

### Participant identification

Please enter the **Participant Number** that was assigned to you.  
Make sure it is the correct number.

Please enter **Participant Number** one more time and click the next button.  
Make sure it is the correct number.

### Instructions

In this survey, you will analyze the Quality Report produced by EULER for the following bug report:

**Bug Report ID:** 104

**Bug Summary:** Links within Wikipedia don't work any more

**Application:** Aard Dictionary v. 1.6.10

Please complete the following steps and answer the questions.

#### 1. Understand the bug described in the bug report

Click [this link](#) to open a web page that contains:

1. The original bug report
2. A video that shows how to reproduce the reported bug in the application
3. The natural language transcription of the interactions shown in the video

Please carefully read and understand the original bug report. Identify the steps to reproduce present in both, the bug summary and description. Watch the video to understand the steps that reproduce the reported bug. The transcribed steps will give you more details about each interaction shown in the video.

**The goal here is that you become familiar with the bug described in the bug report and with the steps required to reproduce the bug.**

## 2. Understand the Quality Report for the original bug report

Click [here](#) to open the Quality Report produced by EULER for the original bug report. Carefully review the quality assessment of the steps to reproduce, in particular, the identified steps and the quality annotations for each step.

For reference, [this document](#) describes each annotation type produced by the tool. It also shows examples of each annotation. Feel free to read it at any time during the survey.

## 3. Evaluate the accuracy of the Quality Report

Based on the reproduction scenario shown in the video, its transcription, and the original bug report, answer the survey questions (shown in the next screens). These questions are meant to determine the accuracy of the Quality Assessment produced by the tool for each reproduction step.

Feel free to review the original bug report, the video and its transcription, and the Quality Report at any time for answering the questions. Each question will have the links to open these sources. In any case, at this point, you should have these sources opened in a new window/tab of your browser.

Please click the "next" (-->) button to start the evaluation.

### step1

The tool identified the highlighted (#1) statement from the **original bug report** as a step to reproduce:

#### 1. Tap link to Wikipedia article

Was the step to reproduce correctly identified?

Useful links: [\[Quality Report\]](#) [\[Original bug report and video\]](#) [\[Annotation types\]](#)

Yes

No

### feed1\_1

Do you agree with the highlighted quality annotation for the step to reproduce (S2R) #1 (highlighted in boldface)?

#	Step to Reproduce (S2R)	Quality Annotation
---	-------------------------	--------------------

#	Step to Reproduce (S2R)	Quality Annotation
1	Tap link to Wikipedia article	<b>AS</b> This S2R matches multiple GUI components (e.g., the "壬戌 Link" view or the "↑ Link" view or the "↑ Link" view).

Exact Match: **HQ** Ambiguous Step: **AS** Vocabulary Mismatch: **VM** Incorrect Input Value: **IV** Missing Steps: **MS**

Useful links: [[Quality Report](#)] [[Original bug report and video](#)] [[Annotation types](#)]

I agree

I disagree

If you selected "I disagree", please explain why you disagree with the quality annotation (be specific).

## Euler Report Usability

### Evaluating the usability and usefulness of the Quality Report


In this section of the survey, you will be asked to review the Quality Report for the original bug report one more time, and then answer the questions below regarding the usability and potential usefulness of the quality assessment.

Click [here](#) to open the Quality Report

Do you agree with the following statements about the Quality Report?

	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Not agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	I cannot judge
The Quality Report is easy to read and understand.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Quality Report is likely to help users write better bug reports.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>


What information did you find useful from the Quality Report?

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin gray border and a small gray triangle in the bottom right corner, indicating it is a text input field.


What information did you find useless from the Quality Report?

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin gray border and a small gray triangle in the bottom right corner, indicating it is a text input field.

What other information (if any) would you like to see in the Quality Report?

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin gray border and a small gray triangle in the bottom right corner, indicating it is a text input field.

What information would you remove from the Quality Report?

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin gray border and a small gray triangle in the bottom right corner, indicating it is a text input field.

### Confirmation

Click the "Finish" button to finish the survey. If you have not finished it, you can go back.

Powered by Qualtrics