Context in Programming: An Investigation of How Programmers Create Context
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ABSTRACT
A programming context can be defined as all the relevant information that a developer needs to complete a task. Context comprises information from different sources and programmers interpret the same information differently based on their programming goal. In fact, the same artifact may create a different context when revisited. Context, therefore, by its very nature is a "slippery notion."

To understand how people create context we observed six programmers engaged in exploratory programming and performed a qualitative analysis of their activities. We observe that the interactions with artifacts and a mapping of meaning from those artifacts for a programming activity determines how one creates context.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Programming, in particular the act of coding, does not occur in isolation. It involves ideating and exploring different solutions and using different types of information (in the codebase and from online/external resources) to complete a task. These relevant pieces of information, along with the programmer’s prior knowledge, creates a context that the programmer uses to solve the task.

In software engineering, 'context' has been described as the perspective gained from all relevant information obtained from these different sources. Although we intuitively understand context; it is a "slippery notion" [5]—hard to formally describe and define. It is dynamic in nature, morphing with every action and evolving along with changing goals.
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2 RELATED WORK
Context, while an intuitive concept, is very hard to define due to its highly dynamic nature. Schilit and Theimer [16] defined context in the "context-aware" computing domain as being various factors of a user such as location, time, and identity.

Brown [3] proposed a definition which included the characteristics of the user, the environment, and the application. However, these definitions are inclined towards static models of the factors that affect context, and assume very little interplay between them.

Models like Mylar [10] and Hipikat [4] capture various factors like the nature of programming tasks, artifacts, and the development environment. These models attempt to identify the context that directly or indirectly contributes to the programmers ability to construct meaningful software.

This kind of representational perspective of context is accurate for modeling software systems where the state of the program is the primary focus. However, these models can only answer "what can be used to represent context?" rather than "what is context?"

Pascoe [12] and Abowd et al. [1] propose perspectives that focus on the interactional nature of context—where context is a subset of
the physical and conceptual states of the user—the user’s emotions, attention, and informational states.

However, *interactional* context is difficult to operationalize due to the transitory nature and focus on users. Although Spyglass [17] was developed with this view of context to create a recommendation system; a model that accounts for the interactions is still missing.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

We conducted a lab study to observe six graduate students with professional programming experience performing a programming task. Their details are presented in Table 1. We provided participants P1-P5 with a prompt requiring planning, designing, and developing software to simulate a traffic intersection. This prompt had previously been used in other studies [11]. This prompt was easy to understand but nontrivial to implement, allowing us to observe participants’ use of context.

We additionally observed participant P6 working on a real-world problem involving development of his own IDE. We do so to contrast the results of participants who were working on a given prompt, from those that occur when a programmer is working on their own programming task.

Our participants provided a brief, but diverse subset of programming styles; P1 adhered to the Test-Driven Development (TDD) model, and P6 displayed a strong affinity for tinkering [2].

We time-boxed the study to one-hour, to prevent participant fatigue. Participants used their preferred development tools and programming language. They were also provided blank paper and given the option to think-aloud. P1 chose to think aloud, which we used to validate our interpretations of P1’s actions. We collected a diverse dataset: audio, screen recording, external notes.

To analyze the data, the first author unitized the screen recordings and audio transcripts into continuous time segments. Each unit contains a logically consistent group of related interactions that represent a small part of their programming task.

For each of these units, we identified the programming activity, the artifacts used, and their frequency. Table 2 lists the 11 programming activities we use in our analysis. The codeset builds on [18], with slight modifications to fit our task prompt: we changed *READING QUESTIONS* to *READING TASK PROMPT* (A4), and added *UPDATING DOCUMENTS* (A1).

Using this codeset, the first and the third authors obtained an Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) score of 97.14% and the first and the fourth authors obtained an IRR score of 92% when coding random segments from the selected participants dataset (which constituted ~14% of the raw data). The remaining 86% of the data was coded individually by the same authors.

### 4 STUDY RESULTS

Here we present our observations of how participants interact with the artifacts during specific activities. Our focus was to develop an understanding of how the context building process occurs, and gain insights into which factors play a role in shaping context.

We observe the types of artifacts that participants refer to during different programming activities. The participants interacted with 6 different types of artifacts: *source code files, documents* (task prompt), *IDE tools* (e.g.: *New Class* dialog box, *terminal*), *web resources* (e.g. search results, *Q&A pages*), *externalized artifacts* (e.g. paper diagrams), and *other* (e.g. calculators).

For each participant, we refer to source code files in the format C1, C2, etc., the prompt document is D1, IDE tools follow T1, T2, etc., web resources follow W1, W2, etc., and external artifacts as EX1. The numbering of these tags represents the sequential order in which participants encountered or interacted with them.

#### 4.1 Artifacts span heterogeneous medium

During our study, participants not only accessed code artifacts, but also tools within the IDE, online resources, and external documents to help them in their programming task. Here we discuss the different types of artifacts and the frequency in which they’re used.

Participiants, as can be expected, accessed the code artifacts most frequently when involved in their coding activity (A0). During their hour-long session, P1 accessed three source code files 87 times and P6 accessed four source code files 147 times.
The interactions with artifacts provide the information which guides an activity forward, sometimes causing a switch to different activity. In Figure 3.B, P6 looked through a stackoverflow.com (SO) page (W3). He is viewing web resources (A7), scrolling and intermittently pausing to read the answers on the page until he finds a probable answer. Then he switches to coding (A8), and for the next two minutes, continued to switch between the activities coding (A8) and viewing web resources (A7). Toward the end of this sequence of activities, P6 scrolled quickly to a desired section and copied the text before returning to code.

While the above examples are intuitive and simple, they shed light on how activity and interactions with artifact are closely tied together. They provide evidence to the notion that not only does context arise from the activity, but the programming activity and the goal behind it guide the specific type and amount of information obtained from the artifact.

4.3 Interaction includes Reflection

Participants evaluated the information within the artifacts that they accessed. Typically these evaluations coincided with prolonged interactions (e.g. long periods of scrolling or highlighting parts of an artifact). After such evaluation periods participants started to code. If participants found errors then they reflected on the information that they extracted from the artifacts.

We observed such cycles of Evaluation-Reflection in all sessions. Figure 3.B presents such a cycle for P6. He read through multiple answers on the SO page (W3), evaluating each one (marked by 'Evaluation' arrow). After selecting the most appropriate (perceived) solution, he started to code (A8) and run the code (A9). Following these steps multiple times as well as revisiting the selected answer on the page (W3). When the selected solution proved to be incorrect, he went back to the same (W3) page and spent 30 seconds (twice the time of previous visits) reflecting on the solutions and their appropriateness.

We saw a similar loop for P1; He sought help when implementing a feature (case class) as seen by his comment: "I don’t know how to do this". Thus, he read the scala documentation, evaluating the information on the page. After scrolling through the page multiple times he reflected that the solution would be too difficult and implementing it was not worth the effort for the task at hand: "How do I do this smartly?... fine, I’ll just do it with strings".

5 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Limitations: Like many other research papers based on formative analysis, our study has limitations. First, this was an exploratory
study that only included six participants recruited through convenience sampling. All participants had at least five years of programming experience, with three participants having three or more years of professional programming experience. Second, we collected different types of data across the participants—screen sharing was captured for all participants, but P4 included video of the participants face during the study and P1 provided think-aloud audio. Since our primary goal was to observe the interactions between participants and the artifacts they utilized during programming, screen capture data was the primary focus during our studies.

**Future Directions:** Our initial analysis reveals two future directions that we plan to pursue.

5.0.1 Using Information Foraging Theory to inform context creation. Context has been largely defined as all ‘relevant information’ that an individual needs to complete a task. We believe that Information Foraging Theory (IFT) constructs [6, 14] can help us model how programmers find information in an artifact and decide whether it is relevant as they carry out their tasks. IFT explains that the consumption of information is similar to how animals hunt for food—following scent of their prey and choosing more valuable prey through a cost-benefit analysis. We observed that participants engaged in such evaluation of artifacts and the information contained within when building context.

IFT has been applied in the programming domain to study how varying goals [13] affect the perceived value of information and how the (perceived) cost of ‘consuming’ information varies across different types of artifacts (e.g., web site vs. Q&A forum) [9]. We plan to build on these works to explore how IFT can help model programmers context building behavior.

5.0.2 Mapping and Memory Modeling. Our observations show that participants accessed artifacts and reflected on the information contained in them. Past work has alluded to how individuals perform “sensemaking” of information contained within artifacts to fit their (task) goal [8], but the process by which individuals map the information they find to the problem or solution space has not been modeled. Moreover, once a context has been built parts of the context (information) can be useful and recalled from memory for another (programming) task. Further studies are needed to understand how individuals recall snippets of context from other tasks to aid their current one or how temporality of actions may cause decay in memory and the ability to recall context.
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