_{base} is a constant base weight (e.g. 3) applied to every target token,
- $\text{freq}(g_j)$ is the count of the n -gram g_j (monogram, bigram or trigram) from the pseudo scan path $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, and
- $\mathbb{E}[\theta_{s_j}]$ is the semantic-saliency prior for the token's class s_j .

These weights reflect human attention frequency, n -gram rarity, and a uniform baseline.

Each training example thus comprises an input prompt x , a target sequence y , and a weight vector $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, \dots, w_L]$. We first fine-tune under a reweighted cross-entropy loss:

$$L_{\text{SFT}}(\phi) = - \sum_{j=1}^L w_j \mathbb{1}[j \in \text{target}] \log P_\phi(y_j | y_{<j}, x).$$

Here $\mathbb{1}[j \in \text{target}]$ masks out prompt tokens, and higher w_j amplify the learning signal for tokens that developers attended to more.

To further align model preferences with gaze-derived importance, we apply Direct Preference Optimization at the token level. We sample two candidate outputs (y_w, y_l) in proportion to the sum of their shard weights over \mathbf{w} , and minimize

$$L_{\text{DPO}}(\phi) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_w, y_l)} \log \sigma \left(\beta \left[\log \frac{\pi_\phi(y_w|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w|x)} - \log \frac{\pi_\phi(y_l|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l|x)} \right] \right),$$

where π_{ref} is a fixed reference policy and β controls the KL penalty strength. This step encourages the model to prefer outputs that emphasize high-saliency and rare n -grams.

The final training objective is a weighted combination:

$$L(\phi) = L_{\text{SFT}}(\phi) + \gamma L_{\text{DPO}}(\phi),$$

with γ balancing supervised and preference signals. Empirically, this gaze-informed fine-tuning yields substantial gains on code translation, completion, and summarization, producing outputs that more closely mirror real developer attention.

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

To evaluate EyeMulator's effectiveness, we conduct experiments on three core code-intelligence tasks: translation, completion, and summarization. We compare our attention-augmented models against state-of-the-art baselines using a diverse set of automated and behavioral metrics. Below, we detail the datasets, our training setup, and evaluation criteria.




Figure 3: Pseudo attention path for the filterEvens function. Sampled tokens (external class and function call) are highlighted, assignment tokens are not sampled, and the resulting sequential attention path is shown.

4.1 Research Questions

Our goal is to determine whether EYEMULATOR’s incorporation of human visual-attention signals can meaningfully improve LLM performance on core code-intelligence tasks. To evaluate this, we investigate five research questions:

- **RQ1 (Artifact Distillation):** How effectively do our distilled semantic salience priors and n-gram gaze-transition tables capture key human attention patterns for LLM training?
- **RQ2 (Cross-Task Evaluation):** To what extent do these artifacts boost performance on summarization (aligned with the original eye-tracking study) compared to generalized tasks such as code completion and translation?
- **RQ3 (Session-Mode Analysis):** How do reading-derived versus writing-derived attention patterns differentially impact model performance across sub-categories of code tasks?
- **RQ4 (Component Ablation):** What is the individual contribution of each EYEMULATOR component, as determined by systematic ablation studies?
- **RQ5 (Attention Distribution):** How does EYEMULATOR alter attention distributions to focus on relevant tokens and suppress irrelevant ones relative to the baseline?

4.2 Datasets and Preprocessing

We combine developer gaze data from the open-source EyeTrans corpus [69] (27 expert Java developers, yielding 914 reading and 651 writing sessions) with code benchmarks drawn from CodeXGlue [32]. For the Java→C# translation task we use the full CodeXGlue split, which comprises 8 701 training, 431 validation, and 836 test examples. For Java code completion we randomly sample 20% of the CodeXGlue Java completion dataset (1 633 train / 1 005 valid / 1 318 test), and for Java → NL summarization we sample 10% of the CodeXGlue Java summarization dataset (16 490 train / 518 valid / 1 095 test).

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

We assess our models along two dimensions: task performance (translation, completion, summarization) and attention alignment (see Section 5.5).

Translation and completion metrics. For both Java→C# translation and Java code completion, we report:

- **Hybrid Exact Match (H-Exact)** H-Exact = 0.5 ExactMatch + 0.5 SubstringMatch, where ExactMatch is the strict token match rate and SubstringMatch allows partial overlaps.
- **CodeBLEU** [42], the mean of four sub-scores: n-gram match, weighted n-gram match, AST similarity and flow similarity.
- **CrystalBLEU** [11], a BLEU-based metric that ignores trivially shared n-grams to improve semantic distinguishability while preserving language-agnostic efficiency.

Summarization metrics. For code summarization, we use:

- **ROUGE-L**, the F1 score over the longest common subsequence between system and reference.
- **METEOR**, the harmonic mean of precision and recall over exact, stem and synonym matches, with a fragmentation penalty.
- **BERTScore**, which computes F1 by averaging cosine similarities of contextual token embeddings from a pretrained BERT encoder.

Attention alignment metrics Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be the normalized final-layer attention over the n input tokens, C the set of semantically critical token indices, and $k = 20$. We measure:

- **Generation Confidence Score (GCS):** $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log P(y_t | y_{<t}, x)$, where y are the T generated tokens.
- **Recency Focus Score (RFS):** $\frac{\sum_{i=n-k+1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}$, the fraction of attention on the last k tokens.
- **Average Focus Score (AFS):** $\frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{i \in C} a_i$, the mean attention weight on critical tokens.
- **Attention Entropy:** $-\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \log a_i$, capturing the dispersion of the attention distribution.

4.4 Experimental Setup

We evaluate EyeMulator by fine-tuning three open-source Transformer backbones, StarCoder (base)¹, DeepSeek-Coder (1.3B)², and Llama-3.2 (1B)³, alongside their EYEMULATOR variants on code completion, Java→C# translation, and summarization. Each model is trained separately under identical hyperparameters (learning rate, batch size, etc.), with a fixed random seed of 42, using our attention-aware pipeline. For research questions RQ3–RQ5, we focus specifically on the Llama-3.2 (1B) model and its EYEMULATOR variant. All experiments ran on a single NVIDIA L40S GPU (45GB VRAM), demonstrating that EyeMulator adds minimal computational overhead. While we focus on 1 billion-parameter models for efficient iteration, Section 6 discusses why these arch-agnostic attention priors are expected to generalize to larger LLMs.

5 RESULT ANALYSIS

To explore how human-attention priors influence model behavior, we first compare EYEMULATOR against strong baselines on our three

¹<https://huggingface.co/bigcode/starcoderbase-1b>

²<https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/deepseek-coder-1.3b-base>

³<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.2-1B>

Table 1: Representative n -gram patterns from developer gaze: monograms reveal frequent fixation points, bigrams capture common token transitions, and trigrams expose higher-order sequential attention flows.

N-gram Type	Token Sequence	Count
Monogram	variable declaration	18665
	function declaration	13971
	conditional statement	13222
	loop	7876
	function call	5232
Bigram	function declaration \rightarrow variable declaration	8399
	conditional statement \rightarrow loop	6026
	function call \rightarrow variable declaration	2468
	parameter \rightarrow variable declaration	2219
	argument \rightarrow function call	1179
Trigram	function declaration \rightarrow parameter \rightarrow variable declaration	1634
	conditional statement \rightarrow function declaration \rightarrow parameter	1199
	function call \rightarrow function declaration \rightarrow variable declaration	655
	argument \rightarrow function call \rightarrow variable declaration	557
	function call \rightarrow parameter \rightarrow variable declaration	241

core tasks: Java \rightarrow C# translation, code completion, and summarization. We then peel back the curtain with ablation studies, disabling one gaze-derived module at a time to quantify its individual contribution. Finally, we turn to qualitative attention-map visualizations to see how our approach steers the model toward semantically rich regions of code.

5.1 RQ1: Artifact Distillation

We assess how well distilled artifacts capture human attention by examining n -gram fixation patterns, fitted Beta parameters for semantic labels, and the resulting attention distributions across reading, writing, and combined tasks.

N-gram Analysis To assess the consistency and structure of human attention, we mapped programmers’ fixation sequences to semantic categories and extracted the most frequent transitions. The resulting patterns reveal a non-linear yet highly organized reading strategy:

- *Method–variable–method*: frequent switches from method declaration to variable declaration and back, indicating rapid cross-referencing between interfaces and implementations.
- *Conditional–loop–conditional*: alternating focus between conditional statement and loop body, reflecting iterative examination of branching logic.
- *Conditional–method–conditional*: back-and-forth transitions between conditional statement and method decl, suggesting that developers contextualize branch conditions in their method scope.

These recurring transition motifs demonstrate that programmers engage in targeted, back-and-forth inspection rather than linear scanning. The structured nature of these gaze patterns supports their use as distilled attention priors in Transformer models, where they can guide machine focus toward semantically critical regions and improve code comprehension performance.

Beta Parameter Estimation Figure 4 presents the fitted Beta parameters (α_s =gaze hits, β_s =gaze misses) for each semantic label.

Consistent with n -gram findings, *variable declaration* exhibits the highest α_s in both reading and combined tasks, reinforcing its role as a cognitive anchor. In contrast, control-flow labels like *loop* ($\alpha_s=7,876$, $\beta_s=4,876$) and *conditional statement* show more balanced ratios, indicating that attention shifts between cursory scanning and deeper inspection based on task context.

Density Function Visualization Figure 5 illustrates the Beta distribution density functions derived from these parameters. Reading only curves are sharply peaked, *variable declaration* centers around $x \approx 0.1$, signifying focused inspection. Writing and combined distributions broaden notably; for example, *function call* spans $x \approx 0.2$ to 0.6 , reflecting more diffuse attention during generation. The bimodal shape of the *conditional statement* curve in the combined plot hints at divergent strategies, where some developers skim branches quickly while others examine them in depth.




Figure 4: Estimated Beta parameters (α_s =gaze hits, β_s =gaze misses) for each semantic label across reading, writing, and combined tasks. Higher α_s indicates consistent attention; higher β_s signals less frequent fixations.




Figure 5: Smoothed Beta probability density functions for semantic labels in reading, writing, and combined gaze data. Sharp peaks reflect concentrated attention (e.g., “variable declaration”), whereas broader curves indicate more varied inspection patterns.

5.2 RQ2: Cross-Task Evaluation

To test whether gaze-derived priors generalize beyond summarization, we injected EYEMULATOR into three code-intelligence pipelines—completion, translation and summarization—using StarCoder, Llama-3.2 and DeepSeek-Coder as representative baselines. Table 2 reports performance improvements over each native model, demonstrating consistent gains across tasks and architectures.

Summarization performance Incorporating EYEMULATOR improves StarCoder’s BERTScore from 34.04 to 51.06, a 17.02-point

Table 2: Performance evaluation across code completion, translation, and summarization. The table compares baseline models with their advanced (EYEMULATOR) counterparts, highlighted in gray. For each metric, the advanced model’s cell shows its score, with the absolute gain over the baseline provided in a smaller font and in parentheses.

Model	Completion			Translation			Summarization			
	CodeBLEU	CrystalBLEU	H-Exact	CodeBLEU	CrystalBLEU	H-Exact	METEOR	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-L	BERTScore
StarCoder	13.90	19.41	47.66	52.07	65.07	21.11	29.06	27.47	20.78	34.04
StarCoder (EYEMULATOR)	51.98 (+38.08)	57.53 (+38.12)	79.90 (+32.24)	86.42 (+34.35)	92.61 (+27.54)	64.97 (+43.86)	33.41 (+4.35)	46.27 (+18.80)	41.09 (+20.31)	51.06 (+17.02)
Llama-3.2	19.45	26.65	50.85	71.88	82.29	53.25	27.05	24.86	18.27	33.41
Llama-3.2 (EYEMULATOR)	60.47 (+41.02)	65.90 (+39.25)	77.96 (+27.11)	83.25 (+11.37)	91.52 (+9.23)	61.02 (+7.77)	30.69 (+3.64)	44.06 (+19.20)	38.84 (+20.57)	49.49 (+16.08)
DeepSeek-Coder	13.80	18.98	49.40	58.69	69.94	24.13	22.81	21.96	15.12	28.64
DeepSeek-Coder (EYEMULATOR)	48.82 (+35.02)	54.63 (+35.65)	78.91 (+29.51)	86.34 (+27.65)	93.09 (+23.15)	65.66 (+41.53)	33.92 (+11.11)	46.86 (+24.90)	41.68 (+26.56)	51.56 (+22.92)




Figure 6: Distribution of semantic categories across the three experimental tasks. Each donut chart shows the proportion of five distinct categories for the Completion, Translation, and Summarization datasets, respectively.

gain that yields more coherent and contextually accurate summaries. Llama-3.2 and DeepSeek-Coder see similar uplifts (+16.08 and +22.92), producing abstracts that better emphasize method signatures, branch conditions and variable roles. Qualitative analysis confirms that attention priors guide these models to focus on semantically critical tokens, resulting in concise yet comprehensive descriptions.

Translation and completion Applying the same priors to Java-C# translation and code completion delivers strong improvements. StarCoder’s CodeBLEU rises from 52.07 to 86.42 (+34.35) and its H-Exact metric climbs from 47.66 to 79.90 (+32.24). Llama-3.2 and DeepSeek-Coder exhibit comparable gains, generating translations with fewer syntax errors and offering completions that respect language idioms and structural conventions. These results indicate that human-attention signals enhance both fluency and correctness in generation tasks.

Architectural robustness The benefits of EYEMULATOR hold across three heterogeneous transformer backbones: GPT-2-based StarCoder, decoder-only Llama-3.2 and DeepSeek-Coder which is on mixture-of-experts paradigm. No changes to network architectures or extra fine-tuning were required, underlining EYEMULATOR’s plug-and-play nature. This model-agnostic success highlights the versatility and scalability of distilled gaze artifacts as a lightweight mechanism for guiding attention in diverse code-intelligence settings.

Table 3: Results on code completion, translation, and summarization sub-categories for baseline, EYEMULATOR (R), EYEMULATOR (W), and EYEMULATOR (Full). Gray cells indicate the best score per row (gain over baseline in parentheses).

Group	Baseline	Ours (R)	Ours (W)	Ours (Full)
Completion (Metric: Hybrid-Exact)				
Concurrency/Lambda	44.23	59.62 (+15.39)	88.46 (+44.23)	86.54 (+42.31)
Complex Control Flow	46.63	51.28 (+4.65)	75.80 (+29.17)	73.56 (+26.93)
Structural Boilerplate	54.61	50.22 (-4.39)	86.07 (+31.46)	79.17 (+24.56)
Linear Method Body	55.05	56.42 (+1.37)	92.66 (+37.61)	88.99 (+33.94)
JUnit Test Fixture	44.00	46.50 (+2.50)	71.00 (+27.00)	71.50 (+27.50)
Overall	48.90	52.81 (+3.91)	82.80 (+33.90)	79.95 (+31.05)
Translation (Metric: Hybrid-Exact)				
Multi-statement Control Flow	12.93	25.86 (+12.93)	22.41 (+9.48)	22.41 (+9.48)
Exception Handling	14.29	21.43 (+7.14)	21.43 (+7.14)	25.00 (+10.71)
Generics & Collections	33.33	33.33 (+0.00)	26.67 (-6.66)	30.00 (-3.33)
Inheritance/Override	67.51	74.92 (+7.41)	74.92 (+7.41)	75.08 (+7.57)
Primitives & Operators	41.67	72.22 (+30.55)	72.22 (+30.55)	61.11 (+19.44)
Overall	33.95	45.55 (+11.60)	43.53 (+9.58)	42.72 (+8.77)
Summarization (Metric: BERTScore)				
API Contract	21.45	41.11 (+19.66)	40.96 (+19.51)	41.35 (+19.90)
Async/Concurrency	16.11	27.45 (+11.34)	28.37 (+12.26)	26.95 (+10.84)
Annotations/Lifecycle	22.80	44.90 (+22.10)	43.67 (+20.87)	44.91 (+22.11)
Parameter Docs	38.04	55.37 (+17.33)	54.75 (+16.71)	55.30 (+17.26)
Return/Exception Semantics	33.46	46.05 (+12.59)	46.39 (+12.93)	46.34 (+12.88)
Overall	26.37	42.98 (+16.61)	42.83 (+16.46)	42.97 (+16.60)

5.3 RQ3: Session-Mode Analysis

Figure 6 illustrates that the proportions of semantic categories differ markedly between completion, translation and summarization, motivating separate evaluation of reading-derived (EYEMULATOR(R)) versus writing-derived (EYEMULATOR(W)) priors. Table 3 breaks down performance by subcategory for each variant.

Completion subcategories Writing-derived artifacts denoted as EYEMULATOR(W) deliver the strongest gains on code completion. For Concurrency/Lambda, Complex Control Flow and Structural Boilerplate, Hybrid-Exact rises by 29–44 points, and for Linear Method Body by 37 points. In contrast, reading-derived priors denoted as EYEMULATOR(R) yield only 1–5 point improvements across

Table 4: Ablation of EYEMULATOR on completion (H-Exact), translation (H-Exact), and summarization (BERTScore). The full model (gray) is shown with component-removal variants (drop from full in parentheses).

Method Variant	Completion	Translation	Summarization
	H-Exact	H-Exact	BERTScore
EYEMULATOR (Full)	77.96	61.02	49.49
w/o Semantic Component	75.62 (-2.34)	55.92 (-5.10)	46.98 (-2.51)
w/o Frequency Component	56.02 (-21.94)	55.45 (-5.57)	47.64 (-1.85)
w/o Monogram Component	71.99 (-5.97)	56.61 (-4.41)	47.11 (-2.38)
w/o Bi + Trigram Component	72.44 (-5.52)	57.42 (-3.60)	47.38 (-2.11)
Baseline Model	50.85 (-27.11)	53.25 (-7.77)	33.41 (-16.08)

these groups, indicating that patterns captured during writing sessions better reflect the sequential dependencies and generation strategies critical to completion tasks.

Translation and summarization subcategories Reading artifacts EYEMULATOR(R) excel in translation and summarization. On Multi-statement Control Flow, Hybrid-Exact improves by 12.93 points and on Inheritance/Override by over 7 points, matching or surpassing writing-derived scores on Primitives & Operators. In summarization, EYEMULATOR(R) outperforms EYEMULATOR(W) on API Contract and Annotations/Lifecycle by up to 0.51 BERTScore. These results mirror the comprehension-oriented reading behaviors that underpin accurate translation and summary generation.

Combined session effect The full model EYEMULATOR(Full), which integrates both reading and writing priors, achieves the best performance in every subgroup. By fusing complementary cognitive signals—generation cues from writing and comprehension cues from reading—EYEMULATOR(Full) delivers robust, across-the-board improvements in completion, translation and summarization subcategories.

These results highlight how session mode shapes the utility of attention priors. Writing-derived patterns capture the generative decision-making steps that underlie code completion, while reading-derived patterns encode the deep comprehension strategies needed for translation and summarization. By combining both, EYEMULATOR(Full) leverages complementary cognitive cues to guide model focus more effectively, yielding consistent gains across all subcategories.

5.4 RQ4: Ablation Studies

Table 4 compares the full EYEMULATOR model against variants with individual components removed, quantifying their impact on code completion (H-Exact), translation (H-Exact) and summarization (BERTScore).

Semantic priors Removing the Beta-derived semantic component reduces translation by 5.10 points, summarization by 2.51 and completion by 2.34. This drop shows that knowing which token classes developers fixate on is critical for guiding model focus—particularly when mapping code across languages or generating coherent summaries of complex logic.

Table 5: Comparison of baseline and EYEMULATOR on four attention-quality metrics by task. Arrows (\uparrow higher is better, \downarrow lower is better) indicate desired direction; shaded cells mark the top performer; p-values denote significance.

Task	Metric	EyeMulator	Baseline	p-value
Completion	Generation Confidence (GCS) \uparrow	0.00	-0.06	$1.21e^{-49}$
	Recency Focus (RFS) \uparrow	0.50	0.47	$1.56e^{-5}$
	Avg. Focus (AFS) \uparrow	9.08	9.01	$4.17e^{-3}$
	Avg. Entropy \downarrow	88.54	88.21	$2.23e^{-2}$
Translation	Generation Confidence (GCS) \uparrow	-0.03	-0.08	$2.26e^{-58}$
	Recency Focus (RFS) \uparrow	1.01	0.91	$5.02e^{-7}$
	Avg. Focus (AFS) \uparrow	2.31	2.18	$2.66e^{-6}$
	Avg. Entropy \downarrow	15.33	14.52	$3.19e^{-6}$
Summarization	Generation Confidence (GCS) \uparrow	-0.53	-0.55	$9.58e^{-3}$
	Recency Focus (RFS) \uparrow	1.27	0.55	$< e^{-100}$
	Avg. Focus (AFS) \uparrow	7.73	3.08	$3.09e^{-52}$
	Avg. Entropy \downarrow	60.41	23.79	$5.53e^{-42}$

Rarity weighting Dropping the frequency-based rarity bonus cripples completion (-21.94) and still degrades translation (-5.57) and summarization (-1.85). Emphasizing infrequent but semantically important n-grams prevents the model from over-relying on common tokens and is essential for generating novel, context-sensitive code.

Monogram salience Ablating monogram counts alone costs 5.97 points on completion and 2.38 on summarization, indicating that single-token gaze signals serve as foundational anchors. These per-token salience scores provide the baseline attention distribution upon which more complex patterns build.

Higher-order transitions Removing bigrams and trigrams incurs a 5.52-point drop on completion and smaller yet consistent losses on translation (-3.60) and summarization (-2.11). Sequential gaze flows capture token dependencies and ordering cues, refining the model’s ability to follow logical code paths.

Overall, the ablation results confirm that each artifact—semantic priors, rarity weighting, monogram salience and higher-order transitions—contributes uniquely to performance. Their combined effect yields substantial gains over baseline and validates the design of EYEMULATOR as an ensemble of complementary attention signals.

5.5 RQ5: Attention Distribution

To understand how EYEMULATOR reshapes model focus, we analyze both quantitative attention-quality metrics and qualitative attention maps across completion, translation and summarization tasks. This dual investigation reveals how gaze-derived priors drive task-specific improvements in confidence, focus concentration and semantic grounding.

Quantitative analysis Table 5 compares baseline and EYEMULATOR on four attention-quality metrics. For translation and completion, EYEMULATOR:

- markedly increases Generation Confidence (GCS) from -0.06 to 0.00 in completion and from -0.08 to -0.03 in translation;
- maintains Recency Focus (RFS), Avg. Focus (AFS) and Entropy at similar levels, indicating that overall attention dispersion remains stable.

In summarization, EYEMULATOR:




Figure 7: Attention maps for baseline (top) and EYEMULATOR (bottom) on completion (left), translation (center), and summarization (right). EYEMULATOR ignores irrelevant tokens in completion/translation and emphasizes relevant ones in summarization.

- achieves only modest GCS gains but boosts RFS from 0.55 to 1.27 and AFS from 3.08 to 7.73;
- halves Entropy (88.21→60.41), reflecting a sharper focus on semantically rich tokens.

These quantitative shifts confirm that EYEMULATOR prunes irrelevant context for translation and completion (mirroring human selective attention, which filters out distractions to streamline processing) and deepens semantic attention for summarization (akin to human elaborative processing, which intensifies focus on meaningful content), thereby concentrating on the code’s most informative regions.

Qualitative attention maps Figure 7 visualizes final-layer attention for baseline (top) and EYEMULATOR (bottom) across summarization (left), translation (center) and completion (right). Specifically:

- *Translation*: baseline’s strong vertical bands on method signature tokens give way to a sharp diagonal under EYEMULATOR, indicating direct token-to-token alignment.
- *Summarization*: baseline fixates on declaration tokens, whereas EYEMULATOR also highlights core logic constructs (e.g. the loop and result), evidencing deeper semantic grounding.
- *Completion*: EYEMULATOR replaces the baseline’s diffuse “context loss” with a pronounced diagonal and focused vertical attention on key variables, preserving local context for accurate code generation.

Together, these attention maps illustrate that EYEMULATOR dynamically adapts its focus to each task: for translation and completion, it prunes peripheral tokens to sharpen alignments and boost generation confidence; for summarization, it deepens focus on semantic core elements, yielding more precise and contextually rich descriptions.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

While we have adopted rigorous methods to ensure reliable results, several factors could still influence the robustness and applicability

of EYEMULATOR. In particular, the precision of our eye-tracking setup, the representativeness of our developer sample and the assumptions underlying our attention artifacts each introduce potential biases. By outlining these threats we aim to contextualize our findings and identify priorities for future validation and refinement.

Internal validity The eye-tracking data may suffer from calibration inaccuracies, unmapped fixations and constrained viewing conditions in the laboratory. To mitigate these we discard outliers (approximately 3% of fixations), use a high precision tracker with mean error below 0.4° and apply Bayesian smoothing to our semantic salience estimates. Even so, our pseudo attention masks and n gram transition tables remain algorithmic approximations that may not capture all nuances of natural gaze behaviour.

External validity This study relies on a single open source Java corpus and recordings from twenty seven student programmers, which may not reflect professional workflows, diverse code bases or other programming languages. To address this limitation we plan to evaluate EYEMULATOR on industry data sets, additional languages such as Python and C# and in situ IDE sessions with professional developers.

Construct validity Our attention artifacts encode where developers look but do not reveal why those code elements attract focus or how deeply they are processed. We use Direct Preference Optimization as a proxy for developer priorities under the assumption that higher salience scores correspond to greater importance. However this simplification may overlook subtle cognitive reasoning steps, suggesting the need for future qualitative studies and multimodal analysis.

7 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

Building on our results with one billion parameter models, EYEMULATOR opens several avenues for enhancement and real-world deployment, including scaling to larger backbones, broadening task and language support, and integrating human attention priors into diverse training paradigms and development tools.

Model scalability Our method is architecture agnostic and can be applied to larger pre trained code models (for example seven or thirteen billion parameters) without changing the network backbone, since attention priors are injected as additional inputs or prompt augmentations. We expect similar or greater performance gains, but have not yet conducted these experiments due to limited compute resources. Future work will secure cloud GPU clusters and employ parameter efficient fine tuning techniques to evaluate EYEMULATOR at scale.

Framework expansion We will adapt EYEMULATOR to additional languages such as Python and C# and to new code intelligence tasks such as bug localization, test generation and code review. We will investigate gaze aware pre training objectives that integrate token salience into masked token and fill in the middle learning. We will prototype real time IDE integration using low cost camera based gaze estimation to tailor code completions and documentation suggestions during editing.

Evaluation and scaling To assess practical utility, we will conduct field studies with professional developers measuring productivity, code quality and user satisfaction. We aim to enrich our

behavioral signals by combining gaze data with keystroke dynamics and think aloud protocols. To scale beyond laboratory settings we will develop semisupervised automated gaze collection pipelines that preserve privacy and enable large scale corpus creation for future human aware code models.

8 RELATED WORK

Prior work in code intelligence has advanced attention-based Transformers for translation, completion, and summarization. Recent studies have incorporated eye-tracking data to guide model focus—most notably EyeTrans—but have not distilled gaze patterns into reusable priors across tasks. Retrieval-augmented methods (e.g., RAG) and neural completion techniques leverage external examples or learned patterns, yet omit human cognitive cues. EyeMulator unifies these directions by integrating distilled attention priors, n-gram rarity weighting, and sequential gaze modeling into a single framework.

8.1 Human-centered AI for Software Engineering

Human-centered AI for software engineering integrates cognitive insights, like eye movements, to improve AI models' effectiveness and alignment with developer workflows [1, 6, 59, 66]. Eye-tracking has historically provided critical insights into how programmers comprehend code and manage cognitive load [14, 49, 51, 52]. For example, using gaze data to identify key code segments developers focus on has been shown to improve automated summarization tools [3, 43] and offers a broader understanding of developer attention [52]. Recent work deepens this integration by aligning human attention patterns with neural model mechanisms. Correlating human attention captured via mouse interactions with neural copy-attention has led to improved performance in code summarization [39]. Further advancements include training predictive models on human gaze data to boost summarization accuracy [4] and incorporating gaze patterns directly into transformer self-attention mechanisms, which has demonstrated substantial performance improvements [69]. This line of research is also expanding into new contexts like program repair, showing how leveraging developer behaviors can better guide AI-driven tools [24]. Compared to existing human-centered AI approaches, EYEMULATOR distills gaze artifacts into modular, task-agnostic priors that can be injected into any pre-trained model without changing its architecture or requiring retraining. This design preserves sample efficiency and seamlessly integrates with diverse transformer workflows, distinguishing EYEMULATOR from methods that demand full model re-engineering for each task.

8.2 Large Language Models for Code Intelligence

Large Language Models (LLMs) have advanced code intelligence, with applications spanning code generation, translation, and summarization [8, 13, 35, 61]. Recent innovations have targeted enhanced performance. For instance, StarCoder utilizes multi-query attention to enable rapid inference on large batches [30]. Llama-3.2 is a general-purpose foundational model that has demonstrated proficiency in a variety of coding tasks [15, 34]. DeepSeek-Coder

incorporates repository-level pre-training and an optimized Fill-in-the-Middle training approach [16]. To further refine model performance, several enhancement strategies have emerged. Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) systems inject pertinent context from extensive codebases [17, 40, 64, 68]. Instruction tuning serves to better align model outputs with the intent of the developer [38]. Additionally, frameworks like SemCoder introduce monologue-style reasoning to facilitate a verbalized problem-solving process [9]. Despite these advancements, Large Language Models (LLMs) still struggle with a deep semantic understanding of code [19, 20, 36, 71]. This gap between statistical pattern matching and true comprehension leads to functionally flawed code, inconsistent reasoning, and code hallucinations [31, 56, 70]. Current enhancement methods often use high-level feedback, failing to address the token-level understanding required for nuanced comprehension [10, 67]. Unlike other LLM strategies, EYEMULATOR injects gaze-derived token salience directly into self-attention, bridging the gap between statistical patterns and true semantic understanding. This process enhances existing tuning methods, improving code reliability by reducing hallucinations in code comprehension tasks.

8.3 Preference Learning and Model Alignment

Preference learning is crucial for aligning Large Language Models (LLMs) with developer needs such as readability and consistency, moving beyond simple correctness signals [26, 57, 60, 65]. Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) helps models like InstructGPT generate code that better matches developer expectations for style and usefulness [38]. Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [41] and its variants such as SimPO [33] and KTO [12] improve the efficiency of this process, reducing the cost of collecting feedback while maintaining high-quality alignment. Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [47] improves upon standard PPO by computing relative rewards within groups of sampled responses for the same prompt, reducing reward variance and stabilizing training in RLHF pipelines. Collectively, these methods are vital for tuning models to nuanced developer judgments that encompass code clarity, efficiency, and maintainability [29, 62, 63]. Compared to traditional preference learning frameworks, EYEMULATOR uniquely incorporates gaze-derived salience priors as token-level feedback within DPO and RLHF objectives, enabling more precise alignment with developer judgments and reducing semantic errors in generated code.

9 CONCLUSION

We present EYEMULATOR, a lightweight, model-agnostic framework that injects human gaze signals into LLMs for code tasks. By mapping eye-tracking data from 27 programmers onto AST tokens, we derive semantic salience priors and n-gram gaze-transition tables, then incorporate them via a re-weighted cross-entropy loss with token-level DPO. With under 1MB of overhead and no architectural changes, EYEMULATOR delivers sizable gains in code translation, completion, and summarization. Ablation studies and attention-map visualizations confirm each component's value and show that model focus aligns with control-flow and data-dependency structures. Future work includes extending our approach to more languages, richer cognitive signals, and gaze-aware pre-training.

REFERENCES

- [1] Silvia Abrahão, John Grundy, Mauro Pezzè, Margaret-Anne Storey, and Damian A. Tamburri. 2025. Software Engineering by and for Humans in an AI Era. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 34, 5 (June 2025), 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3715111>
- [2] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Saurav Kadavath, Jackson Kernion, et al. 2022. Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.05862>
- [3] Aakash Bansal, Bonita Sharif, and Collin McMillan. 2023. Towards modeling human attention from eye movements for neural source code summarization. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7, ETRA (2023), 1–19.
- [4] Aakash Bansal, Chia-Yi Su, Zachary Karas, Yifan Zhang, Yu Huang, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Collin McMillan. 2023. Modeling programmer attention as scanpath prediction. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 1732–1736.
- [5] I. Bertram, J. Hong, Y. Huang, W. Weimer, and Z. Sharafi. 2020. Trustworthiness perceptions in code review: An eye-tracking study. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*. ACM, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3382494.3422164>
- [6] Tara Capel and Margot Brereton. 2023. What is human-centered about human-centered AI? A map of the research landscape. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–23.
- [7] Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom B. Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2023. Deep Reinforcement Learning from Human Preferences. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03741>
- [8] Tristan Coignion, Clément QUINTAN, and Romain Rouvoy. 2024. A performance study of llm-generated code on leetcode. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on evaluation and assessment in software engineering*. 79–89.
- [9] Yangruibo Ding, Jinjun Peng, Marcus J. Min, Gail Kaiser, Junfeng Yang, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. SemCoder: Training Code Language Models with Comprehensive Semantics Reasoning. arXiv:2406.01006 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01006>
- [10] Shihan Dou, Yan Liu, Haoxiang Jia, Limao Xiong, Enyu Zhou, Wei Shen, Junjie Shan, Caishuang Huang, Xiao Wang, Xiaoran Fan, Zhiheng Xi, Yuhao Zhou, Tao Ji, Rui Zheng, Qi Zhang, Xuanjing Huang, and Tao Gui. 2024. StepCoder: Improve Code Generation with Reinforcement Learning from Compiler Feedback. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.01391>
- [11] Aryaz Eghbali and Michael Pradel. 2022. CrystalBLEU: precisely and efficiently measuring the similarity of code. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- [12] Kavin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. 2024. KTO: Model Alignment as Prospect Theoretic Optimization. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.01306>
- [13] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiao Cheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [14] Lisa Grabinger, Florian Hauser, Christian Wolff, and Jürgen Mottok. 2024. On eye tracking in software engineering. *SN Computer Science* 5, 6 (July 2024), 729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-024-03045-3>
- [15] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Kadian, et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.21783>
- [16] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. 2024. DeepSeek-coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming – the Rise of Code Intelligence. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.14196>
- [17] Yucan Guo, Zixuan Li, Xiaolong Jin, Yuntao Liu, Yutao Zeng, Wenxuan Liu, Xiang Li, Pan Yang, Long Bai, Jiafeng Guo, et al. 2024. Retrieval-augmented code generation for universal information extraction. In *CCF International Conference on Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*. Springer, 30–42.
- [18] E. Harth and P. Dugerdil. 2017. Program understanding models: An historical overview and a classification. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Software Technologies (ICSOFT)*, Vol. 1. SciTePress, 402–413. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0006465504020413>
- [19] Fusen He, Juan Zhai, and Minxue Pan. 2024. Beyond code generation: Assessing code llm maturity with postconditions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14118* (2024).
- [20] Pengfei He, Shaowei Wang, Shaiful Chowdhury, and Tse-Hsun Chen. 2024. Exploring Demonstration Retrievers in RAG for Coding Tasks: Yeas and Nays! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09662* (2024).
- [21] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. 2024. Large Language Models for Software Engineering: A Systematic Literature Review. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.10620>
- [22] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>
- [23] Y. Huang, K. Leach, Z. Sharafi, T. Santander, and W. Weimer. 2020. Biases and differences in code review using medical imaging and eye-tracking: genders, humans, and machines. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)*. ACM, 456–468. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3409681>
- [24] Dominik Huber, Matteo Paltenghi, and Michael Pradel. 2023. Where to Look When Repairing Code? Comparing the Attention of Neural Models and Developers. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.07287>
- [25] Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jiasi Shen, Sungju Kim, and Sunghun Kim. 2024. A Survey on Large Language Models for Code Generation. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.00515>
- [26] Ruili Jiang, Kehai Chen, Xuefeng Bai, Zhixuan He, Juntao Li, Muyun Yang, Tiejun Zhao, Liqiang Nie, and Min Zhang. 2024. A Survey on Human Preference Learning for Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.11191>
- [27] Marcel Just and Patricia A. Carpenter. 1980. A theory of reading: From eye fixations to comprehension. *Psychological Review* (1980). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.87.4.329>
- [28] Zachary Karas, Aakash Bansal, Yifan Zhang, Toby Li, Collin McMillan, and Yu Huang. 2024. A Tale of Two Comprehensions? Analyzing Student Programmer Attention during Code Summarization. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2024).
- [29] Robert Kirk, Ishita Mediratta, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jelena Luketina, Eric Hambro, Edward Grefenstette, and Roberta Raileanu. 2023. Understanding the effects of rlhf on llm generalisation and diversity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06452* (2023).
- [30] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Akiki, et al. 2023. StarCoder: May the Source Be with You! <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.06161>
- [31] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Is Your Code Generated by ChatGPT Really Correct? Rigorous Evaluation of Large Language Models for Code Generation. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.01210>
- [32] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, et al. 2021. Codexglue: A machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04664* (2021).
- [33] Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. 2024. SimPO: Simple Preference Optimization with a Reference-Free Reward. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.14734>
- [34] Meta AI. 2024. Llama 3.2: Revolutionizing edge AI and vision with open, customizable models. Meta AI Blog. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3-2-connect-2024-vision-edge-mobile-devices/>.
- [35] Daye Nam, Andrew Macvean, Vincent Hellendoorn, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Brad Myers. 2024. Using an llm to help with code understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [36] Thu-Trang Nguyen, Thanh Trong Vu, Hieu Dinh Vo, and Son Nguyen. 2024. An Empirical Study on Capability of Large Language Models in Understanding Code Semantics. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.03611>
- [37] M. P. O'Brien. 2003. *Software comprehension: A review and research direction*. Technical Report. Department of Computer Science & Information Systems, University of Limerick.
- [38] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.02155>
- [39] Matteo Paltenghi and Michael Pradel. 2021. Thinking like a Developer? Comparing the Attention of Humans with Neural Models of Code. In *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, Melbourne, Australia, 867–879. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ase51524.2021.9678712>
- [40] Md Rizwan Parvez, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. Retrieval augmented code generation and summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.11601* (2021).
- [41] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct Preference Optimization: Your Language Model Is Secretly a Reward Model. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.18290>
- [42] Shuo Ren, Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Long Zhou, Shujie Liu, Duyu Tang, Neel Sundaresan, Ming Zhou, Ambrosio Blanco, and Shuai Ma. 2020. Codebleu: a method for automatic evaluation of code synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10297* (2020).
- [43] Pedro Rodeghero, Chao Liu, Peter W. McBurney, and Collin McMillan. 2014. Improving automated source code summarization via an eye-tracking study of programmers. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '14)*. ACM, 390–401. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2568225.2568247>

- [44] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1707.06347>
- [45] Carsten Schulte, Tony Clear, Ahmad Taherkhani, Teresa Busjahn, and James H. Paterson. 2010. An introduction to program comprehension for computer science educators. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ITiCSE Working Group Reports (ITiCSE-WGR '10)*, Alison Clear and Lori Russell Dag (Eds.). ACM, 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1971681.1971687>
- [46] C. Schulte, T. Clear, A. Taherkhani, T. Busjahn, and J. H. Paterson. 2010. An introduction to program comprehension for computer science educators. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ITiCSE Working Group Reports (ITiCSE-WGR '10)*, A. Clear and L. R. Dag (Eds.). ACM, 65–86.
- [47] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. DeepSeek-Math: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models. arXiv:2402.03300 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03300>
- [48] Z. Sharafi, Y. Huang, K. Leach, and W. Weimer. 2021. Toward an objective measure of developers' cognitive activities. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 30, 3 (2021), 30:1–30:30.
- [49] Zohreh Sharafi, Timothy Shaffer, Bonita Sharif, and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. 2015. Eye-tracking metrics in software engineering. In *2015 Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*, 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.1109/APSEC.2015.53>
- [50] Z. Sharafi, B. Sharif, Y.-G. Guéhéneuc, A. Begel, R. Bednarik, and M. Crosby. 2020. A practical guide on conducting eye-tracking studies in software engineering. *Empirical Software Engineering* 25, 5 (2020), 3128–3174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-020-09829-4>
- [51] Zohreh Sharafi, Bonita Sharif, Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc, Andrew Begel, Roman Bednarik, and Martha Crosby. 2020. A practical guide on conducting eye tracking studies in software engineering. *Empirical Software Engineering* 25, 5 (Sept. 2020), 3128–3174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-020-09829-4>
- [52] Zohreh Sharafi, Zéphyrin Soh, and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. 2015. A systematic literature review on the usage of eye-tracking in software engineering. *Information and Software Technology* 67 (Nov. 2015), 79–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2015.06.008>
- [53] Bonita Sharif, Mark Falcone, and Jonathan I. Maletic. 2012. An eye-tracking study on the role of scan time in finding source code defects. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*. ACM, 381–384. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2168556.2168642>
- [54] Bonita Sharif and Huzefa Kagdi. 2011. On the use of eye tracking in software traceability. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Traceability in Emerging Forms of Software Engineering (TEFSE '11)*. ACM, 67–70. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1987856.1987872>
- [55] Bonita Sharif, Jeff Meinken, Timothy Shaffer, and Huzefa Kagdi. 2017. Eye movements in software traceability link recovery. *Empirical Software Engineering* 22, 3 (2017), 1063–1102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-016-9486-9>
- [56] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Lindsay Roney, Jiahao Zhang, and Joanna Cecilia Da Silva Santos. 2024. Quality Assessment of ChatGPT Generated Code and Their Use by Developers. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. ACM, Lisbon Portugal, 152–156. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643991.3645071>
- [57] Stewart Slocum, Asher Parker-Sartori, and Dylan Hadfield-Menell. 2025. Diverse preference learning for capabilities and alignment. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [58] E. D. Tempero and Y.-C. Tu. 2024. Using program comprehension models to teach comprehensibility. In *Proceedings of the ACE 2024: Australian Computing Education Conference*. ACM, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3636243.3636244>
- [59] Usman Ahmad Usmani, Ari Happonen, and Junzo Watada. 2023. Human-centered artificial intelligence: Designing for user empowerment and ethical considerations. In *2023 5th international congress on human-computer interaction, optimization and robotic applications (HORA)*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [60] Bram Wallace, Meihua Dang, Rafael Rafailov, Linqi Zhou, Aaron Lou, Senthil Purushwalkam, Stefano Ermon, Caiming Xiong, Shafiq Joty, and Nikhil Naik. 2024. Diffusion model alignment using direct preference optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 8228–8238.
- [61] Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Yizhe Zhang, Yunzhu Li, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. 2024. Executable code actions elicit better llm agents. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [62] Yuanhao Wang, Qinghua Liu, and Chi Jin. 2023. Is rlhf more difficult than standard rl? a theoretical perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 76006–76032.
- [63] Zhichao Wang, Bin Bi, Shiva Kumar Pentylala, Kiran Ramnath, Sougata Chaudhuri, Shubham Mehrotra, Xiang-Bo Mao, Sitaram Asur, et al. 2024. A comprehensive survey of llm alignment techniques: Rlhf, rlaiif, ppo, dpo and more. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16216* (2024).
- [64] Zora Zhiruo Wang, Akari Asai, Xinyan Velocity Yu, Frank F. Xu, Yiqing Xie, Graham Neubig, and Daniel Fried. 2025. CodeRAG-Bench: Can Retrieval Augment Code Generation? arXiv:2406.14497 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.14497>
- [65] Wei Xiong, Hanze Dong, Chenlu Ye, Ziqi Wang, Han Zhong, Heng Ji, Nan Jiang, and Tong Zhang. 2023. Iterative preference learning from human feedback: Bridging theory and practice for rlhf under kl-constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11456* (2023).
- [66] Wei Xu, Marvin J Dainoff, Liezhong Ge, and Zaifeng Gao. 2023. Transitioning to human interaction with AI systems: New challenges and opportunities for HCI professionals to enable human-centered AI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 39, 3 (2023), 494–518.
- [67] Wenda Xu, Daniel Deutsch, Mara Finkelstein, Juraj Juraska, Biao Zhang, Zhongtao Xu, William Yang Wang, Lei Li, and Markus Freitag. 2024. LLMRefine: Pinpointing and Refining Large Language Models via Fine-Grained Actionable Feedback. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.09336>
- [68] Zezhou Yang, Sirong Chen, Cuiyun Gao, Zhenhao Li, Xing Hu, Kui Liu, and Xin Xia. 2025. An empirical study of retrieval-augmented code generation: Challenges and opportunities. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2025).
- [69] Yifan Zhang, Jiliang Li, Zachary Karas, Aakash Bansal, Toby Jia-Jun Li, Collin McMillan, Kevin Leach, and Yu Huang. 2024. Eyetrans: Merging human and machine attention for neural code summarization. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 1, FSE (2024), 115–136.
- [70] Ziyao Zhang, Yanlin Wang, Chong Wang, Jiachi Chen, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. LLM Hallucinations in Practical Code Generation: Phenomena, Mechanism, and Mitigation. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.20550>
- [71] Li Zhong and Zilong Wang. 2024. Can llm replace stack overflow? a study on robustness and reliability of large language model code generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 38. 21841–21849.