Freie Universität Berlin

Course "Empirical Evaluation in Informatics"

Surveys

Prof. Dr. Lutz Prechelt
Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Informatik
http://www.inf.fu-berlin.de/inst/ag-se/

- Example: SE education
- Method:
  - Set study goals
  - Select target population
  - Design questionnaire
  - Conduct survey
  - Evaluate results

Freie Universität Berlin

"Empirische Bewertung in der Informatik"

Umfragen

Prof. Dr. Lutz Prechelt
Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Informatik
http://www.inf.fu-berlin.de/inst/ag-se/

- Beispiel: Relevanz der Informatik-Ausbildung
- Methode:
  - Auswahl der Ziele
  - Auswahl der Zielgruppe
  - Fragebogenentwurf
  - Durchführung
  - Auswertung

Example:
Relevance of CS and SE education

Freie Universität Berlin

- Source: T. Lethbridge: "What Knowledge Is Important to a Software Professional?", IEEE Computer, May 2000
  - see also http://www.site.uottawa.ca/~tcl/edrel/

- Research questions:
  Which parts of their education are considered how relevant by software engineering practitioners?
  Do they perceive their education as misaligned?

- Study format: Survey

T. Lethbridge

Approach

Freie Universität Berlin

- Uses a list of 75 topics from Computer Science (CS) and Software Engineering (SE) education
  - e.g. data structures, physics, project management, VLSI
- For each topic, asks 4 questions:
  - (1) how much was learned in education,
  - (2) how much was learned (or forgotten) since ,
  - (3) how useful the knowledge on the topic has been, and
  - (4) how influential on one's thinking the topic has been
- Determines the topics that are
  - deemed important but not taught widely ("knowledge gap")
  - deemed unimportant but taught widely

Survey population

Freie Universität Berlin

- Web-based survey
  - employees of various companies (approached via mgmt)
  - postal mailing lists (e.g. university alumni)
  - email lists, Usenet newsgroups
- Over 200 participants
  - 186 participants were selected to form a balanced sample
- 54% from USA, 23% from Canada; 24 countries overall
  - 42% from software companies
- Education of participants:
  - 15% high school or college level (without degree);
    48% bachelor; 37% postgraduate
  - >60% CS, SE, or IS degrees; 50% other science or engineering;
    20% other disciplines
    - Many had more than one degree

Question 1

Freie Universität Berlin

- How much did you learn about this in your formal education (e.g. **University or College**)?
  - 0=Learned nothing at all
  - 1=Became vaguely familiar
  - 2=Learned the basics
  - 3=Became functional (moderate working knowledge)
  - 4=Learned a lot
  - 5=Learned in depth; became expert (Learned almost everything)

Question 2

Freie Universität Berlin

- What is your **current knowledge** about this, considering what you have learned on the job as well as forgotten?
  - 0=Know nothing
  - 1=Am vaguely familiar
  - 2=Know the basics
  - 3=Am functional (moderate working knowledge)
  - 4=Know a lot
  - 5=Know in depth / am expert (Know almost everything)

Question 3

Freie Universität Berlin

- How useful have the details of this **specific material** been to you in your career as a software developer or software manager?

  Please leave blank if you know little about the material.

  - 0=Completely Useless
  - 1=Almost never useful
  - 2=Occasionally useful
  - 3=Moderately useful, but perhaps only in certain activities
  - 4=Very useful
  - 5=Essential

Question 4

Freie Universität Berlin

- How much **influence** has learning the material had **on your thinking** (i.e. your approach to problems and your general intellectual maturity), **whether or not you have directly used the details of the material?**

  Please consider influence on both your career and other aspects of your life.

  Please leave blank if you know little about the material.

  - 0 = No influence at all
  - 1 = Almost no influence
  - 2 = Occasional influence
  - 3 = Moderate influence in some activities
  - 4 = Significant influence in many activities
  - 5 = Profound influence on almost everything I do

Results: SE topics

Freie Universität Berlin

Category	Topic	Top (■) and bottom (▬) quartile and top (●) and bottom (◒) four topics, in terms of: Overall importance (Q3 + Q4)	Learned in education (Q1)	Learned on the job (or forgotten since education) (Q2 – Q1)
General software design	Data structures	●	■	
	Algorithm design	■	■	
	Software design and patterns	●		■
	Software architecture	●		
	Object-oriented concepts and technology	■		■
	Specific programming languages	●	●	
Software engineering methods	Requirements gathering and analysis	●		■
	Formal specification methods			
	Analysis and design methods	■		■
	Performance measurement and analysis			
	Testing, verification, and quality assurance	■		●
	Software reliability and fault tolerance			■
	Maintenance, reengineering, and reverse engineering		▬	●

Results: SE topics (2)



Results: CS and science topics

Freie Universität Berlin

Real-time and systems programming	Operating systems	■	■	
	Systems programming			
	Data transmission and networks			
	Parallel and distributed processing			
	Real-time system design		■	
Computer hardware	Digital electronics and digital logic		■	■
	Microprocessor architecture			
	Computer system architecture		■	
	Network architecture and data transmission			
	Telephony and telecommunications		■	
Other electrical and computer engineering	Analog electronics	■		■
	Digital signal processing	■	■	
	Data acquisition		■	
	Robotics	■	■	
	VLSI	■	■	
Computer science theory	Programming language theory		■	
	Formal languages		■	■
	Computational complexity and algorithm analysis		■	
	Information theory	■		

Results: CS and science topics (2)

Freie Universität Berlin



Results: Other topics

Business	Economics			
	Accounting		■	
	Marketing		■	
	Management			
	Entrepreneurship		■	
Psychology and philosophy	Psychology			
	Philosophy			
	Ethics and professionalism	■		■
Technical writing		■		■
People skills	Giving presentations to an audience	■		■
	Leadership	■	■	■
	Negotiation		■	■
Second language other than English		■		■

Results summary

Freie Universität Berlin

- Some topics appear to be much over-emphasized in the formal education compared to perceived later usefulness
  - e.g. continuous mathematics

- Others appear much more important in practice than the education reflects, in particular
  - software management
  - people skills
  - requirements gathering
  - quality assurance

Internal validity problems

Freie Universität Berlin

- Self-selection bias
  - Maybe many participants just wanted to lament about their education?
- Subjective answers
  - Real amount of knowledge or usefulness is unknown
- 15% answers from respondents without formal degree
- Scale violations:
  - Taking the difference Q2-Q1 (knowledge now minus originally learned) requires equal-sized difference scales
  - Forming the sum Q3+Q4 (usefulness plus influence) requires equal-sized ratio scales
    - What does the sum mean anyway?

How good is the credibility overall?

External validity problems

Freie Universität Berlin

- Some of the answers strongly reflect north-american curricula
- Importance of topics is continually shifting over time!
  - some parts of the snapshot may already be obsolete
- What mix of software industry branches is represented in the sample?

Generic survey method

Freie Universität Berlin

1. Decide on objectives
2. Select a target population
3. Design the survey instrument (questionnaire)
4. Administer the survey
   - supervised, unsupervised, or semi-supervised
5. Collect, validate and analyze the data
6. Answer the research questions

1. Decide on objectives

Freie Universität Berlin

- A good understanding of the survey goals is required to select a compact set of questions
  - Too-long questionnaire will reduce number of respondents and may reduce the quality of the answers
- Surveys are suitable for measuring attitudes, much less suitable for determining factual situations

Basic types of objectives:

- Cross-sectional: snapshot
  - What is the status now?
- Longitudinal: cohort observation
  - How does the status change over time?
    - Requires multiple rounds of surveying with the *same* participants
- Retrospective: explanation
  - What are the reasons for the status ?

2. Select a target population

Check questions:

- What kind of respondents do I need to reach my goals?
  - Need to use language/terminology appropriate for them
- How many such respondents do I need?
  - Is that realistic with acceptable effort?
- How can I reach these people?
- How can I motivate them to participate?
  - What response rate should I expect?

- How many irrelevant or distortive participants should I expect?
  - Can I recognize these from their answers and sort them out?
- So where and how should I advertise my study?

3. Design the survey instrument (questionnaire)

Freie Universität Berlin

- Search for similar, previously used questionnaires
  - Sociologists call them "instrument": development is difficult
  - Analyze them (and the experience made) and adapt them
    - Piece your questionnaire together from multiple sources

If you need to design your own:

- Minimize the number of questions
  - Standardize the response format where possible
    - e.g. stronly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree
- Design each question carefully (see next slide)
- Put the demographic questions at the end
  - So people already know what information they have provided
  - So they are less likely to drop out near the end
- Ask for global comments on both the topic of the survey and the survey itself

Design the instrument: questions

Freie Universität Berlin

For each question, make sure you have:

- Clear purpose
  - Respondent must understand the role of the question in the context of the survey and for the goals of the survey
- Single purpose
  - A question must not mix two issues
- Complete, precise, unambiguous formulation
  - Use simple and complete sentences
    - What is simple depends on the population
    - Avoid jargon and specialized terminology
      - e.g.: *"How would you rate your training/education experiences regarding co-occurring disorder clients to date?"*
    - Avoid negations
  - What exactly does the question refer to?
    - time, context, entity/attribute
  - What not?

Design the instrument: question types

Freie Universität Berlin

- Open questions:
  - Respondents formulate their own answer
  - Advantages:
    - wider spectrum of possible insights
    - less dependent on prior knowledge of questionnaire designers

- Closed questions:
  - Respondents choose among fixed answer categories
    - e.g. single choice, multiple choice, numeric, date
    - Never forget the category "don't know"/"none of these"/"does not apply"
  - Advantages:
    - easy quantitative evaluation
    - reduced ambiguity, less danger of irrelevant answers

Design the instrument: validation

Freie Universität Berlin

Any questionnaire must be pilot-tested (e.g. by exit interviews):

- (in particular for unsupervised surveys)
- Find out whether overall purpose is clear
  - and why the participant should be motivated
- Find out whether purpose and formulation of all questions are clear
  - Detect ambiguities
  - Detect obscure terminology etc.
- Find out if time to complete is acceptable
- Find out whether layout and user interface are acceptable

Never forget pilot-testing after the very last 'correction'

Design
the instrument: validity, reliability

Freie Universität Berlin

- Validity
  - The degree to which the instrument really measures what it was designed to measure
  - Assessing validity is methodically quite difficult and is beyond the scope of this course
    - See a textbook on social science research methods

- Reliability
  - The degree to which the instrument will give the same results when used in the same circumstances
    - if reliability is low, validity will be limited
  - Assessing it requires a number of respondents answering the questionnaire again after some time (e.g. a few weeks)
    - questions that are difficult to decide for the respondents typically lead to low reliability

4. Administer the survey

Freie Universität Berlin

Basic types of administration:

- Supervised
  - An interviewer asks questions, answers clarification questions, and records answers (one-on-one, e.g. telephone)
- Unsupervised
  - The participant is completely on his/her own with the questionnaire (e.g. web-based)
  - Issues: multiple participation, question misunderstandings, joke answers, random answers
- Semi-supervised
  - An interviewer gives some introduction to a group of participants and answers questions, but the filling-in is unsupervised

5. Collect, validate and analyze the data

Freie Universität Berlin

Tasks:

- Collect data into machine-readable form
  - Avoid/detect mistakes when typing in paper questionnaires
- Validate data:
  - Detect and remove duplicates (e.g. sent by email or http)
  - Detect invalid responses (needs consistency check questions)
  - Detect ambiguous questions (by incoherent answer structure)
- Perhaps balance the respondent set:
  - If some subgroups are over-represented,
    - either sample a subset from each of these (if you have enough data)
    - or weight subsets differently during analysis
- Analyze

6. Answer the research questions

Freie Universität Berlin

When drawing conclusions from a survey

- keep in mind the limitations of your sample
  - in particular non-representativeness
- keep in mind possible validity problems such as
  - bias in the questions,
  - bias in the answers,
  - ambiguities and misunderstandings

Summing up: Surveys

Freie Universität Berlin

- Surveys can be a low-cost means of collecting interesting information
  - They can be cross-sectional, longitudinal, or retrospective
- Try to reuse or adapt existing questionnaires where possible
- Carefully design and validate in any case
- Watch out for sampling bias!
  - You will almost always have some
  - but if you do not understand what it is, your data becomes dubious

Thank you!