

Supporting Active Learning by Introducing an Interactive Teaching Tool in a Data Structures and Algorithms Course

Tommy Färnqvist*
tommy.farnqvist@liu.se

Fredrik Heintz*
fredrik.heintz@liu.se

Patrick Lambrix*
patrick.lambrix@liu.se

Linda Mannila†*
linda.mannila@abo.fi

Chunyan Wang*
chunyan.wang@liu.se

*Department of Computer and Information Science
Linköping University
SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden

†Department of Information Technologies
Åbo Akademi University
Joukahaisenkatu 3-5 A
FIN-20520 Turku, Finland

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, theoretical foundations in data structures and algorithms (DSA) courses have been covered through lectures followed by tutorials, where students practise their understanding on pen-and-paper tasks. In this paper, we present findings from a pilot study on using the interactive e-book OpenDSA as the main material in a DSA course. The goal was to redesign an already existing course by building on active learning and continuous examination through the use of OpenDSA. In addition to presenting the study setting, we describe findings from four data sources: final exam, OpenDSA log data, pre and post questionnaires as well as an observation study. The results indicate that students performed better on the exam than during previous years. Students preferred OpenDSA over traditional textbooks and worked actively with the material, although a large proportion of them put off the work until the due date approaches.

Keywords

active learning; e-textbook; interactive textbook; data structures and algorithms

1. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, covering the theoretical foundations in a data structures and algorithms (DSA) course uses lectures followed by tutorials, where students practice their theoretical understanding on pen-and-paper tasks. In these courses, however, many concepts benefit from computer-based visualisation. Since the 1960s a multitude of tools and activities using visualisation have been developed for DSA courses, while didactic research investigating how to use such tools has become more common [13]. Until recently, though, there

was no all-in-one way to integrate these tools into a traditional DSA course. Now, the open project OpenDSA [9, 14], aims at providing such an integrated tool. Some of its main features are the following. OpenDSA is an e-learning tool that provides textbook quality text with links to a dictionary of important terms. It provides many code examples and step-by-step algorithm visualizations. Understanding of algorithms is supported by simulation exercises for the algorithms. After each section and each chapter, there are quizzes with multiple choice questions based on the main concepts that have been covered. All examples, exercises and quizzes are randomly generated which allows a multitude of practice possibilities. Students can obtain hints as well as automated and immediate feedback on exercises and quizzes. Further, OpenDSA automatically stores extensive log data about the students' interaction with the system. For more details on how OpenDSA works and its features we refer to Fouh et al. [9].

In this paper, we present findings from a pilot study on using OpenDSA as the main material in a course on data structures and algorithms. We wanted to design a setting that builds on two main pedagogical principles: (1) *active learning* [4], where we, by employing a blended learning environment, could give students more responsibility and control over their own learning; and (2) *continuous examination* with individual and immediate feedback. We begin by briefly describing the rationale and pedagogical underpinnings for using OpenDSA in the course. Next, we present our study and the methods and data collection instruments used, after which we present and discuss the results. The paper is concluded with some ideas for future work.

2. PEDAGOGICAL RATIONALE

Active learning [4] builds on constructivist principles, which require that students are active participants in their own learning process [2]. Instead of viewing learning as passive transmission of information from the teacher to the students, learning is considered an active process, in which students themselves construct the knowledge by building further upon their prior knowledge. Moreover, both constructivism and active learning are related to the cone of experience developed by Dale in the 1940s [7]. This model suggests that students retain more information by what they

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

SIGCSE '16, March 2–5, 2016, Memphis, TN, USA

© 2016 ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-3685-7/16/03...\$15.00

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2839509.2844653>

do (90%) compared to what they read (10%), hear (20%) or observe (30%). Consistent with this model, Ramsden [12] suggests that most students cannot learn unless they are actively involved.

In addition to being actively involved in their studies, students also need feedback on their work – learning requires practice with frequent feedback [5]. To decrease the risk of students developing misconceptions that hinder learning it is important to discover and address them quickly [5]. Visualizations and interactive exercises have the potential to increase student engagement [10], and material that is perceived as engaging also drives students to invest more effort in studying it [15].

Lately, interactive and electronic study material has become increasingly popular, partly through the introduction of massive open online courses (MOOCs). Students are provided continuous access to different types of material, examples and exercises. From a teacher and research perspective, this kind of computer based, interactive material makes it possible to gather large amounts of data, ranging from time stamped interactions (e.g., page loads and button clicks) to performance on different types of tasks [11]. These data can be used to gain insight into student activity and learning.

The interactive exercises in OpenDSA engage students and give them increased opportunities for practicing their knowledge through practical hands-on work (analyzing problems, working with varying types of data structures, as well as applying algorithms to different structures). Furthermore, the summary questions at the end of each chapter give students a way of forming their own opinion on how well they succeeded in grasping the current concept. This is needed since learners tend to overestimate how much they have learned [3].

3. OUR STUDY

3.1 The Study Setting

At the start of their second year, the CS majors at Linköping University used to take a DSA course (TDDC70) comprising 6 ECTS credits. TDDC70 was a traditional monolithic course, with lectures, pen-and-paper based tutorials, and programming assignments. The course was assessed via a written exam at the end of the course for 4 credits, graded (fail, 3, 4, 5), and programming assignments for 2 credits, graded pass/fail. Since 2014 they instead take an 11 credit course (TDDD86) where the DSA contents is the same as in TDDC70 (with a few smaller additions), with the rest of the credits spent on teaching C++ and a small introduction to programming paradigms. It is in the TDDD86 course we have deployed OpenDSA.

Within the TDDD86 course we tried to discern how to best use the system and changes to the organisation of the course to create a blended learning environment in line with our aims. The goal was to support an active learning style among students by giving the students more responsibility for, and control over, their own learning, as well as employing continuous examination with individualised feedback.

One of the important criteria when designing the new version of the DSA course was to give students the opportunity to work at their own, albeit steady, pace, through continuous individual examination with immediate feedback. The mechanisms for this are already in place within OpenDSA, but to give the desired change more support, we also changed

the examination of the course. Originally, the theoretical content of TDDD86 was supposed to be assessed by a written exam, comprising 5 ECTS credits, at the end of the course. We instead opted to split the exam credits in two parts: a two credit part for completing all assigned modules and exercises in OpenDSA, and a three credit part for an exam given at the end of the course. The OpenDSA exercises were to be completed by the students during non-scheduled time (compared to TDDC70, where tutorials were scheduled for doing paper-and-pen exercises). The new exam consisted of one computer-based part (using a small sample of the OpenDSA exercises used during the course) for which completion gave a passing grade (3) on the exam. For a higher grade (4, 5) the students needed to solve written problems testing deeper understanding of and connections between different DSA concepts.

3.2 Data Collection and Methodology

Our study involves data from four different sources; exam results, log data captured by the OpenDSA system, questionnaires, and an observation study. These are briefly described in the following:

3.2.1 Final Exam

We chose to include final exam results for TDDC70 from 2010–2013, since these had the same examiner as in TDDD86. Also, the written problems for a higher grade on the TDDD86 final exam were of the same types and estimated difficulty as the hardest types of problems used in the TDDC70 final exams.

3.2.2 Log Data

OpenDSA automatically stores extensive log data covering all interactions with the system. Hence, the data makes it possible to study aspects related to student behavior (how and when they study), student learning (performance on different types of exercises) and technical aspects (platforms and browsers used). A thorough overview of all data stored can be found on the OpenDSA web site (<http://algoviz.org/OpenDSA/Doc/manual/DatabaseSchemas.html#exercise>). The data can be used to investigate very specific issues related to these three areas. In this study, we have focused on log data related to student activity – how often they have used the material and at what times.

3.2.3 Questionnaires

To study the experience and attitude among the students toward interactive textbooks in general and our material specifically we conducted two online surveys. The first survey was distributed electronically to all the students at the start of the course and the second survey after the end of the course. The first survey was answered by 54 of 130 students (42%), while 35 students (27%) the second survey. Our experience from other studies in previous courses is that it is harder to get students to answer a questionnaire after the end of the course, there are of course also fewer active students as some have dropped out.

3.2.4 Observation study

We decided to use an observation study as it allows us to gather data in the specific setting to be studied [6], which in our case is that the students use the interactive book

for studying. We used two nonparticipant observers. One of the observers has domain knowledge (former teacher in the area) while the other observer has no domain knowledge (language teacher). We expected the observers to focus on different things. The observers took descriptive as well as reflective notes.

Six students, five males and one female, participated in the observations. They were paid volunteers. For privacy reasons, in the remainder of this paper we refer to each student participating in the observation study as 'he'.

The students were each observed individually three times. In each session, the students worked on the chapters selected by the examiner and the observers together. The first observation was at the beginning of the term. The aim was to let the students become familiar with the observation. The chapter for the first session contained a large amount of text. The second session was arranged mid-term, while the third and final session was at the end of the term. The chapters for the second and third session required the students to be active and interact with the material. For the second and third session the students were asked not to work on the respective chapters before the sessions.

Each observation session lasted about 30 minutes. At the start of the first session the research project was introduced and students were asked about their expectations and concerns about using an interactive book. For each of the sessions the students were observed for about 25 minutes, during which they worked on the interactive online book. Students were also asked to think aloud. The observers sat back and observed the students' work methods and study patterns. In some cases the observers asked clarification questions. Furthermore, about 5 minutes at the end of the sessions were used for questions and discussions regarding the students' opinions about the interactive book, the comparison between learning using a traditional book and learning using the interactive online book, and whether, and if so, how the way of learning using the interactive book changed during the course.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Exam Results

In Table 1 we can see the results on the final exam for different years in TDDC70 and TDDD86, respectively. Statistical calculations reveal that our experiment did not influence the average (passing) grade that much, but if we look at the proportion of students getting a higher than passing grade out of all students taking the exam, we have a significant increase when compared to the exams from 2010, 2012, and 2013 ($p < 0.02$, when looking at results from 2-sample χ^2 -tests for equality of proportions). We also note that the 2011 TDDC70 exam has similar properties when compared to the other TDDC70 exams, but with a lower significance ($p < 0.05$).

4.2 Log Data

In total, the course had close to 145,000 exercise submissions and over 700,000 interactions. These data also include exercises taken as part of the exam and after it. If only considering exercises submitted during the course (September - December) and excluding exercises on the exam, students submitted almost 138,500 exercises.

	fail	3	4	5	avg	prop
TDDC70 2010	39	29	10	6	3.48	19 %
TDDC70 2011	19	42	21	3	3.41	28 %
TDDC70 2012	59	25	8	2	3.34	10 %
TDDC70 2013	64	27	11	1	3.33	12 %
TDDD86 2014	0	71	30	15	3.51	39 %

Table 1: Number of students receiving different grades, average passing grade, and proportion of students receiving a higher than passing grade out of all students taking the exam.

Almost all (95%) of the students who were registered for the course submitted a solution to at least one exercise. On average students attempted 83 exercises (once or several times); only 12 students attempted less than 10 exercises (These students did not take the final exam and were otherwise quite inactive in the course). Most (98.5%) interactions with the system took place through a non-mobile operating system, with only a few students trying to use OpenDSA with Android or iOS.

Figure 1 shows the timely distribution of all exercise submissions (black) and overall interactions (grey) throughout the 24 hours in a day. Submission after the deadline did not give any course credit. Clearly, most activity has taken place in the late afternoon and early evening, but the system has been used over the entire span of a day.




Figure 1: Hourly distribution of student activity with OpenDSA throughout the course

The data reveal that although students have been somewhat active throughout the course, the activity exploded in December. Figure 2 shows the distribution of when students submitted exercises during the fall period.

In December, most exercise submissions took place around the exam (December 19). The OpenDSA exercises included in the exam are not part of the data presented in Figure 3. In addition to this being the time of the exam, December 21 was the deadline for submitting the compulsory exercises for credit.

4.3 Questionnaires

4.3.1 Previous experience with textbooks

The questionnaires reveal that most students are used to reading textbooks, mainly for looking things up and for studying for an exam. The students have to a large degree been satisfied with earlier textbooks (15% is dissatisfied or very dissatisfied).

According to the students, the following properties charac-




Figure 2: Monthly distribution of exercise submissions (not including exercises on the exam)




Figure 3: Daily distribution of exercise submissions in December (not including exercises on the exam)

terize a good textbook, here ordered from most important to least important: correct information, clear structure, good explanatory examples, clear pictures, suitable for the level of students and the course, correct language, nice layout and design.

4.3.2 Previous experience with e-books

Almost a third (30%) of the students had used e-books for other things besides studies, 39% also for studies and 31% had no previous experience. The benefits according to the students are: easier to navigate and find specific information, weightless, possible to enlarge the text, interactive and multimedia content, always available. The downsides according to the students are: tiring for the eyes, dependent on batteries, hard to get an overview of where you are, closer to distractions.

4.3.3 Experience with OpenDSA

Nearly two thirds (62%) of the students have studied the theory parts of OpenDSA at least once each week and 31% more than once a week. 54% of the students completed one or more exercises in OpenDSA at least once each week and 20% completed exercises more than once a week.

Most (89%) students were satisfied with OpenDSA and 49% of them were very satisfied. 71% of the students felt that their expectations were met and most (91%) of them prefer OpenDSA over a printed textbook. Only 3% prefers a printed textbook over OpenDSA, while the remaining students are indifferent.

Students were asked about the benefits and drawbacks with OpenDSA. Students were happy with the material al-

ways being accessible and appreciated the animations and interactivity which increases understanding. Students also found it good to have quizzes making it possible to check their own understanding. On the downside, students found some parts too long and were frustrated with the existence of bugs. Students also pointed out the need for an improved layout, in order to make it more clear what parts of the material are most relevant.

4.4 Observation Study

4.4.1 Initial expectations and worries

At the beginning of the first session, one student expected that the interactive book would be the same as a traditional text book but modernized (e.g., with interactive exercises). Two students expected that the interactive book will help or make them learn. Four students mentioned that they expect that they do not need to carry a book. Most of the students said that they have no worries regarding the use of the interactive book. Some students worried that there will be bugs and that there will be a lot of text. Some students worried that they may guess the answers to questions, and therefore not learn. One student usually skips large parts of text and worries that the exam may require that the students have read everything.

4.4.2 Observed work methods and study patterns

When using the interactive book, some students mark or use the mouse pointer to follow the text while reading. Several students adjust the screen to make it easier to read. Some students use pen and paper while reading, but several do not.

We observed that many students read a chapter from the beginning to the end, and do the exercises in turn. One student skims through the whole chapter to get an overview and then starts from the beginning. Another student reads the whole text first and then does the exercises. Several students skip text. They mentioned that they do not worry that they miss any important information. The students think that the important information will be in the tables, figures and interactive parts. This is consistent with Fouh et al. [8], who also found that, although ideally, students using OpenDSA should read most or all of the text, completing exercises as they go, many students skip directly to exercises only reading as required to get exercise credit (at least the first time they work on a particular piece of material).

We found that the dictionary was much appreciated and frequently used. Also, the students like the code examples.

Regarding the visualization of algorithms, we observed that some students go back and forth between the visualization and the text or code. However, some students go very fast through the visualizations and essentially just click through them. We also noted that students did not take advantage of the ability to run their own algorithm execution examples.

In general the students appreciated the interactive exercises. All students use the hints, but with different strategies. Some check all hints before answering. Some check hints only when answering wrong, and otherwise, they do not check the hints. Some check the remaining hints after answering correctly. We noted that some students try to guess the answers while others go back and forth between the exercises and the text. Sometimes students just click on

all possible answers. One student said 'it takes too long to figure out the right answers'.

4.4.3 Results from discussions with the students

In the questions and discussions part of the sessions, most students said that they used the tool during the observation sessions in the same way as at home. This is important as it means that our observations are relevant for the real situation of how the students use the interactive book. One student mentioned that he usually works together with another student, because he likes discussions, which makes it easier to memorize.

With regard to when the students use the interactive book, most of the students usually use it after the lecture. One student mentioned that he works on several chapters at the same time.

Most students do not use additional materials. One student uses Wikipedia as a complement. Another student looked at other books in the beginning but found the interactive book to be better.

Regarding the positive aspects related to the interactive book, the students mentioned that the dictionary is very good because they do not have to go to another source to check the terminology. They like that there are many exercises and that they can redo exercises many times. They like the possibility to receive hints in the exercises and the fact that they can check answers, which helps their understanding. As one student said 'Even when you get the answers wrong, you still learn something'. Further, they thought that the code examples, the visualizations, and the overviews and introductions at the beginning of the chapter are good. Most negative comments regarding the interactive book are related to the presentation on the screen. The text format is not perfect and sometimes the students have to adjust the screen to make reading easier. Some students said it is hard to focus on the screen when they get tired. One student suggested introducing 'mini-content' pages that show an overview of the chapter that the student is working on. One student suggested using a pop-up dictionary instead of going to a new web page. Further, there are some bugs in the interactive books. Regarding the exercises some students found that some exercises require doing similar things too often and that some exercises need a better explanation. Some students want to have additional links from the exercises to other parts in the interactive book, so they would more easily know where to read when they failed an exercise.

Most students used the interactive book in the same way from the first session to the third session. One student mentioned that in the beginning he mainly guessed the answers to the exercises but realized that he did not learn much, and then changed his study method by spending more time on answering the questions in the exercises.

We discussed the difference in learning using a traditional book and the interactive book. Most students said that they usually do not read or like to read traditional books. With the interactive book, they are more active, and they feel they have to read the book. They would not read a traditional book until right before the examination, while with the interactive book, they read throughout the course because working with the interactive book is required for obtaining part of the credits of the course. The students said that they usually skip or do only some exercises in a traditional book and this right before the examination, while with

the interactive online book, students are more active and do the exercises throughout the course because it is interesting and they get credits. The visualizations in the interactive book allow of immediate feedback on the correctness of the student's interpretation of the algorithms or exercises. With a traditional book, students would visualize with paper and pen, but would not be sure if it is correct. Finally, the students mentioned that they feel they learn deeper with the interactive book. One student thinks that is because they use more senses.

5. DISCUSSION

When looking at final exam results, one thing that stands out is that no students failed the exam in TDDD86, while quite a number of students failed the TDDC70 exams. Is this because the TDDD86 exam was easier? In a certain sense this is probably true, but at the same time it is a fact that 117 students finished all assigned OpenDSA exercises, and out of these 116 took the exam — meaning they were very well prepared for the OpenDSA part of the final exam. As we have no way of measuring how much drilling the TDDC70 students had done on the "easier" type of questions testing definitions and understanding of basic properties it is hard to make a fair comparison, but since the OpenDSA exercises were mandatory in TDDD86 and the students could work in their own pace continuously throughout the course, there is probably a big change in how much time the students have spent learning the basic concepts.

We have also seen, that there seems to be a change in how many students aspire for and obtain a higher grade on the final exam. Is this due to the fact that the TDDD86 students might have done more drilling than their TDDC70 counterparts? We certainly hope so — being more familiar with the properties of various data structures and their algorithms should make you better prepared to answer the harder questions requiring insight into how to combine different structures to solve algorithmic problems. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the change in exam results is just due to the student group. To control for this we intend to make an analysis factoring in performance also on previous courses. A further confounding factor stems from other course activities; in TDDC70 the students did four mandatory programming assignments, while TDDD86 has eight mandatory programming assignments out of which six has clear algorithmic content. It could be the case that the higher exposure to solving more complex problems made the TDDD86 students significantly better prepared for those types of questions than the TDDC70 students. On the other hand, using OpenDSA enabled the examiner of the TDDD86 course to skip some lecture time used in TDDC70 to provide detailed demonstrations of data structure behaviour, leaving the TDDD86 students to do that kind of course work on their own, meaning that the TDDD86 students actually had less DSA lectures scheduled than the TDDC70 students.

The log data suggest that students actively used the material throughout the course. Having all students submitting on average solutions to nearly 90 exercises is a big improvement compared to using traditional material with a limited number of exercises to practice on. Students have also used OpenDSA continuously throughout the day and work week, suggesting that students have used it also outside university.

Nevertheless, the monthly and daily distribution of submissions (Figure 2 and 3) show that most activity took place

around the final exam and the due date for submitting compulsory exercises for credit. This is in line with the findings of Fouh et al. [8], who found that students using OpenDSA tend to wait until the deadline before dealing with the tasks assigned. One thing to consider is hence, whether a more continuous formative assessment scheme, using, for instance, both OpenDSA exercises and a learning journal, could aid in helping students distribute their work more evenly.

The findings from the questionnaires show that the overall student experience with OpenDSA is very positive, 89% satisfied and 91% prefer OpenDSA over printed textbook, and the only issue is bugs. One student writes in a free text answer: ‘When you get rid of the bugs this will be one of the best text books you can get. Animations in combination with text is very close to what you get from a good lecture.’ The students also tend to spend more time with the material, can work in their own pace and keep a steady tempo through the course. Some comments from the students regarding this: ‘I have learned more in less time, [...] [I] can go through the material in the pace that is needed.’, ‘The way the exercises were presented in OpenDSA made me spend more time with them after reading the chapter compared to a printed textbook, which is positive!’ and ‘Since there were mandatory exercises, and quite many, I read and did the exercises in the same pace as the lectures, which made it easier to study for the exam at the end and I had more knowledge and a better understanding.’ We note that all of these findings have to be taken with a grain of salt, since especially the post survey had a low response rate.

Some main positive findings from the observation study are that (1) students prefer the interactive book over a traditional book, (2) the dictionary, visualizations and exercises (the interactive parts of the book) are appreciated and help students understand, and (3) the interactive book encourages students to work during the course.

The observations also revealed some issues that require special attention when using an interactive book: there are students that (1) skip text, (2) guess answers to exercises and (3) interact with the visualizations without learning.

6. FUTURE WORK

The findings presented in this paper indicate that the initial experience from the redesigned version of the DSA course, incorporating OpenDSA as the main material, has been positive. As stated above, OpenDSA collects a large amount of interesting data making it possible to study a multitude of interesting questions. Future work involves investigating, for instance, potential relationships between student activity in OpenDSA and exam performance. Also, the TDDD86 course is now (fall 2015) offered again using the same format, hence adding to the data available for analysis.

We are also interested in investigating how the log data can be used to guide the learning and the teaching in a dynamic way during the course, so called Just-in-Time Teaching [1]. For instance, for topics that from the log data are identified to be difficult, extra sessions could be scheduled.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to acknowledge the timely and competent support provided by Cliff Shaffer and the OpenDSA team making this study possible, as well as the many helpful suggestions by the reviewers. The study was partially

financed by funding for pedagogical projects at Linköping University, and by the pedagogical development group (PUG) at the Institute of Technology at Linköping University.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bailey and J. Forbes. Just-in-time teaching for CS0. *SIGCSE Bulletin*, 37(1):366–370, 2005.
- [2] M. Ben-Ari. Constructivism in computer science education. *SIGCSE Bulletin*, 30(1):257–261, 1998.
- [3] R. Bjork, J. Dunlosky, and N. Kornell. Self-regulated learning: Beliefs, techniques, and illusions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64:417–444, 2013.
- [4] C. C. Bonwell and J. A. Eison. *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. George Washington University, 1991.
- [5] J. D. Bransford, A. L. Brown, and R. R. Cocking, editors. *How People learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. National Academy Press, 1999.
- [6] J. W. Creswell. *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson, 4th edition, 2012.
- [7] E. Dale. *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching*, chapter 4. Dryden Press, 1946.
- [8] E. Fouh, D. A. Breakiron, S. Hamouda, M. F. Farghally, and C. A. Shaffer. Exploring students learning behavior with an interactive e textbook in computer science courses. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 41:478–485, 2014.
- [9] E. Fouh, V. Karavirta, D. A. Breakiron, S. Hamouda, S. Hall, T. L. Naps, and C. A. Shaffer. Design and architecture of an interactive e textbook - The OpenDSA system. *Science of Computer Programming*, 88:22–40, 2014.
- [10] C. D. Hundhausen, S. A. Douglas, and J. T. Stasko. A meta-study of algorithm visualization effectiveness. *Journal of Visual Languages & Computing*, 13(3):259–290, 2002.
- [11] A. Korhonen, T. Naps, C. Boisvert, P. Crescenzi, V. Karavirta, L. Mannila, B. Miller, B. Morrison, S. H. Rodger, R. Ross, and C. A. Shaffer. Requirements and design strategies for open source interactive computer science ebooks. In *Proceedings of the ITiCSE Working Group Reports Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education-working Group Reports*, ITiCSE -WGR ’13, pages 53–72, 2013.
- [12] P. Ramsden. *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. Routledge, 1992.
- [13] C. A. Shaffer, M. L. Cooper, A. J. D. Alon, M. Akbar, M. Stewart, S. Ponce, and S. H. Edwards. Algorithm visualization: The state of the field. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education*, 10(3):9:1–9:22, 2010.
- [14] C. A. Shaffer, V. Karavirta, A. Korhonen, and T. L. Naps. OpenDSA: Beginning a community active-eBook project. In *Proceedings of the 11th Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research*, pages 112–117, 2011.
- [15] J. Sorva, V. Karavirta, and L. Malmi. A review of generic program visualization systems for introductory programming education. *ACM Transactions of Computing Education*, 13(4):15:1–15:64, 2013.