





An evaluation of Diagnosis in a Learning Environment for Object-Oriented Modeling

Ludovic AUXEPAULES, Dominique PY

LIUM - Laboratoire d'Informatique de l'Université du Maine (France)

ICALT 2010 - July 7th 2010



lium

Context of this work

ŶD↓

- Project of the LIUM laboratory: « Interaction and knowledge »
- Participants: Dominique Py, Mathilde Alonso, Thierry Lemeunier and Ludovic Auxepaules
- Goal of the project: designing models, methods and tools for object-oriented modeling learning environments
- **Application:** the *Diagram* environment

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

lium

Outline

ICAU

• The *Diagram* environment

ŶD↓

- The ACDC matching method
 (Automatic Class Diagrams Comparator)
- A diagnosis example produced by ACDC
- An ACDC evaluation with *Diagram* used on ecological context
- Conclusions and perspectives

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

lium

The *Diagram* environment

ŶD↓

- An open UML class diagrams editor
 - Allowing the student to work with the problem text and the diagram together
 - Providing specific interaction modes and help features for novice users
- A three-step method for solving modeling problems







Example of feedback messages in Diagram



The proposition of diagnosis within Diagram

Modeling and *Diagram* contexts

₹D.

- Diagnosis in our context: the system ability to analyse student's answers
- No pedagogical solver in open-ended domains like modeling
- Calculus time should **be fast enough** for synchronous pedagogical feedbacks
- A diagnosis based on a models matching method
 - Comparison of the **diagram built by the learner** with **a reference model** supplied by an expert
 - Production of **a differences list** between the models (no errors)

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives



• An automatic and customizable matching method [Auxepaules 09]



- An hybrid matcher that combines
 - String-based similarity of namespaces and type similarity constraints
 - Element-level and structure-level matching techniques [Shvaiko & Euzenat 05]
- Univalent or multivalent mappings at all model granularity levels
 - It fully or partially matches **one or more** structures of a model to **one or more** structures of another model and mutually

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

3 sequential steps of ACDC matching method



Schematization of inputs models into structural patterns (simple or complex)

 \rightarrow Trees and graphs algorithms : search, cover and sort of roots, leafs, ways...

Evaluation of local similarities and differences of each patterns couple per type

- \rightarrow Similarity function that combines lots of criteria: names, context, specific properties...
- Choice of one mapping of models patterns and differences

 \rightarrow Greedy process without backtracking

ŶD↓

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives



Our differences taxonomy [Auxepaules 09]

- Univalent difference: partial match of two single patterns (1:1 matching cardinality)
- Multivalent difference: partial match of a patterns group (n:m matching cardinality)



 Those differences are converted into pedagogical differences for elaborating feedback messages [Py *et al.* 08]

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

A diagnosis example produced by ACDC

ŶD↓



- 12 full univalent matches (without structural differences)
- 4 main content and structural differences used by *Diagram* to produce pedagogical feedback messages

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

Example of a compound difference



ŶD↓ ≮--



Differences identified by ACDC				Pedagogical feedb	acks
{have (bodyfelt pen) has (bodypen)} SPLIT					
{has (Body <i>Pencil</i>)}					
{have (bodyfelt pen)} TRANSFER LOWER				unlightion and transfer of a	rolationabin
{has (Body <i>Pencil</i>)}		L		relationship	
{has (bodypen)} TRANSFER LOWER					
{has (Body <i>Pencil</i>)}					
Diagram environment	ACDC matching method	Diagn exam	osis ple	ACDC evaluation	Conclusions and perspectives

Example of an other compound difference

	used	Pencil		
person		color brand name	00	ay
· · · · · · · ·	· · · · ·	1	have	· · ·
· · · · · · · ·	pen	felt po	en has	
Student's diagram		eraser fe	lt-pen	

2 D ↓ **€** --

ICALT.



Differences identified by ACDC	Pedagogical feedbacks
{felt pen::top} REPLACEMENT {Top} {felt pen::top} INCOMPATIBLE_NATURE {Top}	Misrepresentation of a class and omission of linked
OMISSION {belongs to (Person <i>Pencil</i>)}	elements

Diagram	ACDC	Matching	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

(a class instead of an abstract class)

Example of two simple differences

↑D €

| {Pencil} NOT_ABSTRACT_TO_ABSTRACT {*Pencil*}

ICALT.

person used Pencil body brand name pen felt pen top has Student's diagram	Person uses Pen Pen Felt-Pen A Reference diagram
Differences identified by ACDC	Pedagogical feedbacks
OMISSION {belongs to (PersonPencil)}	Omission of a relationship
{Pencil} VOID { <i>Pencil</i> }	Misrepresentation of a class

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

1st evaluation of ACDC within *Diagram*

Previous evaluations

PD

- Tests of usability, interaction and pedagogical functionalities of *Diagram* (without diagnosis system) [Alonso *et al.* 08]
- Off-line evaluation of ACDC (not in *Diagram*) [Auxepaules et al. 2008]
- Protocol of the evaluation of ACDC within *Diagram*
 - 18 novice students in 2nd year of University (DEUST)
 - 4 practice sessions of 3 hours of modeling in *Diagram*
 - Reference diagrams built by OOM teacher
 - Sessions, built diagrams, diagnosis calls and feedbacks have been recorded
- Evaluation of feedback messages reported in [Alonso & Py 09]

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

Match quality measures

PD

- Comparison of the automatically identified matches (ACDC outputs) with the manually determined real matches
 - *False positives A* : matches needed but not identified by the matcher
 - *True positives B* : correct matches automatically predicted by the matcher
 - *False negatives C*: matches falsely proposed or mistyped by the matcher
- Measures of quality [Do & Rahm 07] [Giunchiglia et al. 07] [Melnik et al. 02]
 - *Precision* = $|B| / (|B| + |C|) \rightarrow$ an accuracy or fidelity measure
 - $Recall = |B| / (|B| + |A|) \rightarrow a$ completeness measure
 - F-Measure \rightarrow an harmonic mean of Precision and Recall
 - *Overall* = $(|B| |C|) / (|B| + |A|) \rightarrow$ an evaluation of the post-match effort needed for adding missed matches and removing false ones

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

lium

Results at the diagram level

Number and % of diagnosis calls where	Precision	Recall	F-Measure	Overall
Quality Measure Result = 1 (best)	103	60	55	55
	71.6%	41.7%	38.2%	38.2%
0.85 ≤ Quality Measure Result < 1	30	65	78	59
	20.8%	45.1%	54.2%	41%
0.7 ≤ Quality Measure Result < 0.85	11	19	10	22
	7.6%	13.2%	6.9%	15.3%
Quality Measure Result < 0.7	0	0	1	8
	0%	0%	0.7%	5.5%

• Good results for the 144 diagnosis calls (144 different student diagrams)

- **38%** of diagnosis calls outputs are perfect
- More than 92% of diagnosis calls outputs are relevant at 85%
- At least one mismatch on only **28%** of 144 diagnosis calls
- At least one omited match on 58% of 144 diagnosis calls
- Diagnosis calculi time from 0.2s to 6s with an average of 2s

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

Results by type of structural differences

ŶD↓

Differences	A: false negatives	B: true positives	C: false positives	Precision	Recall
Split	43	71	23	0.76	0.63
Merge	6	47	22	0.68	0.89
Void	31	3069	52	0.98	0.99
Replacement	62	416	33	0.93	0.87
Transfer	141	133	18	0.88	0.49
Total	283	3736	148	0.96	0.93

- Most of matches are **strict** (without difference of structure)
- Results related to the biggest structure alterations of models are well
 - 70% of multivalent matches are identified and 72% are correct

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives



- Precision and Recall trends of ACDC decrease according to the number of differences between compared diagrams
- Precision results are better than Recall Results

ADI K-

ICAL

A wrong match can replace one or more correct matches

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives

lium

Conclusions and perspectives

TD

- An evaluation overview shows that ACDC worked fairly well but requires to be improved in some specific situations
- Use of several reference diagrams to analyze the student's diagram
 - Complete / part of diagrams and correct / erroneous diagrams
 - ACDC can already compare more than two models and choose one reference at the end of the 2nd step of similarities and differences patterns evaluation
- Extend to others kinds of model or domains
 - Direct transposition for Entity-Relationship models of Data-Bases
- Use of ACDC system outputs in other context : teacher needs

Diagram	ACDC	Diagnosis	ACDC	Conclusions and
environment	matching method	example	evaluation	perspectives







Thank you for your attention

