Senseo - Questionnaire

1. How did you feel about the time pressure?

Result:

Time pressure was very high; impossible to cope with all tasks	**5**	Arith. mean: 2.80 (n = 30)
Serious time pressure, but could cope with most tasks	.	STD: 0.42 (n = 30)
Felt no time pressure	.	Arith. mean Senseo group: 2.67 (n = 15)
Could have done slightly more task in the time provided	.	Arith. mean control group: 2.93 (n = 15)
There was too much time, could have performed many more tasks in these 90 minutes	**1**	

2. Please rate the difficulty of the different tasks:

Result:

	impossible (5)	difficult	average	simple	trivial (1)	Arith. mean (n = 30)	STD (n = 30)	Arith. mean Senseo group (n = 15)	Arith. mean control group (n=15)
Task 1.1						3.2	0.69	3.0	3.4
Task 1.2						2.8	0.41	2.7	2.9
Task 2.1						3.6	0.25	3.1	4.1
Task 2.2						2.4	0.31	2.5	2.3
Task 3.1						3.2	0.56	3.2	3.2
Task 3.2						3.5	0.41	3.1	3.9
Task 4.1						3.1	0.27	3.0	3.2
Task 4.2						3.2	0.19	2.9	3.5
Task 5.1						2.8	0.86	2.7	2.9
Task 5.2						2.9	0.72	2.9	2.9
					Overall:	**3.07**		**2.9**	**3.2**

The following questions are only answered by subjects from the Senseo group.

4. Please specify for each task which dynamic information provided by Senseo you used.

	Run-time types (Tooltip)	Number of invocations	Number of created objects	Number of exec. bytecodes	CCRC	Dyn. Collaborators
Task 1	33%	53%	33%	27%	7%	53%
Task 2	47%	67%	47%	33%	7%	80%
Task 3	47%	40%	27%	20%	0%	73%

Task 4	20%	27%	13%	7%	0%	33%
Task 5	27%	40%	27%	13%	7%	27%

(Results in the table, n = 15)

5. How useful do you rate dynamic information resp. features provided by Senseo in a scale from 4 (very useful) to 0 (not useful at all)?

Dynamic information / Senseo feature	very useful (4)	useful	some limited usefulness	barely useful	not useful (0)	Arith. Mean (n = 15):	STD (n = 15)
Tooltip showing run-time types						3.6	0.45
Ruler column with dynamic metrics						3.2	0.38
Overview ruler column with dynamic metrics						3	0.41
Package tree with dynamic metrics						2.4	0.29
CCRC						2.1	0.94
Collaboration View						3.7	0.11

6. Concerning the overall performance of Senseo, do you think it provided you with added value in terms of:

	Yes	No	Result (yes-percentage, n = 15):
High-level understanding (eg. package-level collaboration)			87%
Low-level understanding (method structure, collaboration, control flow, etc.)			73%
Understanding dependencies between different artifacts			80%
Feature localization, feature understanding (identifying and understanding artifacts implementing a specific feature)			67%
General program understanding			73%
Performance assessment or optimization			53%
Software qualitiy assessment			53%

8. After using Senseo, do you think it provides you with added value for your daily work on maintaining or developing software systems?

	Yes	No	**Result (yes-percentage, n = 15):**
			87%

Thanks for participating in the experiment and for completing this questionnaire!