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ABSTRACT
Programmers must draw explicit connections between their code and runtime state to properly assess the correctness of their programs. However, debugging tools often decouple the program state from the source code and require explicitly invoked views to bridge the rift between program editing and program understanding. To unobtrusively reveal runtime behavior during both normal execution and debugging, we contribute techniques for visualizing program variables directly within the source code. We describe a design space and placement criteria for embedded visualizations. We evaluate our in situ visualizations in an editor for the Vega visualization grammar. Compared to a baseline development environment, novice Vega users improve their overall task grade by about 2 points when using the in situ visualizations and exhibit significant positive effects on their self-reported speed and accuracy.
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INTRODUCTION
Programmers perform a variety of high-level tasks during the software development process, including authoring, testing, debugging, and reviewing code [22]. Many popular development environments include specialized tools to support these tasks. For example, techniques such as logging, replay [5, 18, 28], and breakpointing interactively surface the internal state of the program, and are used to pinpoint specific lines of code responsible for the runtime behavior.

However, these existing techniques must be explicitly invoked and are presented to programmers in separate, coordinated views. Studies have shown that switching between these views imposes a burden on developers, making it difficult for them to maintain a clear picture of the overall context of the runtime behavior [22, 27, 29, 31]. This separation is particularly problematic when programmers are immersed within a particular task — they may overlook details that would be obvious with an alternative view [31]. Expectations about the desired behavior may additionally cause programmers to overlook errors when the behavior diverges from expectation.

We hypothesize that automatically surfacing contextually relevant information directly within a code editor can help programmers better understand runtime behavior. We contribute in situ visualizations of program behavior intended to narrow the gulf of evaluation for software development tasks. We present a design space of embedded visualizations for interactive applications that visualize time-varying variables. Snapshots of the program state highlight the exact value of scalar variables, or the underlying distributions of set variables. We further contribute criteria for the placement of code augmentations based on trade-off metrics. Interactive visualizations of the program state can enable richer interactions within the development environment and present runtime information as a first-class component of the code authoring process.

We evaluate our in situ visualizations in an editor for the Vega visualization grammar [32]. In an evaluation with 18 novice Vega users, we found that participants improved their overall task grade by about 2 points when using the in situ visualizations. When reflecting on their experience, participants showed significant positive effects on their self-reported speed and accuracy. Participants found the visualizations particularly useful for understanding the dynamic behavior of the code.
RELATED WORK
This research is motivated by three areas of related work: empirical studies of programmers, program visualization and debugging, and text and environment augmentation.

Empirical Studies of Programmers
Many debugging tools utilize separate coordinated views, which require programmers to intentionally switch between code authoring and debugging tasks. However, this required shift of the programmer’s focus can incur a high context switching cost and interrupt the programmer’s flow.

Flow [27] is a well-studied topic from the field of psychology and describes the state in which an individual “operates at full capacity.” While “in flow,” programmers may introduce but overlook errors in their code. Saff & Ernst [31] describe a model of developer behavior where the phase in which programmers have unknowingly introduced an error is called “ignorance.” Across two development projects, Saff & Ernst [31] found that Java programmers were ignorant of program errors for about 17 minutes on average (and sometimes more than 90 minutes). Identifying these errors requires programmers to switch from code authoring to debugging: Ko et al. [22] found that programmers spend 5% of their development time switching between tasks on average. We hypothesize that by visualizing program state in situ, programmers will be more aware of the impact of code changes and thus reduce the time spent ignorant of errors or switching between tasks.

Once an error has been introduced, programmers must invest time to find and fix the error. Ko et al. [21] found that programmers spend 46% of their time debugging. Saff & Ernst [31] found a significant relationship between the “ignorance time” of an error and the amount of time needed to fix it. Parmin & Rugaber [29] studied the time required to resume program after an interruption and found that 30% of programming sessions had a lag of over thirty minutes between entering the session and authoring new code, potentially as a result of extensive debugging tasks. By surfacing program state earlier in the process via in situ visualization, we hope to reduce the time span between introducing and fixing errors.

Program Visualization and Debugging
Program visualization can facilitate both educational and debugging tasks. The Online Python Tutor [14] visualizes objects, variables, and stack frames allowing students to inspect the runtime state of their code. The Online Python Tutor has been used by over 3.5 million people and has been extended to support additional languages including JavaScript and C. Algorithm visualizations [4, 8, 33] can illustrate the behavior by visualizing each step in the algorithm and have been shown to improve understanding of the behavior [13].

Many debugging tools provide coordinated views to display relevant system information and facilitate tracing of the execution history. The Whyline [20] visualizes the path of runtime actions relevant to a “why” or “why not” question about the runtime behavior. Timelapse [5] visualizes web event streams and displays linked views of internal state information; breakpoints allow programmers to trace state information to particular parts of the original source code. FireCrystal [28] emphasizes the connection between code and runtime behavior by extracting the relevant CSS, HTML, and JavaScript code responsible for behaviors on a web page. Hoffswell et al. [18] describe visual debugging techniques that show the history of interaction events and relationships within the code to debug interactive visualizations. Our system provides a more direct link between program state and source code by directly augmenting a code editor with visualizations of program behavior.

Theseus [23] similarly narrows the connection between runtime behavior and code by displaying visualizations of program calls alongside the source code and call stack. In situ visualizations of program behavior have been developed for a variety of programming topics including code properties such as the edit history or code author [15], variable read/write accesses [1], performance behavior [2], and real-time programming tasks [34]. Bret Victor [36] describes design considerations for a programming system to support program understanding tasks aided by both code annotations and visualizations. Our work contributes to this body of work by presenting design considerations for the incorporation and placement of generic augmentations within code. We further describe the design space for visualizations of program state and temporal changes to program variables.

Text and Environment Augmentation
Text augmentations display supplemental information to support or extend the text [6, 38], Tufte [35] identified sparklines as a way to incorporate small, data-rich visualizations into text. Goffin et al. [9] have generalized this idea to include any form of word-scale graphics. Goffin et al. [10, 11] additionally present design considerations for the placement of word-scale graphics and for incorporating interactions. Willett et al.’s scented widgets [37] augment standard navigational widgets with visualizations of page visitation or content engagement. Such visualizations help orient users within the space of content and help them to engage with underutilized content. Our work similarly aims to attract user attention to areas of interest by providing contextually relevant visualizations of program state that highlight interesting trends in the runtime behavior.

USAGE SCENARIO
Programmers often have a set of implicit assumptions about how their code will behave, which reflect their original intentions when writing the code. Consider a case in which a programmer is creating a scatter plot visualization that supports panning and zooming. The programmer may define xMin, xMax, yMin, and yMax values that track the view port position and update based on how much the user has dragged. These values can then be used to determine the current domain for each axis (xDomain and yDomain). The programmer decides to vary the point size based on the relative zoom level, using the span of the xDomain as a proxy. However, the programmer accidentally introduces an error where the xMin and xMax values are mutually dependent and therefore cause the xDomain to stretch as the user pans the visualization. With the code wired up to use all the variables, the programmer may begin testing the output via interaction.
The programmer starts by performing pan operations to see how the visualization updates based on the changing values of the axis min and max \((x_{\text{Min}}, x_{\text{Max}}), (y_{\text{Min}}, y_{\text{Max}}),\) the computed domains \((x_{\text{Domain}}, y_{\text{Domain}}),\) and the point size. However, even while only panning, the scatterplot visualization seems to also zoom into the points. This behavior is surprising, as it does not reflect the programmer’s intentions. Looking at the dynamic code behavior indicated by the inline visualizations, the programmer notices that the size is increasing while panning. The size is based on the span of the \(x_{\text{Domain}}\) (which should not change while panning), revealing an underlying error in how \(x_{\text{Domain}}\) is computed: the \(x_{\text{Min}}\) and \(x_{\text{Max}}\) values are mutually dependent and thus produce an error when updated sequentially.

**DESIGN SPACE OF CODE-EMBEDDED VISUALIZATIONS**

In this section, we describe the design space of embedded visualizations (Figure 2). Programmers must understand the values of, and changes to, variables as their code executes. Thus, we decompose the design space into two types of visualized data (value and set) at two levels of detail (data and change) across two temporalities (snapshot and sequence). We also consider issues of interaction, size, and placement.

**DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

Code augmentations narrow the gulf of evaluation between the programmer’s code and the runtime behavior by surfacing contextually relevant information in situ. In this section, we describe three requirements that inform the design of effective in situ visualizations: they must be **comparable**, **salient**, and **unobtrusive**. These properties are motivated by prior work surrounding text augmentation and program visualizations.

In situ visualizations help programmers draw connections between variables in the code and their runtime behavior. Code augmentations should facilitate identification of important trends that can amend the programmer’s understanding of the runtime behavior. **Comparability** is particularly essential for understanding the overall behavior. Programmers need to interact with multiple visualizations to understand the behavior of different variables in the code. For example, on-demand linking [3] can enable the programmer to understand the relationships between different variables. When comparability is essential to the programmer’s current task (e.g., to compare the values of related variables), the augmentations should prioritize placement decisions that facilitate comparison across separate augmentations using alignment and shared axes [30].

The code augmentations should adopt to provide contextually relevant information for the programmer’s current task and should update their **salience** to attract the programmer’s attention to potential areas of interest. The placement [10, 38] and animation [16, 25] for a code augmentation influence the salience. The **temporality** (snapshot or sequence) of the augmentation impacts its utility for particular tasks.

The code augmentations must remain **unobtrusive** so they do not detract from the programmer’s primary task. The amount of text reflow and occlusion [10, 38] can increase the obtrusiveness of the code augmentations. The code augmentations should minimize changes to the position and visibility of the code when the programmer is actively reading the code. However, violating such layout concerns may better maintain the code structure or improve augmentation salience at the programmer’s periphery (e.g., while testing the program output).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Temporality</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Visualization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Exact Value</td>
<td>&quot;{x&quot;: 42, ...}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set</td>
<td>Snapshot</td>
<td>Heatmap</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Stacked Area</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. We identified ten visualizations for code augmentation based on the level of detail, variable data type, and temporality level of interest.

Figure 3. The "index_term" variable in this Vega [32] specification represents an object, so we select a representative property to visualize and differentiate the augmentation from others using color. On line 44, the programmer uses the index_term.price, so we choose “price” as the representative property. The selected key is also shown on mouseover.
Level of Detail: Data

For the data level of detail, the programmer is interested in understanding the exact value and underlying distributions of her program variables. We thus identified several visualizations to highlight properties of the data at different temporalities.

Value-Snapshot: Exact Value

When viewing a snapshot of the runtime behavior, we display the exact value of the variable. For variables representing a single object, we produce a simplified representation that shows a single property of the object (e.g., `{x: 42, ...};` the full object can be viewed on-demand (e.g., `{x: 42, y: 56}`).

Rationale. The programmer often has expectations about the type or value of variables. Displaying the exact value makes it easy to determine whether or not the value is of the expected type or near the expected value. Development environments often enable this check as an on-demand tooltip showing the current value [12]; whereas other development environments require the user to view this information via mouseover, our representation eliminates the need for interaction by surfacing the same information automatically.

Value-Sequence: Line and Horizon

Sequence representations emphasize comparisons across the history (or a subset of the history) of the program runtime. We identified two visualizations to show sequence data: a line chart and a horizon chart [17].

Design. For numeric values, we display the exact value over time. For categorical values, we position each category at its own point on the y-axis, which allows the programmer to view trends in the visitation history; for example, a sawtooth pattern indicates habitual revisitation of an earlier state. For arrays of values, we create a line for each element in the array, based on the value type.

The length of the history can quickly surpass the number of states that a programmer can easily reason over; in response, we found it useful to limit the number of states visualized as the program executes to a subset of the most recent states. We found that visualizing up to twenty states with the horizon chart provides a reasonably interpretable view of the data, using four layers (for both positive and negative values) [17]. However, the programmer can expand the time window on-demand to view a larger slice of the history.

Rationale. The horizon chart is particularly useful for comparisons across positive and negative values [17], whereas the line chart provides a more easily interpretable view of the overall trend. For categorical values, the line chart may be useful for visualizing patterns in the visitation history, but does not otherwise encode useful information in the y position.

Set-Snapshot: Histogram and Heatmap

To provide an overview of set variables, we identified two visualizations of the underlying distribution of set data: a histogram and a heatmap [17].

Design. For sets of numeric values, we arrange the values into uniformly sized bins. For categorical data, we compute distinct bins for each category and visualize the top n. We place all remaining values in a separate (“other”) bin and visualize it alongside the top n. The “other” bin is colored black and is drawn to scale up to the size of the largest bin in the top n. This representation allows the programmer to make comparisons among the largest bins while still representing all the data. In the histogram, different values in varying quantities. We visualize the top n (where n = 6) and thus place two values into the “other” bin.

We found that visualizations with a size of about eight pixels per bin are easily interpretable (as in the examples above) and can support interaction on the elements. Representations that push bars towards a width of two pixels make it harder to distinguish between bins or interact effectively.

Rationale. We recommend the histogram as the position encoding is a more effective representation than the color encoding in the heatmap [24]. We include the heatmap for its amenability to miniaturization, which we discuss later in the paper.

Set-Sequence: Line and Horizon

For set variables, the sequence representation needs to aggregate the underlying results to provide an informative summary of the behavior of the set variable over time. Similar to the value type, we visualize the aggregated sequence data as either a line chart or horizon chart.

Design. There are multiple ways to represent the value of set variables at the sequence temporality. For this work, we compute the variance of the dataset and visualize the difference in the variance between the current and previous points in the runtime behavior. Numerous aggregation measures could be applied, and the utility of these measures is highly dependent on the programmer’s task and requirements for the dataset.

As such, the programmer can configure the system to use the appropriate aggregation measure for her task.

Rationale. Our decision to use the difference in the variance was selected to show large shifts in the underlying distribution of the data between states in the program runtime. However, if the difference between states is of less interest, standard aggregations (e.g., mean or median) may be more appropriate. For set representations using the difference measure, we recommend using the horizon chart as it more strongly emphasizes large values and the direction of the change [17]. Horizon charts also provide a more easily interpretable view of small differences given the small size of the visualization.

Level of Detail: Change

At the change level of detail, the value and set data types are simplified to an indication of the level of change for the variable. For value variables, the change is a boolean indicator of whether or not the variable was updated between snapshots of the program runtime. For set variables, the change is defined as the number of elements that were added, modified, or removed. The change level of detail helps to attract the programmer’s attention to variables with dynamic updates.

Value-Snapshot: Indicator

The indicator shows whether a variable has changed in a particular snapshot (or period) of the runtime behavior.
**Design.** The indicator is either empty (☐) when no change has occurred or filled (●) when a change has occurred within snapshots of the program runtime. The indicator can be extended to provide additional information by displaying an arrow indicating the direction of the change or other glyphs.

**Rationale.** The indicator acts as a midpoint between the snapshot and sequence temporalities by showing a comparison of the current and previous states, or as a summary of the change in a set of states. This augmentation is the simplest proposed and provides a small indication of where the programmer may want to focus her debugging efforts when understanding changes in the runtime behavior.

**Value-Sequence: Tick and Timeline**
We identified two visualizations to show the history of changes to value variables: tick (●) and timeline (■).

**Design.** The timeline visualization shows a bar for each state where the variable is updated. In the tick visualization, a teal block (●) is shown when a variable is updated and a brown block (■) is shown for states when the variable is not updated.

**Rationale.** The tick visualization is based on Tufte’s baseball sparkline [35], whereas the timeline is motivated by the timeline from Hoffswell et al. [18]. For the change level of detail, we recommend the tick visualization as it provides a clearer indication of the behavior for every snapshot in the sequence. The tick visualization allows the programmer to inspect the value of a variable even when it has not been recently updated; for example, the programmer may be interested in the value when it is used but not updated (e.g., the variable represents a previously defined value and is only “read”). The redundant position/color encoding allows the programmer to easily extract the update status at a glance while also facilitating miniaturization. The timeline visualization may be more appropriate when the variable does not have a value during states when it was not updated (e.g., the variable only exists for states when it has been newly defined).

**Set-Snapshot: Modification Indicator**
Similar to the indicator, the modification indicator (■) shows changes to set variables by counting the number of elements added, modified, or removed at the current snapshot.

**Design.** The modification indicator creates a bar representing the number of elements that were added (●), modified (■), or removed (■) in the data. The starting point in the dataset labels all values as “added,” and displays changes from that point.

**Rationale.** This representation allows the programmer to understand the impact of transformations on set data at a more granular level than whether or not a change has occurred.

**Set-Sequence: Stacked Area**
We selected the stacked area chart (□) to show the changes within a set variable at the sequence temporality.

**Design.** The stacked area chart creates a band representing the number of values that were added (●), modified (■), or removed (■) in the data at each snapshot within the sequence.

**Rationale.** This representation allows the programmer to see information about the impact of transformations on set data over time. In particular, this behavior can help programmers understand when changes to a set variable are particularly expensive due to unnecessary additions or removals.

**Miniaturizations**
To reduce the **obtrusiveness** of the code augmentations, we designed miniaturizations for the visualizations. The miniaturization for the horizon chart and line chart is a smaller version of the horizon chart that appears as an underline of the text. The miniaturization for both the histogram and heatmap is a smaller version of the heatmap that appears as an underline of the text. For the tick and timeline visualizations, the miniaturization is a compacted version of the full visualization that appears as an underline of the text. We also use the compacted version of the tick visualization as the miniaturization of the stacked area chart. Each of these miniaturizations was designed to provide useful information similar to that of the larger chart that is amenable to the smaller size constraints. As the indicator is already small, and the exact value itself is important, we do not provide additional miniaturizations.

**Interaction**
We include a number of interactions to facilitate analysis of the visualizations and facilitate **comparisons** across representations. For the exact value representation, mousing over a simplified object augmentation (\{ “x”: 42, ... \}) displays the full object (\{ “x”: 42, “y”: 56 \}). For the line chart and horizon chart, mousing over the visualization shows a cursor and the value at the current point (\{ “x”: 81, “y”: 87 \}). To facilitate comparison between augmentations, holding shift draws a cursor and value for the current snapshot across all visible charts in gray. For augmentations representing an object simplification, the cursor displays the property name used for the visualization in addition to the full value (\{ “x”: 81, “y”: 87 \}).

For the histogram and heatmap, hovering over a bar shows additional details, including the range or value for the current bin and the number of elements. For visualizations representing a simplified object, the augmentation similarly shows the bin and count, but also shows the name of the property that is currently visualized (Figure 3). If the programmer holds shift while interacting with the histogram, the environment updates all the related visualizations to show the distribution relative to the programmer’s current selection (Figure 1).

Mousing over the tick and timeline visualizations highlights the snapshot and displays the value of the variable at that snapshot (\{ “x”: 81, “y”: 87 \}). To facilitate comparisons, holding shift highlights and displays the value for all visible augmentations. For the modification indicator and stacked area visualization, mousing over the visualization shows the number of elements, added, modified, or removed from the set variable (8, 1, 3).

**Visualization Size**
To support the **comparability** of augmentations throughout the code, we standardize the augmentation width, which is set
We identified twelve techniques for the placement of code augmentations (Figure 4) and assess each technique based on a set of design trade-offs. These placement options are an extension of the techniques presented by Goffin et al. [10].

**Placement Techniques**

The right and left placements position the augmentation immediately adjacent to the corresponding token. The above and below placement techniques ensure that the individual lines of code maintain their original structure, but may introduce new whitespace lines and increase the overall code length. The inline-transparent and inline-opaque placements draw the augmentation over the corresponding token, thus requiring interaction to improve legibility for the visualization or code.

To satisfy the need for unobtrusive augmentations, we include the placement techniques: expand-inline and expand-below. These placement techniques require the augmentation to include a miniaturization that displays the augmentation as an underline of the text. Hovering over the token expands the augmentation as either inline-opaque or below. However, unlike below, expand-below does not add a whitespace line and instead draws the augmentation over the existing code so as not to require additional spacing in the code.

The inline-start and inline-end placement techniques position augmentations on the same line, but not adjacent to their corresponding tokens. The inline-start placement leverages the code indentation to place augmentations in the whitespace at the start of the line. The inline-end placement maintains the full readability of the line, using the augmentations as the final punctuating marks. As multiple tokens may occur on the same line, the augmentations can either be placed adjacent or overlapping, but some interaction is required to relate augmentations back to their corresponding tokens.

The left-margin and right-margin placement techniques separate the augmentations from the token by placing them in the margin of the code editor but improve **comparability** across augmentations. When multiple augmentations exist on the same line, they overlap in the margin, thus requiring additional interaction to select the augmentation of interest.

**Placement Trade-off Metrics**

For each placement technique described in this section, we discuss trade-offs in the application of the technique with respect to the reflow requirements, line spacing, augmentation width, vertical alignment, and occlusion. We provide a brief description of each metric and include the results in Figure 4.

- **reflow** The code must reflow inline to make space for the augmentation, thus changing the length of the code.
- **spacing** The code must add additional space between lines to include the augmentation, thus changing the length of the document.
- **occlusion** The augmentation partially or fully occludes the code, thus requiring interaction to improve legibility of the augmentation or code.
- **width** The augmentation must be of a variable width to fulfill the placement requirements.
- **alignment** The augmentation will be vertically aligned with other augmentations in the document.

**Reflow**

The left and right placement techniques introduce reflow changes inline to make space for the visualization. Depending on the programming language used, these changes...
may be minimal due to the amount of existing whitespace and structure in the code. The inline-transparent and inline-opaque placement techniques may reflow for small tokens to improve the legibility of the augmentation by increasing its width. If many augmentations are on the same line, the inline-start placement may increase the indentation at the start of the line. All other techniques do not cause reflow changes.

Spacing. Only the above and below placements add additional spacing to the document. The impact of this additional spacing is highly dependent on the structure of the code; for augmentations where whitespace is already available above or below the line, we do not introduce a new line into the code but instead use the existing whitespace (Figure 4, Above).

Occlusion. The inline-transparent and inline-opaque placements occlude the token, thus requiring interaction to improve the legibility of the augmentation or code. For the expand-inline and expand-below techniques, the augmentations will not occlude the code when miniaturized, but will introduce some occlusion when expanded to their full size. The left-margin, right-margin, and inline-start techniques may introduce occlusion if the augmentations overlap when there are more than one on a given line. For the inline-end placement, augmentation can be positioned side-by-side to facilitate comparison. The above and below placements may need to handle occlusion with other augmentations on the same line, as described in [10]. Neither right and left occludes the text.

Width. The right, left, above, below, inline-start, inline-end, left-margin, right-margin techniques can use a standard width to facilitate comparisons. For the inline-transparent, inline-opaque, expand-inline, and expand-below techniques, the width must match the size of the token.

Alignment. The left-margin and right-margin augmentations will be aligned, thus facilitating comparisons. Using the inline-start placement can produce augmentations that are aligned based on the indentation depth of their tokens. All other techniques will not be aligned due to the original token position.

General Placement Guidelines
Based on our design considerations, the augmentations must be comparable, unobtrusive, and salient, such that they attract the programmer’s attention to interesting trends, without detracting from her ability to perform her current task.

The comparability of the augmentations is largely affected by their alignment and width. When the programmer needs to make fine-grained comparisons between augmentations, the margin-left and margin-right placements are ideal because they maintain the same temporal axis across augmentations.

The unobtrusiveness of the augmentations requires minimal changes to the code structure caused by reflow or additional spacing; large structural changes can be detrimental to the programmer’s ability to review the code [38]. Occlusion is also relevant to the programmer’s ability to read the code or extract information from the augmentations. When the unobtrusiveness of the augmentations is most important, we recommend using the expand-inline placement technique; this technique provides an indicator of what variables are changing while limiting changes to the visibility of the code.

The salience of the augmentations influences how easily the programmer’s attention is attracted to particular augmentations of interest. Whereas the expand-inline placement provides some indication of variable changes or distributions, it can easily be overlooked as it appears only as an underline. To better attract the programmer’s attention, we recommend using the right placement technique to produce a large augmentation near the source of the token. For tokens on the periphery of the programmer’s focus, the inline-opaque technique may be better so as to reduce reflow changes to the document.

EVALUATION: AUGMENTING THE VEGA EDITOR
To evaluate the utility of in situ visualizations for program understanding tasks, we conducted a user study with 18 programmers presented with unfamiliar programs written in the Vega visualization grammar [32]. To perform this evaluation, we identified in situ visualizations from our design space relevant to novice users and appropriate for Vega runtime state. We implemented these embedded visualizations as an extension to the online Vega code editor. In this section, we discuss our use of Vega and selected embedded visualizations, study methods, and experimental results. We have included the instructions, session script, task specifications, task questions, and post-task questionnaire in the supplemental material.

Background on Vega
Vega is a declarative grammar for specifying interactive visualizations. The relative simplicity of Vega was convenient for exploring the design space of in situ visualizations and strategies for the placement and automatic incorporation of embedded visualizations. However, many of Vega’s constructs are representative of properties of more general languages.

The programmer produces a Vega specification in JSON format that describes the data transformations, interactive behavior, and visual appearance of the output visualization. Signals are dynamic variables that capture interaction events on the Vega output and can be used throughout the Vega code to parameterize the behavior. Datasets represent collections of data tuples and can be representative of more complex data structures with arbitrary nesting and usage throughout the code. References to particular data fields extract a property from each tuple in the underlying datasets to be used as variables throughout the Vega specification. The runtime state can be represented by snapshotting the signal values.

The visual appearance of the output is specified via scales, axes, legends, and marks. Scales are functions that map from data values to visual properties, and can be visualized as axes and legends. Marks can be arbitrarily nested and dynamically initialized at runtime, thus representing complex data flows during program execution. Marks can be parameterized by both signals and data, with the help of scales to produce reasonable mappings from data fields to visual properties.

Implementation in the Vega Editor
To evaluate the utility of embedded visualizations, we identified several in situ visualizations appropriate for Vega vari-
In Situ Visualization Selection

We followed a simple rule-based process for selecting the type of in situ visualization to display for each variable in the Vega specification. For this implementation, we do not currently allow the visualization type to change once selected, though such automatic updates are an important part of future work.

Tooltip

Hovering over a data field or signal name to fully represent the variable. For signal variables that are initialized to null or are not a number at runtime, we selected the tick visualization rather than the timeline because the tick visualization explicitly represents each state in the program runtime and may thus be more informative for novice users. For example, the modification indicator or stacked area chart could be useful for visualizing tuple-specific changes to the underlying Vega datasets, which is useful for particular debugging tasks surrounding data transformations. As such, we did not evaluate these visualization types.

Participants

We recruited 18 students (7 female, 11 male) from our university, including both PhD (4) and undergraduate (14) students. Participant ages ranged from 18 to 30 (μ = 21.1, σ = 3.74). Participants completed a screening survey about their experience and programming language familiarity to ensure all participants had prior programming coursework or job experience. The most common programming language regularly used by our participants is Java, followed by Python, JavaScript, and C/C++. All of our participants were novice Vega users (i.e., were unfamiliar with Vega), though two participants had previously seen Vega in other contexts. Each participant received a $20 gift card for completing a 90 minute session.

Methods

Participants answered program understanding questions about two Vega programs, with and without the assistance of in situ visualizations of program behavior.

At the start, participants were given an instruction sheet with a sample Vega program, an explanation of the code, and an introduction to the development environment and important keywords. Participants were then given a training task in which they answered several sample questions and viewed the sample answers. During this time, participants were encouraged to ask any questions about Vega or the task setup. Once participants started the tasks, the researcher no longer answered questions.

For the study tasks, we selected four Vega programs that cover a range of visualization designs, datasets, and program understanding challenges, three of which exhibit an error.

Population

A population pyramid with a slider to select the year that is visualized. This Vega specification includes missing data for the year 1890, which causes derived data sets to be empty and the visualization to be blank at this point.

Index

A line chart of stock prices with an interactive cursor that selects an index point to which stocks are normalized to show investment returns. The Vega specification includes derived datasets and nested data declarations. An error in one

We implemented the visualizations using D3.js and utilized the Monaco API to extract tokens from the Vega code and insert the visualizations (see Figures 1, 3). Prior to inserting the visualizations, we performed a preprocessing step in which additional white space is inserted at the visualization position. We identified two types of variables in the Vega specification to visualize: signals (value variables) and data fields (set variables). Our implementation of embedded visualizations for the Vega editor is available at https://github.com/uwdata/code-augmentation.
of the data transformations causes all tuples to be filtered out at certain times, causing the lines to visually flatline.

Scatterplot. A scatterplot of points that supports infinite pan-
ning. This Vega specification includes many interconnected
signal definitions to define the interaction; due to a bug with
the evaluation order of signals, the domain of the axes be-
comes distorted while panning. This example is similar to the
one described in the Usage Scenario.

Overview. Two area charts showing stock price over time;
selecting a region in the smaller chart zooms the larger one.
This Vega specification includes many interconnected signal
definitions nested in the specification. There is no error.

Participants completed two tasks, one in each of two condi-
tions: baseline and visualization. In the baseline condition,
participants were given a simple code editor based on the on-
line Vega editor. Tooltips were added to the signal and data
field tokens in the code to show information about the runtime
state, similar to other common development environments. For
the visualization condition, the editor was additionally aug-
mented with our in situ visualizations of the program behavior.
Prior to the visualization condition, participants were shown
an instruction sheet with an explanation of the in situ visual-
izations and were encouraged to experiment with them using
the same visualization seen in the training task. We counter-
balanced the order of the conditions across participants. The
experimental protocol is shown in Figure 5.

Participants answered 18 program understanding questions for
each task about major Vega concepts, such as signals, data
sets, and data fields, which required participants to reason
about how the state of the visualization changed during in-
teraction. These questions encouraged participants to read
and experiment with the program to develop an understanding
of the interconnectedness and runtime behavior of the code.
Participants were also asked to identify any unexpected be-
havior in the Vega output and answer follow-up questions
about the source of that unexpected behavior; participants
were not informed that an error existed if they did not identify
it themselves. Participants provided free-form answers for
each question and a rating of their confidence on a scale from
1 (not confident) to 5 (extremely confident).

Participants finally completed a post-task questionnaire in
which they rated their self-perceived speed and accuracy on
the task questions on a scale from 1 (better with baseline con-
dition) to 7 (better with visualization condition). Participants
also scored how helpful, interpretable, and intrusive each of
the in situ visualizations were on a scale from 1 (not confident) to 5
(exremely). The larger scale for the speed and accuracy was
selected to encourage nuanced comparison of the conditions.

Quantitative Results & Analysis
To perform the analysis, we first created a gold-standard set
of answers for each task and scored participant answers on
an integer scale from 0 to 2 ("incorrect," "partially correct," "correct"). Scores were provided by the second author, who
was blinded to the study condition for each task. Final grades
were determined by simple summation.

We fit linear mixed-effects models for participants’ grades, log-
transformed task times, and average confidence. Each model
included fixed effects for condition and presentation order,
plus per-subject random intercepts. Likelihood ratio tests indi-
cated a marginally significant effect of the visualization condi-
tion on task grade (χ²(1) = 3.30, p < 0.1). Participants had
roughly one more “correct” (or two more “partially correct”) answers in the visualization condition overall. Exploratory
data analysis also indicated a strong difference in grades due to
education level, but with similar absolute grade improvements
in the visualization condition. There was a significant effect
of task order on the log time for participants to complete the
task (χ²(1) = 8.96, p < 0.01), with participants faster in the
second task regardless of condition. We found no significant
effect of condition or order on participant confidence.

For the post-task questionnaire, we used 1-sample non-
parametric Wilcoxon signed rank tests with a null hypothesis
that the result is neutral (middle Likert scale value). We found
significant positive effects in favor of the in situ visualiza-
tions for the participants’ self-reported speed (p = 0.002) and
accuracy (p = 0.0026).

Figure 6 depicts subject ratings of how helpful, interpretable,
and intrusive each of the visualizations were. We found a
significant positive effect for line visualization helpfulness
(p = 0.005) and a marginally positive effect for histogram help-
fulness (p = 0.186). We found a significant positive effect for
how interpretable the value (p = 0.003), indicator (p = 0.021),
and line (p = 0.015) visualizations were, and a marginally sig-
nificant positive effect for the histogram (p = 0.132). For the
intrusiveness of each visualization, we found a significant neg-
ative effect for the value (p = 0), indicator (p = 0.005), line
(p = 0.009), and tick (p = 0.031).

Qualitative Results & Discussion
We selected questions that would be reasonable to expect
participants to answer regardless of condition. The notable
significant effect of task order on the completion time suggests
some improved knowledge of the language and questions,
which helped participants know where to look. While we
did see a marginally significant effect of the visualization
condition on task grade, participants were generally able to
answer the task questions by reviewing the code and probing
the state information with the tooltip on signals and data fields.
The question answering process could be quite different between the two conditions. Question 8 asked participants to identify how each signal that updates is used throughout the code. In the baseline condition, P18 spent over 16 minutes attempting to identify how each signal in the specification behaved (Q8 median 3.65 min). In order to fully answer this question, P18 carefully experimented with different interactions, probing the signal value with the tooltip to identify when in changed. This back and forth between testing interactions with the output and assessing the state clearly demonstrated the disconnect between the code behavior and output.

Participants in the visualization condition similarly tested interactions, but could identify changes at a glance. As P2 put it: “the [in situ] visualizations allowed me to connect the dots between the code, its properties, and what it did.” When comparing the two conditions, P11 noted that “The biggest factor for me was just seeing which values change in real-time when interacting with the visualization.” Rather than reading the code or probing the state on-demand, participants could view changes as they worked rather than as a separate task.

We saw a significant positive effect in favor of the in situ visualizations on both participants’ self-reported speed and accuracy. Across conditions, participants utilized search to find keywords of interest. But, as P15 explains, “the code visualizations helped better locate the signals and made me more confident about my answers.” Moreover, the in situ visualizations turned the underlying data into a physical artifact to reason over. P2 noted that “I found it helpful to be able to interact with the data on a graphical, physical level.”

The error in the index chart can be a challenging one to reason about because it occurs due to a small difference in the date/time of the tuples in the dataset from the filter window. For most participants, it was clear that the error only occurred at certain dates in the visualization. However, the error was not with the signal itself. For P9, it became clear that the error was in the data because “when I mouse over the flatline behavior, the ‘index’ field changes and the [histogram] shifts to the left (next to the variable).” When interacting with the in situ visualization of the signal, P9 also correctly noticed that indexDate contained a time in addition to the date. While none of the participants correctly diagnosed the error in its entirety, P9’s observations were crucial steps towards uncovering the convoluted source of this error. The in situ visualizations provide a lightweight way to incorporate the underlying state into the program understanding process.

While the utility of in situ visualizations for interpreting interactive behavior was apparent, participants sometimes struggled to understand their contextual implications, particularly for the data fields. For instance, to understand the range of different data fields in the index chart, P9 inspected the visual encodings and noted “Oh, okay, I guess Microsoft... for some reason.” Although P9 identified that the data field only had one value (which was Microsoft), it was not clear why this was the case when other parts of the code showed the full range (e.g., all five companies). In this case, P9 had overlooked the nested dataset declaration; five different marks are dynamically created, but the embedded visualizations only show the results for one of them. To understand where each data field came from, participants needed a more intimate understanding of the implementation hierarchy and dataflow.

**LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK**

While Vega’s relative simplicity was convenient for evaluating the design space of in situ visualizations, we believe that Vega is an exemplar of a larger class of reactive languages, such as React [19] and Elm [7], for which these techniques could apply. For example, Elm [7] was originally designed as a reactive programming language that similarly utilizes the streaming constructs implemented (and visualized) in Vega.

Moreover, many of Vega’s constructs are representative of properties seen in other languages. The arbitrary nesting of mark definitions produces numerous examples of how scope can be a concern when referencing particular variables and how such environments are dynamically allocated at runtime. Since marks can be dynamically added and removed, the scope and number of instances can change as the programmer interacts. While the design space presented in this paper provides a breakdown of potential data types of interest, we do not currently address this underlying code structure. Furthermore, the use of object simplification and summarization in the embedded visualization shows one approach to handling complex nested data structures by emphasizing particular properties of interest. Future work should explore how interaction or other techniques might surface relevant scoping information or navigate complex nested data structures.

Vega’s reactive framework was useful for effectively snapshotting the program behavior for producing the in situ visualizations. While we do not propose advances in system logging, techniques such as Dolos from Burg et al. [5] enable efficient logging with minimal overhead for web programming. This infrastructure could provide an effective framework on which to introduce in situ visualizations for web development.

While in situ visualizations helpfully call attention to the dynamic behavior of program variables, it may be important to change their salience relative to the programmer’s current task. P14 noted that “I thought the code visualizations were cool and helpful, but they could also be a little distracting.” Future work should consider techniques to infer the programmer’s task and deploy in situ visualizations as needed.

In this paper we described the design space for embedded visualizations of program behavior, including design considerations for the placement of such visualizations within code. In an evaluation with novice Vega users, we found that participants improved their overall task grade by about 2 points when using the in situ visualizations and exhibit significant positive effects on their self-reported speed and accuracy.
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