

TOWARD EFFECTIVE ALGORITHM VISUALIZATION ARTIFACTS:
DESIGNING FOR PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION
IN AN UNDERGRADUATE ALGORITHMS COURSE

by

CHRISTOPHER DAVID HUNDHAUSEN

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Computer and Information Science
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

June 1999

ABOUT THIS MANUSCRIPT

The following manuscript is a reformatted version of my original dissertation, which I defended in May of 1999 in the Department of Computer and Information Science at the University of Oregon. It is published as technical report number CIS-TR-99-07 (June, 1999) by the Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Oregon, Eugene. If you wish to have a hard copy of the technical report mailed to you, please contact Jan Saunders (jan@cs.uoregon.edu).

I am making my dissertation available on-line in hopes of better disseminating the work. I hope to publish pieces of this work as conference papers and journal articles; look for these to appear over the next few years. In the meantime, if you would like to cite this work, please use the designation “unpublished doctoral dissertation,” and reference the technical report cited above.

I am still actively developing the prototype versions of SALSA and ALVIS presented in Chapter 7, and hope eventually to release them into the public domain. If you're interested in a status report on SALSA and ALVIS, or if you have any comments, questions, or feedback on any of this work, please contact me!

Chris Hundhausen
Postdoctoral Researcher
Laboratory for Interactive Learning Technologies
Department of Information and Computer Sciences
University of Hawai'i at Manoa
1680 East-West Road
Honolulu, HI 96822
hundhaus@hawaii.edu
<http://lilt.ics.hawaii.edu/~hundhaus>

Happy reading!

C.D.H.
Honolulu, HI
November, 1999

“Toward Effective Algorithm Visualization Artifacts: Designing for Participation and Communication in an Undergraduate Algorithms Course,” a dissertation prepared by Christopher D. Hundhausen in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree in the Department of Computer and Information Science. This dissertation has been approved and accepted by:

Dr. Sarah Douglas, Chair of the Examining Committee

Date

Committee in charge: Dr. Sarah Douglas, Chair
 Dr. Christopher Wilson
 Dr. Michal Young
 Dr. Harry Wolcott
 Dr. John Stasko

Accepted by:

Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Algorithm visualization (AV) software graphically illustrates how computer algorithms work. While the software initially had much promise as a pedagogical aid, research studies designed to substantiate its pedagogical benefits have yielded markedly mixed results. I argue that to harness the pedagogical promise of AV software, we need to rethink the theory of effectiveness that has guided its design and pedagogical use. My starting point is an alternative theoretical foundation that views learning not at the level of the individual, but rather at the level of the community of practice. On this alternative view, learning is seen in terms of participating more centrally in the practices of the community.

To tailor this theoretical perspective to the particulars of the community of practice in which algorithms learning takes place, I conducted an ethnographic study of an undergraduate algorithms course in which AV software was used to facilitate students' more central participation in the community. Specifically, students were asked to use AV software to construct and present their own visualizations—two activities commonly performed only by community experts (algorithms instructors). The key finding of the study is that requiring students to use conventional AV software in this way actually impedes learning within the community, because it requires students to put inordinate amounts of time into community-irrelevant activities, and because it discourages students and instructors from engaging in meaningful conversations about algorithms. On the other hand, asking students to construct and present homemade visualizations made out of simple art supplies appears to avoid these problems.

To explore this finding further, this dissertation pursues two parallel research directions: (1) a controlled experiment that tests the hypothesis that, on a test of procedural understanding and recall, students who construct their own, homemade visualizations will outperform students who interact with a visualization constructed by an expert; and (2) a prototype AV system that supports the construction and presentation of unpolished, pen-and-paper visualizations. This research provides the beginnings of an alternative theory of effectiveness, which emphasizes the importance of students' constructing and discussing unpolished, pen-and-paper visualizations as a means of participating in a community of practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This epic journey would not have been possible without the help of several individuals. To begin with, I owe a big hug and kiss to my parents, Patricia and David Hundhausen, who have always been remarkably supportive of my interests, despite the fact that those interests have not always been understandable or interesting to them.

Lee Schmidt, my high school mentor, and Tom Naps, my undergraduate mentor, planted the initial seeds for my venture into computer science and research. Lee sparked my interest in computer programming in Pascal, while Tom sparked my interest in doing long-term research, and then patiently taught me how to do it during the four summers I helped him to build software for Lawrence University's algorithm visualization laboratory (NSF ILI grant #88-51781).

I am grateful to Walter Tichy for inviting me to pursue the preliminary stages of this research as a Fulbright Scholar in his Institute for Programming Structures and Data Organization at the University of Karlsruhe, Germany. During my "Traumjahr" there (1993-94), Arne Frick, Stefan Hänssgen, Rick Chamberlin, Delel Chaabouni, Christoph Jerger, Aida Chouchane, Karim Diab, Frederic Million, Fabien Fersing, and Richard Kupprion sustained me with much needed encouragement and friendship as I learned to live "auf die echte deutsche Weise" (in the true German way). When I arrived back in Eugene, Dr. Allen Malony advised and funded me during my first year in the Ph.D. program, while Gunnar Sacher helped me to maintain balance by beckoning me away from my computer for hiking and camping trips.

The ethnographic fieldwork and experiment presented in this dissertation would not have been possible without the enthusiastic participation of numerous CIS 315 students and their CIS 315 instructor; unfortunately, I cannot mention them by name. I am grateful to the University of Oregon's College of Arts and Sciences and Graduate School for two grants (the Mary Chambers Brockelbank Scholarship, and a Graduate Student Research Award) that paid the participants in the experiment presented in Chapter 6. The prototype language and system presented in this dissertation would not have been possible without the help of (a) Hank Bennett, who programmed the back-end animation engine and a significant portion of the user interface, and (b) fellow HCI lab member Ted Kirkpatrick, who furnished ingenious advice at times when the Microsoft® Foundation Classes had me really stumped. Ted also kept me honest during the statistical analysis of my experiment's data.

I am grateful to Harry Wolcott for getting me excited about ethnography, and for offering sage advice on the ethnographic research presented in this dissertation. I am grateful to John Stasko, one of the pioneers of algorithm visualization, for being such a wonderful remote collaborator and discussant throughout my graduate studies, and for serving on my committee. Last, but not least, I am deeply indebted to my inspirational advisor, Sarah Douglas, who challenged me while remaining encouraging all the way through, especially in the final months, when I needed her support the most.

My greatest thanks, however, goes lovingly to my best friend, life partner, and fiancée, Laura Girardeau, who has inspired me to grow in ways I could never have imagined. Despite my tendency to act as though algorithm visualization is the most important thing in life, she was able to see through to my true self, remaining passionate, patient, giving, and forgiving. Namaste!

DEDICATION

To my old self, who thought that he had to achieve to be loved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Problems.....	3
1.2 Paths to Solutions.....	4
1.3 The Thesis	5
1.4 Brief Summary of the Dissertation	6
1.4.1 EF Theory, Its Stronghold on Past Research, and Its Inadequacy	6
1.4.2 Choosing an Alternative Theory.....	6
1.4.3 Empirically Exploring the Sociocultural Constructivist Approach.....	7
1.4.4 A Framework of Cause and Effect.....	8
1.4.5 Two Research Directions	9
1.5 Organization of the Dissertation.....	12
2. EPISTEMIC FIDELITY THEORY	14
2.1 The Allegory of Musica	15
2.2 Key Assumptions.....	16
2.2.1 The Knowledge Representation Assumption.....	16
2.2.2 The Knowledge Flow Assumption	16
2.2.3 The Graphical Medium Effectiveness Assumption	16
2.2.4 Overriding Assumption: Epistemic Fidelity Is Crucial	17
2.2.5 Practical Implications.....	17
2.3 Variations on EF Theory	18
2.3.1 Weak EF Theory (Learner Involvement).....	18
2.3.2 Weak EF Theory (Individual Differences).....	18
2.3.3 Weak EF Theory (Dual-Coding)	18
2.4 EF Theory's Influence on Past Research.....	18
2.4.1 Influence on AV Technology Design	19
2.4.1.1 Support for Knowledge Flow	19
2.4.1.2 Support for Algorithmic Fidelity	22
2.4.1.3 Support for Cultural Fidelity.....	23
2.4.2 Influence on Effectiveness Evaluation	24
2.4.3 Influence on Pedagogy	25
2.4.3.1 AV in Lectures	25
2.4.3.2 AV in Labs	26
2.4.3.3 AV for individual study	26
2.5 A Critique of EF Theory	27
2.6 Summary	31
3. CONSTRUCTIVISM: AN ALTERNATIVE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION	33
3.1 Cognitive Constructivism	34
3.1.1 Key Assumptions.....	34
3.1.1.1 Learners Actively Construct Their Own Knowledge.....	34
3.1.1.2 Stages of Intellectual Development: Concrete to Abstract.....	34
3.1.2 Implications for Pedagogy	35

	Page
3.1.3 Implications for Technology Design	35
3.1.4 Implications for Effectiveness Evaluation.....	36
3.2 Discussion: Algorithms as a Social Practice.....	37
3.3 Sociocultural Constructivism	38
3.3.1 The Allegory of Musiphonia.....	39
3.3.2 Key Assumptions.....	40
3.3.2.1 Knowledge and Learning within a Community	40
3.3.2.2 Learning Is Changing Participation and Identity.....	40
3.3.2.3 Access Is Crucial.....	41
3.3.3 Implications for Pedagogy	42
3.3.4 Implications for Technology Design	43
3.3.5 Implications for Effectiveness Evaluation.....	44
3.4 Summary and Research Questions	45
4. ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDIES	46
4.1 Background.....	47
4.1.1 Informants: Students and the Instructor	48
4.1.2 Algorithm Visualization Assignments and Supporting Technology.....	48
4.1.2.1 Study I Visualization Assignments	48
4.1.2.2 Study II Visualization Assignments.....	49
4.1.3 Field techniques.....	50
4.2 Observations.....	50
4.2.1 Animation Construction	52
4.2.1.1 Storyboard Construction Activities	53
4.2.1.2 Samba Construction Activities	54
4.2.2 Animation Presentation and Discussion	56
4.2.2.1 Storyboard Presentations	56
4.2.2.2 Samba Animation Presentations.....	57
4.3 Discussion.....	58
4.3.1 Activity Relevance	59
4.3.2 Designing for Conversations about Algorithms.....	60
4.3.3 AV Construction and Presentation as Expert Forms of COSA Participation	61
4.4 Summary	62
5. A FRAMEWORK OF CAUSE AND EFFECT.....	63
5.1 AV Effectiveness Factors.....	64
5.1.1 Representation Factors.....	64
5.1.1.1 Input Generality and Typset Fidelity.....	64
5.1.1.2 Story Content.....	65
5.1.2 Graphics Creation Technique.....	65
5.1.3 Self-Construction.....	66
5.1.4 Instructor Communication	66
5.2 AV Effectiveness Measures	67
5.2.1 Activity Relevance	67
5.2.2 Understanding and Recall.....	67
5.2.3 Effective Communication	69
5.2.4 Community-Building	69
5.3 Hypotheses	70
5.3.1 The Activity Relevance Hypothesis	71
5.3.2 The Communication Effectiveness Hypothesis	71

	Page
5.3.3 The Understanding and Recall Hypothesis.....	72
5.3.4 The Community-Building Hypothesis.....	73
5.4 Summary and Research Directions.....	75
6. EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES.....	76
6.1 A Series of Experiments.....	76
6.2 Experiment 1: Active Viewing versus Self-Construction.....	78
6.2.1 Design.....	78
6.2.2 Equalizing the Treatments.....	79
6.2.3 Participants.....	80
6.2.4 Materials.....	80
6.2.4.1 Active Viewing Treatment Group.....	81
6.2.4.2 Self Construction Treatment Group.....	84
6.2.5 Tasks.....	85
6.2.6 Procedure.....	87
6.2.7 Scoring the Traces and Programs.....	87
6.2.8 Results.....	87
6.2.9 Discussion.....	90
6.3 Summary.....	92
7. PROTOTYPE LANGUAGE AND SYSTEM.....	94
7.1 Empirical Foundations.....	95
7.1.1 AV Content.....	96
7.1.2 Process of AV Construction.....	97
7.1.2 Process of AV Execution and Presentation.....	97
7.1.3 Design Requirements.....	98
7.2 SALSA.....	98
7.2.1 Data Types.....	99
7.2.2 Spatial Relations.....	100
7.2.3 Commands.....	101
7.3 ALVIS.....	101
7.3.1 Overview.....	102
7.3.1 Storyboard Construction Interface.....	103
7.3.1.1 Creating and Placing Storyboard Elements.....	104
7.3.1.2 Animating Cutouts.....	105
7.3.2 Storyboard Presentation Interface.....	106
7.4 Example of the Prototype in Use.....	107
7.4.1 Creating the Storyboard Elements.....	108
7.4.2 Placing the Storyboard Elements.....	109
7.4.3 Programming the Spatial Logic.....	111
7.4.4 Presenting the Storyboard.....	113
7.5 Related Work.....	115
7.6 Summary.....	116
8. CONCLUSION.....	118
8.1 Research Contributions.....	120
8.2 Directions for Future Research.....	121
8.2.1 The Understanding and Recall Hypothesis.....	121
8.2.2 The Activity Relevance Hypothesis.....	122

	Page
8.2.3 The Communication Effectiveness Hypothesis	122
8.2.4 The Community-Building Hypothesis	123
8.2.5 The Prototype Language and System.....	127
8.3 A Vision for the Future: The “Algorithms Studio”	127
Appendix	
A. ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY I.....	129
A.1 Background.....	130
A.1.1 Getting in the door.....	131
A.1.2 Disclaimers	131
A.1.3 Using Samba for Algorithm Animation	132
A.1.4 Field Techniques.....	132
A.1.4.1 “Experiencing” Techniques	133
A.1.4.2 “Enquiring” Techniques	134
A.1.4.3 “Examining” Techniques.....	135
A.1.5 Informants: Students and the Instructor.....	135
A.2 Study I Animation Assignments.....	136
A.3 How Students Went about the Animation Assignments	136
A.3.1 Time Spent.....	138
A.3.2 Animation-Building Activities	138
A.3.2.1 Deciding on a Project.....	138
A.3.2.2 Implementing the Algorithm	139
A.3.2.3 Programming the Animation	139
A.4 The Animation Presentation Sessions.....	140
A.4.1 A Typical Presentation Session.....	141
A.4.2 Assignment Improvement Discussions.....	143
A.4.2.1 The Value of Programming the Algorithm.....	143
A.4.2.2 The Difficulties of Graphics Layout.....	143
A.4.2.3 Input Generality a Formidable Challenge.....	144
A.5 The Instructional Side of the AV Assignments.....	145
A.6 Assessing the Costs and Benefits of AV Assignments	146
A.6.1 Students’ Perspective.....	146
A.6.2 The Professor’s Perspective.....	147
A.6.2.1 Grading is Difficult and Takes Too Long.....	148
A.6.2.2 Students’ Time Not Well-Spent on the Animation Assignments.....	148
A.7 Why are AV Assignments Effective?.....	150
A.8 Discussion	151
B. ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY II.....	153
B.1 Study II Animation Assignments	154
B.2 Research questions	154
B.3 Field techniques.....	155
B.4 Students’ Work on the Revised Animation Assignment.....	156
B.4.1 Time Spent.....	157
B.4.2 Animation-Building Activities	158
B.4.3 Approaches to the Assignment.....	158
B.5 The Presentation Sessions.....	159
B.5.1 Storyboard presentations.....	159
B.5.1.1 Clarifying Questions	160

	Page
B.5.1.2 Design Discussions.....	161
B.5.1.3 Tailoring Scenarios to Algorithms, and Algorithms to Scenarios.....	163
B.5.2 Final Animation Presentations.....	167
B.6 Was the Revised Animation Assignment Format an Improvement?.....	169
B.6.1 Did a Single Animation Assignment Work out Better?.....	169
B.6.2 Was the Absence of an Input Generality Requirement an Improvement?.....	169
B.6.3 Assessing the Storyboard Phase of the Assignment.....	171
B.7 Comparing the Storyboard Phase to the Final Animation Phase.....	172
B.7.1 Differences in What Students Learned.....	172
B.7.2 Relevance of What Students Learned.....	173
B.7.3 Are Both Phases Necessary?.....	174
B.8 Discussion.....	175
C. ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY MATERIALS.....	176
C.1 CIS 315 Syllabus for Study I.....	177
C.2 CIS 315 Syllabus for Study II.....	180
C.3 Study I Animation Assignments.....	181
C.3.1 Assignment 1.....	181
C.3.2 Assignment 2.....	181
C.3.3 Assignment 3.....	182
C.4 Calls for Participation.....	184
C.5 Informed Consent Agreements.....	185
C.6 Study I E-Mail Surveys.....	190
C.7 Study II Animation Assignment.....	192
C.8 Study II: Guidelines for Developing a Storyboard Presentation.....	194
C.9 Study II Diary Form.....	195
D. EXPERIMENT MATERIALS.....	196
D.1 Preliminary Interest Questionnaire.....	197
D.2 Background Information Questionnaire.....	198
D.3 Informed Consent Agreement.....	199
D.4 Instructions: Active Viewing Group.....	201
D.5 Instructions: Self-Construction Group.....	207
D.6 Tracing Task Instructions.....	212
D.7 Tracing Tasks.....	214
D.8 Programming Task Instructions.....	218
D.9 Java QuickSelect Skeleton.....	220
D.10 C++ QuickSelect Skeleton.....	223
D.11 Instructions for Finishing Up.....	226
D.12 Exit Questionnaire: Active Viewing Group.....	227
D.13 Exit Questionnaire: Self-Construction Group.....	228
E. EXPERIMENT DATA.....	229
F. SALSA LANGUAGE SUMMARY.....	231
F.1 Commands.....	232
F.1.1 Storyboard Element Creation, Deletion, and Attribute Modification.....	232
F.1.2 Conditionals and Iteration.....	233
F.1.3 Animation.....	234

	Page
F.2 Attributes of Storyboard Elements	236
F.2.1 SALSA Object Attributes	236
F.2.2 Cutout attributes.....	237
F.2.3 Position Attributes	237
F.2.4 Grid Attributes.....	237
G. SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ASSESSING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD AN ALGORITHMS COURSE.....	239
BIBLIOGRAPHY	243

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Ten AV Effectiveness Experiments	28
2. Independent Variables Manipulated in Ten AV Effectiveness Experiments	29
3. Ten AV Effectiveness Experiments vis-à-vis the Version of EF Theory For Which They Were Designed to Provide Evidence.....	29
4. Four Storyboard Stories That Stood Out For Their Creativity and Innovation	58
5. Independent and Dependent Variables in the Understanding and Recall Hypothesis	77
6. Series of Planned Experiments	77
7. Design of Experiment 1.....	78
8. The Table Participants Filled in for Each Trace.....	86
9. Mean Trace Scores and Times of the Two Treatments.....	88
10. Mean Program Scores and Times of the Two Treatments.....	89
11. Implications of Framework Hypotheses for AV Technology Design.....	95
12. The Ten Spatial Relations Supported By SALSA.....	101
13. Brief Summary of SALSA Commands	101
14. A 2 × 2 Design that Explores Self Construction and Instructor Communication.....	122
15. Ethnographic Field Techniques vis-à-vis Wolcott's Taxonomy.....	134
16. Excerpts from the Content Log of a Typical Presentation.....	142
17. Field Techniques Used to Address Study II's Research Questions.....	156
18. The Six Kinds of Questions That Were Offered and Elicited During Storyboard Presentations.....	161
19. Five Storyboard Stories that Stood Out for Their Creativity and Innovation.....	164
20. Curt and Jeff's Final Animation Scenario	168

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Knuth's Illustration of the Deque as a Railway Switching Network.....	1
2. A snapshot of the "Grand Race" in <i>Sorting Out Sorting</i>	2
3. A Snapshot from An Interactive Session with BALSA.....	3
4. Graphical Summary of the Dissertation.....	7
5. Pseudocode Description of Insertion Sort Algorithm.....	11
6. An AV of the Insertion Sort Algorithm.....	12
7. The POLKA User Interface for Controlling Animation Execution.....	12
8. The Musibeest.....	15
9. A Schematic Diagram of Knowledge Flow According to EF Theory.....	17
10. Knowledge Flow in Brown's (1988) User Model for AV Software.....	20
11. Prototypical Design of an AV Effectiveness Experiment.....	25
12. Summary of the Experimental Support for each Version of EF Theory.....	30
13. The Historical Evolution of AV Effectiveness Experiments and Empirical Studies.....	31
14. Layers of AV technology-mediated participation.....	43
15. Sample Samba Script Fragment and Animation Snapshot.....	49
16. The Polka Control Panel.....	49
17. Algorithm Themes Animated by Student Groups.....	51
18. Number of Geometric and Story-based Animations.....	51
19. Time Spent on Storyboards and Samba Animations.....	53
20. Students' Storyboard Construction Activities.....	53
21. Students' Samba Animation Construction Activities.....	54
22. A Taxonomy of AV Effectiveness Factors.....	64
23. A Taxonomy of AV Effectiveness Measures.....	67
24. Graphical Summary of the Framework.....	71
25. The Activity Relevance Hypothesis.....	71

	Page
26. The Communication Effectiveness Hypothesis.....	72
27. The Understanding and Recall Hypothesis	72
28. The Community-Building Hypothesis.....	74
29. The Understanding and Recall Hypothesis	77
30. The “Console” Window	81
31. The Polka Control Panel	82
32. The “Forest Rangers” Window	83
33. The “History” Window.....	84
34. The “History Legend” Window.....	84
35. Box Plot of Trace Scores of Each Condition	89
36. Box Plot of Trace Times of Each Condition.....	89
37. Box Plot of Programming Task Scores.....	90
38. Box Plot of Programming Task Time.....	90
39. Predefined Cutout Refpoints.....	99
40. Cutouts in a Sample SALSA Storyboard	100
41. Snapshot of the ALVIS Environment	103
42. The ALVIS Menus.....	103
43. The Create Cutout Dialog Box.....	104
44. The Cutout Graphics Editor.....	105
45. The Script Move Dialog Box.....	106
46. The Execution Control Toolbar	107
47. The Present/Edit Toolbar	107
48. Pseudocode Description of the Bubble Sort Algorithm	108
49. The Football Bubble Sort Storyboard	108
50. The ALVIS environment After Creating First Player	109
51. Creating a Grid with the Create Grid Dialog Box	110
52. The ALVIS Environment After All Cutouts Have Been Placed.....	110
53. SALSA Script for Football Bubble Sort Storyboard.....	113

	Page
54. The ALVIS Environment Before the Players Are Swapped	114
55. "Attempt to Edit Previously Executed Line" Dialog Box	114
56. A Taxonomy of AV Construction Techniques.....	115
57. Example of the Semantic-Level Analysis Technique	126
58. A Schematic of the Area in Which the Fieldwork Was Conducted.....	133
59. The Assignment 2 Animation Projects.....	137
60. The Assignment 3 Animation Projects.....	137
61. A Taxonomy of How Students Spent Their Time on Animation Assignments	138
62. The Animation Projects Chosen By the 28 Student Groups	157
63. Comparison of Time Students Spent on the Storyboard and Animation Implementation Components of the Assignment.....	158
64. The Number of Student Groups Adopting Five Alternative Animation Implementation Strategies.....	159