Pedro Santos Rodrigues

Bachelor in Computer Science

Accelerating SQL with Complex Visual Querying

Dissertation plan submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in
Computer Science and Informatics Engineering

Adviser: Teresa Romão, Assistant Professor,
NOVA University of Lisbon

Co-advisers: Rui Nóbrega, Assistant Professor,
NOVA University of Lisbon

Tiago Simões, Principal Product Designer,
OutSystems

FACULDADE DE
CIÊNCIAS E TECNOLOGIA
UNIVERSIDADE **NOVA** DE LISBOA

February, 2020

ABSTRACT

The Low-Code development has turned the software development industry, accelerating and streamlining the application development and deployment, reducing also the background required. At the same time, individual or professional demands require information gathering of databases.

The OutSystems Low-Code Development Platform provides a visual tool, called Aggregates, to formulate data queries through interaction and manipulation of visual components. This user interface reduces the necessity to resort to textual languages, such as SQL, to build queries. These visual query systems turn the query design process more effective and efficient, reducing also the background knowledge required.

However, Aggregates not only do not support all the existing SQL functionalities but also have usability problems in the provided interface. Leading end users of the platform to use SQL to build their data queries.

Through an iterative design process, this dissertation includes the design, implementation, and evaluation of prototypes with different fidelity levels. The aim is to create a user interface integrated into the OutSystems Platform which improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the query formulation process.

Keywords: Human-Centered Design, Visual Query Interfaces, Low-Code Development, Human-computer Interaction, Iterative Design, Database Querying

Resumo

O Desenvolvimento *Low-Code* tem-se expandido nos últimos anos por revolucionar o processo de desenvolvimento de *software*, acelerando-o e reduzindo o pré-requisito de conhecimentos técnicos necessários. Paralelamente, a consulta de dados a bases de dados apresenta-se cada vez mais como uma necessidade a nível pessoal e profissional na maioria dos setores, independentemente do conhecimento existente em sistemas de computadores.

A Plataforma de Desenvolvimento Low-Code *OutSystems*, inclui no seu sistema os *Aggregates*, que permitem que as consultas de dados sejam construídas através de uma interface gráfica, sem recorrer a liguagens textuais como o *SQL*. Estes sistemas visuais de consulta de dados, tornam as consultas mais eficazes e eficientes, reduzindo também o nível de conhecimentos prévios necessários para a sua construção.

Acontece que, para além de este componente de consulta não suportar todas as funcionalidades existentes em *SQL*, também apresenta problemas de usabilidade na interface gráfica disponibilizada. Levando utilizadores finais da plataforma a recorrer a *SQL* para construir as suas consultas de dados.

Através de um processo de desenho iterativo, esta dissertação contempla o desenho, implementação e avaliação de protótipos com diferentes níveis de fidelidade com o objetivo de obter uma interface integraga na Plataforma OutSystems, que melhore a eficiência e eficácia do processo de construção de consultas de dados.

Palavras-chave: Desenho Centrado no Utilizador, Interfaces Gráficas de Consulta de Dados, Desenvolvimento *Low-Code*, Interação Pessoa-Máquina, Desenho Iterativo, Consulta de Bases de Dados

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

Nowadays, database queries are required not only in computer systems areas but also in most sectors of professional environments or personal demands. This database information gathering claim needs should resort on actual technologies to optimize the time spent and reduce the errors of this query process since the most important is the obtaining of the intended information.

In the decades of the 1960s, Database Management Systems (DBMS) arose, and later at 1970s new management systems that use relational models, designated as Relational Database Management Systems (RDBMS). Moreover, the first Data Query Languages (DQL) appeared, like SQL [6] which was considered by the ANSI (American National Standards Instituite) and ISO (International Organization for Standardization) as the standard query language [18]. These technological evolutions have improved the effectiveness and the efficiency of the querying process. However, to find more specific and complex information on databases a higher degree of DQL understanting was required. Thus, if from one side the technological evolution and the digital transformation have optimized the data querying process, only a subset of people could use these powerful querying technologies.

Visual Query Systems (VQSs), defined by Catarci, *et. al.* [4] as "systems for querying databases that use a visual representation to depict the domain of interest and express related requests", are used to mitigate some problems already referred. These systems use different visual representations and interaction strategies to make database queries, using a more intuitive visual approaches, instead of using textual languages, which are more difficult to learn mainly for people without programming base knowledge. In addition, even if it is not mandatory to be considered a VQS, some systems have also data

visualization features which can be useful to view the query result, or even the possibility to manage the database schema in a visual way too.

However, usually, these visual languages are associated as more useful to naive users, while textual languages are associated to more expert users. Conversely, some studies have revealed that visual languages might be convenient to the expert users too. For example, the comparison made by Catarci and Santucci [5] concludes that diagrammatic languages can reduce the error rate of the queries, in comparison with those made in a textual language by expert users. These results imply that even expert users make mistakes in simple queries (e.g., they may not remember the name of the tables or the precise syntax of some language expressions). Thus, it is important to analyse how those languages could be used to optimize the querying process not only to the users with a low experience level but also for highly experienced users.

Nonetheless, the widely users' background and the diversity of the data domain made that a lot of these systems need to be modelled to a specific domain. So, it is very difficult to find an global integrated solution that covers necessities of all users on all domains being this personal or professional.

1.2 Motivation

Low-Code Development is a recent development paradigm which seeks to reduce the time and effort spent in tasks that will not have a significant impact on the final product outcome. Just as the rise of high-level languages, APIs, and third-party infrastructures have provided to developers to be more productive and spend more effort on the most valuable sections of the software they produce. Also, the goal of the Low-Code is to extend this reasoning, using visual IDEs, connectors between components and lifecycle managers, to put away some concerns as infrastructure and re-implementation of patterns and free up people to think better on things that could be more relevant to their objectives [39].

The goal of this dissertation is to analyse and improve the OutSystems Platform [32] data querying component that can be used to create relational database queries through drag and drop interactions and simple configurations beyond visual components and multiple drag and drop features. The platform aim is to provide a complete application development environment where users with different development backgrounds can build, deploy and manage their applications following good practices and using state-of-the-art technologies even without having to worry about those details.

However, conversely of No-Code approaches, the development through low-code systems give, many times, the possibility to use low-level code, written in textual languages, such as Java, .NET or SQL, in order to increase the extensibility and the power of low-code solutions [41]. Therefore, it is provided to users an alternative to perform their requests that are not supported by the low-code visual approaches. However, if the visual languages of low-code platforms are more robust, responding more thoroughly to users'

requirements, there is a diminished demand to resort on these textual programming languages which are high error-prone and have a worse learning curve, requiring also, on multiple situations, previous coding experience.

Furthermore, as mentioned by Amaral *et. al.* [20], web and mobile applications produced on OutSystems' technology, have proven not only an increase on quality, but also allowed developers to increase 10.9x on productivity, when compared with IT Industry standards that do not use these rapid software development solutions [37]. These results reinforces the importance of this matter, the improvement of visual languages used on this platform.

1.3 Problem Description

The OutSystems platform provides a visual query language that allows users to retrieve data from databases by simple processes. Besides, with this language, it is possible to perform some operations that are usually supported by textual Data Querying Languages (DQL), namely join, filter, sort and group operations.

Currently, the OutSystems' solutions have been applied on digital transformation processes in multiple industries that lead with high quantities of data, in order to accelerate the application development processes, unlocking its value and growth.

To this extent, the already implemented querying tool is not able to deal with a set of scenarios, because it might not be accurate when the domain has a lot of tables involved, or does not support essential advanced constructors. Are part of these constructors not supported clauses, such as IN, NOT IN, EXISTS, NOT EXISTS, DISTINCT, UNION and the possibility to use subqueries.

Accordingly, the following questions were fundamental to analyse and explore the problem and its requirements:

- What query features are supported by the existing OutSystems visual query language?

- Why do OutSystems developers often use SQL to perform database queries?

- Why are some queries that can be built visually written though SQL instead?

- What are the main causes that users point out to use SQL?

- Who are the users more unsatisfied with the current provided visual approach to retrieve data? What are their reasons?

Under the above mentioned circumstances, the goal of this thesis is to design and evaluate a new and more powerful Visual Query Interface and User Experience that allows developers to do all these complex data queries in intuitive and efficient way without using SQL.

1.4 Research Questions

The main research question that is being addressed in this dissertation is:

> Can we enable OutSystems developers to easily do all kinds
> of database queries without ever using SQL?

Regarding the main question and the spread background of the system target users, it is important to research how can be developed a solution that covers the requirements of all user types with the best usability possible.

The following research questions focus on this usability trade-off which depends on the users and the system particularities:

Research Question 1: Has the actual implementation problems to the less experienced users?

Considering the visual query interface already implemented, the most complex queries have not been correctly covered to this tool. However, is important to analyse also if novice users had similar problems or others that have an impact on their tasks.

Research Question 2: Can experienced users take advantages in using the visual interface to build queries instead of SQL?

Since the users more experienced who knows other textual query languages, such as SQL, can use SQL to perform the queries, are advantages for them in the usage of a visual query interface? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this type of approach for these users?

Research Question 3: Can be improved the user experience of expert users without reducing the learnability and satisfaction of the system to the less experienced users?

The usability attributes trade-off depends on the system's target users expectations and requirements. Thus it is important to take into account if the development to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and satisfaction in expert users does not harm the effectiveness and the learnability of the operations performed for the less experienced users.

1.5 Main Expected Contributions

This work aims to provide a set of contributions not only as scientific research, but also as additional value to OutSystems. Thus, are presented below a summary of the main expected contributions for this project:

- A synthesization of the design concepts, including relevant interaction and conceptual models, usability definitions, guidelines and principles, and a description of the processes to evaluate the human-computer interaction in the context of a software analysis;

- Provide a state-of-the art about what are the most significant Visual Query Systems, presenting also a comparison of visual representation techniques and interaction strategies used, as well as other important features proper for this study;

- A description of the analysis made to identify what are the most impactful problems regarding the existing visual query interface, which includes user interviews and data analysis;

- Design and implementation of a new graphical user interface prototype that tries to improve the existing solution to make queries visually. This prototype expects to fix some predominant problems selected as the most relevant to solve;

- An usability evaluation of the prototype developed through the use of user tests, confronting these results with the first obtained.

1.6 Structure

The remaining chapters of this thesis are organized as follows:

- Chapter 2 - Background: introduces some design and usability concepts to be used in this work. As well as, it is provided a context of the OutSystems platform current progress, which explains the system actual point, in the data querying domain, before the study;

- Chapter 3 - Related Work: analyses the users' interaction with database systems to improve the interfaces' suitability to the target users of the system. Also, are described and compared the approaches used by other systems to create interfaces which allow to visually build queries, detailing the interaction strategies used.

- Chapter 4 - Proposed Solution: explains the work made in the requirements analysis, including user's interviews and metrics gathering, and the decisions of what are the principal and impactful problems to be tackled. Moreover, it is detailed what will be the design approach and process adopted to develop the solution.

Background

As the objective of this thesis is to create an interface that allows users to build queries in a more efficient and effective way. Human-computer interaction is a core subject of the work since the interface can only be improved if the interaction and the suitability of the interface with the user are studied.

Accordingly, in this chapter will be introduced key concepts of Human-Computer Interaction, as well as, a briefly contextualization of the OutSystems Platform Background that are indispensable for the comprehension and progression of this study.

2.1 Human-Computer Interaction

Although computer systems have been designed by humans, these two parts of human-computer interaction do not communicate through the same language. Nonetheless, these type of systems were created to support, in a transparent way, human's tasks and requirements, forgiving careless mistakes. [17] Thus, human-computer interaction fields aim to study the relationship of users and computer systems, in the context of the users' desired tasks, in order to "unfold and reveal challenges and insights, and to instrument appropriate solutions for alleviating the current obstacles to the access and use of advanced information technologies" [42].

2.1.1 Interaction Models

Therefore, have been proposed interaction models to represent the intention of a user to perform a certain task on a system. One of the most influential is Norman's model, that characterize the interaction of a user with a system beyond execution-evaluation cycles. [17] Thereby, the execution is a flow when the user interacts with the system, and the evaluation phase comprise the presentation and the interpretation of the system

output. However, this model only represents the interaction from the users' point of view. Thereupon, Abowd and Beale [1] proposed an extension of this model where it is possible to view how the system communicates through the interface.

In this approach, represented in Figure 2.1, after the user has defined his goal and respective tasks to achieve it, he transmits his intention (articulation) through input language, and after this, that information is translated to system language (performance), ending the execution phase. Secondly, the result of the action executed by the system is presented (presentation) and the user observes it (observation), ending the evaluation phase.


Figure 2.1: Interaction Model proposed by Abowd and Beale [42] (Based on Norman's Model)

These models are useful to understand two concepts that cannot be forgotten when a system is being designed, since these are two effects that designers want to reduce as much as possible, in order to optimize the effectiveness of the human-computer dialogue. Following, these concepts will be described respecting *Dix et al.* [17] definition:

- **Gulf of execution**: "Difference between the user's formulation of the actions to reach the goal and the actions allowed by the system. If the actions allowed by the system correspond to those intended by the user, the interaction will be effective."

- **Gulfs of evaluation**: "Distance between the physical representation of the system state and the expectation of the user. If the user can readily evaluate the presentation in terms of his goal, the gulf of evaluation is small."

2.1.2 Main Concepts

The **Usability** of a system is one of the most important concepts in human-computer interaction, that can not be forgotten on the design process, since its attributes must be taken into account performing also a guidance function through all this process. This concept was standardized in ISO-9241 [21] as "extent to which a system, product or service can be used by specified users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction in a specified context of use".

However, usability is not a single-dimensional property, being always associated with its attributes, that characterize the user accessibility when is using the system into five different points, such as referred by Nielsen [29]:

- **Learnability**: How easy is the learning process until a novice user (has not used the system before) has some high-level of proficiency using the system [48]. The learnability is higher as the learning process is faster, and the user has to spend less effort to reach his goal. Also, it depends on tutorials and training provided to users. A system that requires less training has a higher learnability than a system that requires more training. The time that a novice user requires to perform some specific tasks can be used to measure learnability. Learnability can be improved using tips while a novice user explores the system doing his first tasks.

- **Efficiency**: Refers to the productivity level of a user which have already learnt how to use the system. Efficiency can be measured analysing the time that expert users spent to do specific tasks on the system. This attribute can be improved, for example, adding shortcuts to accelerate the interaction process.

- **Memorability**: Defines how easy is for a user, that was using a system before but did not use it for a time period, to do his desired tasks on the system. So it's related to how many time the user has not used the system and the time that the user needs to remember how the system works. Therefore, if a system has a good memorability the user does not need many time to remember it, even if it has stopped use it for a long period of time. Memorability can be measured, for example, analysing the interaction process of a user who has been away from the system, while he uses the system again. The use of visual components and metaphors with real-life objects helps, sometimes, the users in this process.

- **Errors**: A system not only must have a low error-rate but only if an error occurs, the user should be able to recover from that. Since there are multiple types of error with different severity levels, it is important that catastrophic errors must not occur. This attribute can be measured evaluating the error-rate, taking into account the severity levels of the errors. Furthermore, if a system has errors, that can be reverted and do not have a negative impact on the final result, cannot be forgotten that these errors also harm the efficiency of the system.

- **Satisfaction**: The most subjective attribute of the usability that is related to the overall satisfaction of the user when uses the system. Could be measured by asking the users about the experience while they are using the system, always searching for subjective answers.

Nonetheless, as mentioned by Nielsen [29]:

"it is not always possible to achieve optimal scores for all usability attributes simultaneously".

Thus, when a system is designed it is necessary to prioritize what are the most important attributes for the users and the domain where the system will be used and applied. These trade-offs are one of the most challenging tasks of the design processes because it depends on user expectations and their backgrounds, as well as, the problem domain and what are the main focus of the system use.

Accordingly, it is fundamental that the design process can focus on target users of the systems. Therefore, following will be described some main concepts, processes and techniques for a design process centered on the users.

2.1.3 User-centered Design

Before user-centered design principles and methodologies were adopted, the Waterfall model was commonly adopted as a software development process. This model comprises five sequential phases, from the requirements specification phase to the operation and maintenance phase, and has a good quality control since documentation and planning are a major concern of this methodology.[2] However, the stages of this model are not overlapping stages, so other development methodologies and philosophies arose to mitigate this problem and include the user on the design process, due to their impact on the usability of the system.

Consequently, it was necessary a new model that has the users included on the development process to verify, along the development, if the approaches adopted are positive and what is the users' acceptability. Nielsen [28] reinforces this saying that "user interfaces should be designed iteratively in almost all cases because it is virtually impossible to design a user interface that has no usability problems from the start. Even the best usability experts cannot design perfect user interfaces in a single attempt, so a usability engineering lifecycle should be built around the concept of iteration".

The Spiral model of iterative design arose as an iteration through design, implementation and evaluation phases where the cost and accuracy increase on each iteration, since first iterations should use low-cost resources, like paper prototypes, and when the results are positive the accuracy is incremented, changing to computer prototypes, for example. [22] An overview of this model is represented in Figure 2.2.

2.1.3.1 User and Task Analysis

Regarding the concept of usability presented above and the importance of the users on the design process, it is important to define the users and their desired tasks of the system in order to find the best solution as possible to the usability attributes trade-offs. Just a good description of the users and the tasks of the system leads the designers to the best choice of what are the usability attributes most important for the system.

Figure 2.2: Sprial model of Iterative Design (adapted from [22])

Accordingly, it is important to make a **User Analysis** to understand all users' characteristics that could have an impact on the acceptability of the system. The expected result of this analysis should be a set of structured information that characterize the users of the system in terms of technological expertise, knowledge of business domain, application experience, educational background, gender and age, as other aspects that might be useful to comprehend, depending on the system's users and domain. [16] The more traditional process to gather this information is through questionnaires or interviews, but that can also be obtained by conducting a market analyses or observational studies. [29]

Furthermore, it is essential to enumerate and analyse the tasks the users should perform using the system. The **Task Analysis** process aims to aggregate information about the tasks that should be performed on the system, starting from the system overall goals and break down these to obtain individual tasks. [29] Moreover, the goal of this analysing process is to obtain more structured information about: how the tasks are performed using the existing systems, what are the pre-conditions and the requirements of each task, why the users need to perform this tasks, and others that might be useful to characterize the tasks of the system.

The techniques used, to extract information to this analysis, tries that users specify how the tasks should be done instead of how they would perform them, resorting on examples as well as possible, in order to understand what type of strategies are used, what type of exceptions from their normal workflow are occurring, and other aspects that can be observed where the communication with users is on a concrete level. [29] In addition, Nielsen [29] points out that "The users' model of the task should also be identified, since it can be used as a source for metaphors for the user interface", which reinforces that these dialogues with users to obtain analysis content, can be useful also to find relevant solutions to latter design process phases.

Therefore, the outcome of this analysis should contain a list of the entire tasks that users what to perform in the system, the information that is required to complete them, the steps and the dependencies between tasks, all the outputs that must be generated, and how is the communication process between the users associated with the system's tasks. [29]

2.1.3.2   Sketching and Prototyping

After the user and task analysis process, designers must start sketching and prototyping ideas and approaches, in order to think about how can they solve the problems. Nevertheless, this phase of the design process should start with sketching techniques, as these are not only a good and inexpensive starting point to communicate ideas, but also help to develop structure and enrich the reasoning, leading to the perception of other details as well as of other approaches to solve the related problems.

While sketching techniques are more plentiful, and have a low detail level, being mainly based on suggesting and exploring, rather than retrieving results, the prototyping phases, have more refinement approaches and are used to test the design choices made.

However, there are prototypes with different thoroughness degrees, presenting different advantages and disadvantages. Thus, it is important to start the prototyping process with low fidelity prototypes, as paper prototypes, since the objective of these is to evaluate the conceptual model (if the users understand the system), the functionalities presented, the navigation, the screen components distribution, and the terminology used. After the evaluation of these prototypes presents good results, high fidelity prototypes should be used, like computer prototypes. There are a set of available tools to assist in the building process of these prototypes, such as Balsamiq [3] and Mockingbird [27]. These different prototype types can detect different issues when tested with users, so it is very important to test prototypes with different granularity levels.

Furthermore, there is another relevant aspect of the prototype designing, that is the scope definition of the prototype. It is important to define what features the prototype undertakes and what is the inherent detail level. Nielsen [29] describe this as two dimensions of prototyping: horizontal prototyping and vertical prototyping, as demonstrated in Figure 2.3. A vertical prototype is characterized as a prototype to test a restricted part of the system but with real users and circumstances. A horizontal prototype is presented as suitable for test the entire system but in a less realistic approach.

Finally, regarding the methodology about how to use the prototypes built, Dix et al. [17] refer that are three main approaches:

- **Throw-away**: After the prototype is built and tested, it is used on the final system development, but after that, the prototype is discarded and the rest of the design process continues without relaying on the prototype previously built;

- **Incremental**: First, the system is separated into different parts, and each part is built, one at a time. So the prototypes are developed separately, regarding its correspondent part, and finally are combined together to build the final system;

- **Evolutionary**: Contrary to the throw-away approach, the prototypes developed are used as the basis for the next iteration of design.

Figure 2.3: The two dimensions of prototyping: Horizontal prototyping keeps the features but eliminates depth of functionality, and vertical prototyping gives full functionality for a few features (extracted from [29])

2.1.3.3 Evaluation Techniques

The evaluation phases are crucial in the design process, since they allow designers to understand the systems' specific problems and the impact of the interfaces on users. So, the expected outcome of these processes is a list of usability issues ordered by priority level, referring what usability principles and guidelines are not being accomplished and what solutions can be applied to solve the problem. [29]

However, there are different approaches to evaluate interfaces. First, one important topic that distinguishes two types of techniques is who performs the evaluation. There are techniques where only the designers and specialists are involved on the process, and are another type of evaluation where users participate in the evaluation. [17] Thus, there are two types of evaluation: evaluation through expert analysis and evaluation through user participation.

Evaluation through expert analysis

In this type of evaluation, designers, or other specialists, evaluate the system, supporting their analysis on cognitive principles, to preview usability problems likely to occur. Moreover, this evaluation not only is cheaper because it does not involve users, as also can be applied on any phase of the design process, from the design specification to the high fidelity prototypes. [17]

Regarding the approach presented above, these two methods are one of the most used:

- **Heuristic Evaluation** [30]: The system is thoroughly analyzed in order to find problems that do not follow important and recognized usability heuristics. After a problem has been detected, it should be reported, not only with a description of the problem but also the indication of the heuristics that have not been accomplished, the severity level of the problem and possible solutions to solve it. [29]

- **Cognitive Walkthrough** [38]: On this method is used a sequence of actions as the principal resource to guide the evaluation process. For each action, the evaluator tries to understand if all steps are clear and visible, as well as, if the system gives a clear feedback, confirming if the action has been completed. Usually, the main focus of this method is to analyse the learnability of the system. Mainly, to understand if the system provides a good learn mechanism through exploration, rather than using manuals, training or other types of *a priori* learning processes. [17]

A study made by Desurvire *et al.* [12] concluded that Heuristic Evaluation made by specialists is better to predict some problems before the user testing process than Cognitive Walkthrough. The reason pointed out for this result is that heuristic evaluation can often help to remind the designers of problems since this method analyses more dimensions of the system than Cognitive Walkthrough.

Evaluation through user participation

Although there exist methods that do not need the users to evaluate the system usability, it is difficult to predict all the behaviours of the users when they interact with a system. Therefore, there are multiple methods to make usability tests with people that are the system's target. Then, following will be presented some methods of user testing which can be resourceful on the context of this work, respecting the terminology used by Dix *et al.* [17]:

- **Observational Methods**: the main principle of these methods is observing users using the system to conclude important usability information about it. Usually, it is requested to the user to 'thinks aloud' since it might be possible to obtain more insights that can be useful, not only to understand why the user might have made an error, but also it can be a good strategy to find starting points for other possible solutions. Moreover, although usually these tests have a set of predetermined tasks, since it is easier to find the user reaction to the system part the need to be tested, also can be executed tests only by evaluating the normal tasks of the users on their work;

- **Experimental Methods**: starting from a properly defined test hypothesis, it is selected a set of users to perform an experimental test to verify if the test hypothesis proves to be true or not. Thus, it is necessary to define previously all the experimental environment, which includes: the test hypothesis that wants to be verified, the users that will perform the test, and the independent and dependent variables. The dependent variables are the ones that express the result of the test in function of the independent variables, such as the task execution time or the number of the errors that occurred. The independent variables are chosen by the test designer to produce different conditions for comparison. Examples of independent variables can be the size of an interface component or the use of an interaction technique.

This method is very useful to verify through a test hypothesis which of the possible solutions presented (independent variables) have a better performance for the intended application context;

- **Query Methods**: these methods focus on what the user thinks about the system, collecting information from interviews or questionnaires to analyse this opinion. One advantage of this method is that it might reveal issues not observed previously complained before, but contrary a lot of cases are not tested, since in the interaction field, many times, the user only finds a problem when it occurs for the first time. So it is not possible to extract concrete information from users that never have passed for this situation.

Finally, independently of the evaluation process adopted (through expert analysis or through user participation), severity ratings should be attributed to the problems identified in order to define the main priorities and understand which might have a larger impact on the system acceptability. However, although these levels should be attributed by specialists, if they use not only cognitive principles, but also use the results observed from user testing phase to sustain the classification of the problems detected, the result can be more accurate.

Besides, the Figure 2.4, extracted from [29], displays two influential factors that should be taken into account to attribute a severity level to a problem: how many users are experiencing this problem and what is the impact level on the user.

		Proportion of users experiencing the problem	
		Few	*Many*
Impact of problem on the users who experience it	*Small*	Low severity	Medium severity
	Large	Medium severity	High severity

Figure 2.4: Severity Levels of the Problems based on their impact on the users (extracted from [29])

2.1.3.4 Errors Classification

The errors occurred when a users interacts with a system are an excellent indicator to designers, because understanding the reason that led to error situations is a good strategy to classify them. Therefore, errors can be classified as slips and mistakes, as will be presented below according to Dix *et al.* [17]:

15

- **Slips**: in these type of errors, the user knows how to do the intended task on the system, however, he presses a wrong button or closes one window accidentally. So, he understands the action, but a misaction does not allow that he reaches his goal;

- **Mistakes**: these errors occur when the user does not understand the system, formulating a wrong goal. An example of an Mistake is when the user does not understand the action associated with an icon, performing a not intended action.

Therefore, the strategy to mitigate the problems associated with these two types of errors could be different, as mentioned by Dix *et. al.* [17]: "Slips may be corrected by, for instance, better screen design, perhaps putting more space between buttons. However, mistakes need users to have a better understanding of the systems, so will require far more radical redesign or improved training, perhaps a totally different metaphor for use."

2.2 OutSystems Background

The OutSystems Platform has the mission of simplifying and accelerating the development and management of digital enterprise solutions, no matter the dimension and domain of the applications. It covers the entire development lifecycle which aims to promote rapid development and integration, to facilitate and speed up the deployment stages, to keep track the status and health of the applications produced, and to expedite the management of daily operations and configurations on the final products. [31]

2.2.1 Visual Development Environment

Service Studio is the low-code development environment of the platform, which allows the developers to create complete applications using visual elements to perform drag and drop actions. Figure 2.5 presents an overview of the IDE, which highlights the different areas of the workspace.

Using the widgets and icons provided in the toolbox, the main area is dedicated to design the applications' interface and logic. So, in the main area, there are visual elements, which can be set using the properties editor, placed on the bottom right corner of the screen.

Also, it includes other sections whose main purpose is not the product development, but are related to key actions of the software development process. Therefore, on the window's top, there is a toolbar which has shortcuts to some of the most common operations, and a green circle button, denominated "1-Click Publish button", to start the automated deployment process provided. In addition, the bottom of the window is dedicated not only to the presentation of messages, errors, and warnings but also to debugging the application.

Since the development environment can be used to develop a complete full-stack application, the elements, which can be manipulated in the Service Studio, can be related

Figure 2.5: Main areas of Service Studio (extracted from[33])

to different parts of the application. Thus, following will be described the purpose of each one of the Application Layer Tabs, that contains in that section, a tree view of the elements related:

- **Processes**: in this section, it is possible to create and manage business processes of the systems through a flow that can be composed by human or automatic activities, time waits, conditional decisions and indications to execute processes. In addition, on this section can be configured the timers of application. Then, it is possible to indicate when a timer should start, what is it period and what action should be performed when it is triggered;

- **Interface**: the purpose of this section is the management of the components related to the visual interface of the final application. It is possible to observe all applications' screens, as well as, the variables and the actions related to each one. Moreover, flows between the various screens can be also defined. Accordingly to the overview presented above, if one screen or action is selected, it will be possible to add new visual components to the interface or assign new elements to the action flow in order to define all the client-side logic of the screen;

- **Logic**: in this area is where the core logic of the application is defined. It includes not only the server actions of the application but also the exceptions specification, the existing user's roles and also the integration with external services. Although there is a data section on the application layer tabs, which will be described below, the actions which require data querying are managed into this section.

- **Data**: the database modelling aspects are covered in this section, making possible the creation of diagrams to represent the schema of the database. Moreover, in the

17

tree view of this tab is allowed to establish new entities and static entities in order to define the data model of the application.

2.2.2 Visual Data Querying

The main topic of this work is the improvement of the visual data querying process on the low-code development of applications, using OutSystems. Consequently, the headway of visual querying components of the platform is an essential factor to properly understand the entire project. Then, regarding the last version of the OutSystems platform, will be described, the actual visual data querying tool that is the starting point of this study.

2.2.2.1 Previous Work

Since 2002, which is the release date of the first OutSystems low-code development environment, the Hub Edition 1.0, it has been provided two distinct manners to create database queries [40]:

- **Simple Queries**: visual query builder that allowing the creation of some less complex queries, interacting with a graphical user interface;

- **Advanced Queries**: feature to specify queries textually, using a language based on SQL, but includes some extra syntax to reference variables used of the application development;

Then, since the first versions of the IDE, it is provided two ways to build queries. The first uses the visual language, which does not need so many learning requirements but also diminishes the necessity to remember the entities name or the language syntax. The second provided relies on SQL, which is the standardized textual query language, known for the developers' majority.

The first simple queries versions have accelerated the query building process finding automatically the relationships between the entities chosen. The main idea is that the developer only needs to select the entities intended and the respective join conditions would appear automatically in the query view interface. After this, it will be possible to change the join type, as well as, to add, edit and remove filtering or sorting conditions. Figure 2.6 presents a simple query example in Hub Edition 2.0 (2003) when the developer was changing the join type to an Outer Join.

This visual querying approach continued in the next versions, adding some minor improvements, such as the support to structures in order to store temporary information without changing the entity definition [35], and the inclusion of a properties pane to view and change the properties of all query elements in a single window [36].

However, at the launch of the OutSystems Platform 9 (2013), has been released an entire new way to manipulate data and express database queries. These new components

Figure 2.6: Simple Query example in Hub Edition 2.0 (extracted from [34])

of the system, called **Aggregates**, have replaced Simple Queries, promoting a new interaction strategy to query databases, where the main focus is the data, instead of query design. Also, new features have been introduced to improve the expressiveness of the visual query language, namely grouping functions and the ability to add calculated columns easier.

2.2.2.2 Current Progress

Since the implementation of Aggregates, the query process without textual languages is more visual and more focused on the query outcome. Aggregates can be used to query data from the server or mobile local storage, and can be created in the following ways:

- If someone is designing the user interface and wants to present some data gathering from the database (server or local storage), he can right-click on the screen where data will be displayed and select "Fetch Data from Database";

- When an action flow is designed, it is available an Aggregate icon in the toolbox that can be dragged and dropped to the main area;

When the Aggregate is created, the first step is the data source selection in order to specify what entities should be included in the query. Then, the developer should click in the main area and choose the entities he wants or drag and drop the entities to add them to the query. When an entity is added, all its attributes are automatically included in Aggregate. Since an Aggregate can include one or more entities, added on the beginning or later, if it has more than one, it will be analysed to verify if there are relationships between them. Unless there is a relationship that links them, the Aggregate will request the condition to join them. Otherwise, the entities will be included automatically using an inner join.

Hereupon, the Aggregate has already been created and the data source of it specified, so the visual querying process can be started, in a progressive way, seeing at the same time the query output. Figure X demonstrates an Aggregate on the referred state, to be possible to understand the structure of the interface.

Employee Name	Employee Email	Employee JobTitle	Employee IsManager	Project Name	Project Description	Project DueDate
Mirabella Wetwood	mwetwoodl@canalblog.com	Help Desk Operator	false	Project C	Aenean elementum a risus quis tempor. Fusce eu metus eget turpis pharetra eleifend consequat at ipsum. Done...	2020-02-04
Cherida Wrate	cwrated@wisc.edu	Account Representative II	true	Project F	Nulla pharetra imperdiet vestibulum. Suspendisse dapibus congue erat et maximus. Aenean finibus dapibus ma...	2020-12-16
Ceciley Stickney	cstickneye@typepad.com	VP Marketing	true	Project A	Nam rutrum consequat lectus ut egestas. Proin viverra viverra lectus, sed facilisis lacus auctor nec. Suspendisse t...	2020-01-15
Oralee Broe	obroei@example.com	Compensation Analyst	false	Project H	Sed in sem nec neque finibus ultricies in eu enim. Maecenas nec eros sit amet tortor suscipit facilisis sed ac.	2020-09-14
Elka Scopes	escopes1@nifty.com	Internal Auditor	true	Project C	Aenean elementum a risus quis tempor. Fusce eu metus eget turpis pharetra eleifend consequat at ipsum. Done...	2020-02-04
Cletus Harget	charget4@techcrunch.com	Structural Analysis Engineer	false	Project M	Curabitur at cursus lectus, nec rhoncus odio. Cras volutpat leo sit amet elit vehicula, ac laoreet turpis maximus. S...	2020-02-02
Cathleen Martt	cmartt9@yellowpages.com	Internal Auditor	true	Project K	Pellentesque vulputate diam leo, quis fringilla massa consectetur vitae. Aliquam fermentum porta congue. Pelle...	2020-06-14
Roseanne Pencott	rpencottk@tiny.cc	Recruiting Manager	true	Project J	Fusce non sem a augue sagittis egestas sit amet non nisi. Duis tempus, purus sit amet dictum egestas, sapien lo...	2020-12-31
Deloria Mcinility	dmcinility0@skype.com	Staff Accountant I	false	Project A	Nam rutrum consequat lectus ut egestas. Proin viverra viverra lectus, sed facilisis lacus auctor nec. Suspendisse t...	2020-01-15
Anny Ledington	aledington2@chron.com	Senior Sales Associate	true	Project D	Fusce placerat magna at turpis lacinia tempus. Cras quam felis, ullamcorper id ullamcorper quis, luctus a odio. V...	2020-09-06
Anatol Lago	alago3@archive.org	Teacher	false	Project A	Nam rutrum consequat lectus ut egestas. Proin viverra viverra lectus, sed facilisis lacus auctor nec. Suspendisse t...	2020-01-15

Figure 2.7: Aggregate Example

First, this component of the OutSystems Platform presents two main capabilities, represented visually in two distinct areas: the query design area, and the viewer of the query result. The former, located at the top of the window, is composed of a set of four tabs, where each selection action changes the grey area to the respective form-based interface. The latter is a table-based interface, which is similar to spreadsheets applications, such as Microsoft Excel [24] of Google Sheets [19] and its principal aim is to provide a direct and visual approach to show the query output.

Focusing on the query design area, the sources tab, illustrated in Figure 2.8, it can be used to add, change or remove the entities of the query, defining also, the join types between them. There are three join types available: "only with", "with or without", and "with". The respective joins in SQL are: "inner join", "left join", and "full outer join". Additionally, each one appears with a visual representation similar to Venn Diagrams [23] to be easier to identify which data is selected on each join type. Moreover, it is possible to edit the join condition textually, using the platform expression editor.

The filtering tab is can be used to apply filters in the query likewise the where statements in SQL. These filters can be defined through boolean conditions inserted in the expression editor. Despite the fact that they are provided shortcuts, listed in a tree view and also others in a list of buttons, the conditions are specified using only textual language.

The sort conditions can be added in the sorting tab choosing the add sort or the add dynamic sort options available. The difference between them is that dynamic sort relies on a variable of the system, contrary to the other that depends only on an entity attribute.

Figure 2.8: Aggregate - Defining Sources

To add a sort, the user has to select what entity wants to sort and specify what are the sort criteria, for example, ascending or descending. Moreover, more than one sort can be inserted for different entities. Also, the sorts inserted can be ordered to define the priority between them.

Finally, the last tab has a different behaviour when compared with the rest of the options available in this interface area. The main goal of this feature is the testing of query output when it is assigned concrete values to the variables referred in the query. Thus, it does not contribute to the query design in the same way as the other tabs, presenting only a test purpose in the context of the query result visualization.

Figure 2.9 presents an usage example of the last three sections referred, to create a query to filter and sort dates, regarding a value of a variable.


Figure 2.9: Aggregates - Filtering, Sorting and Test Values in an example of querying DueDates after a month indicated in a variable

On the other side, the area dedicated to viewing the query output provides also provides some functionalities to design the query while the user is interacting and exploring the query result. Therefore, as represented by an example in Figure 2.10, the user can change the query when he performs a right-click on a column or when clicks on the new

attribute. The only options in the list presented that do not change the query are the hide options since they just change the result in the presentation layer. So, if the user hides a set of columns, he will not see them in the result table, however, the query did not change. In addition, the user can add other attributes based on the existing, so Figure 2.11 shows an example of this functionality.

Figure 2.10: Query Design functions while interacting with Query Result

Figure 2.11: Calculated Attribute Insertion

22

3

RELATED WORK

Since the users are a fundamental component on the study, their relationship with data and what are their expectations to these query systems will be discussed. Moreover, a set of technologies and techniques will be described and compared. This information can turn to be useful to explore solutions, and understand different points of view to manage problems, regarding the project scope. As the project is focused on the improvement of an interface that combines the query design with the query output viewer.

3.1 Users in Database Query Formulation

3.2 Low-code Development Users

3.3 Visual Query Composition

The first relevant topic to analyse is the visual representation approaches, which can be applied to design an user interface capable to build queries through a visual language. Catarci *et al.* [4] presented an interesting classification according to the visual formalism which the interface is based on:

- **Form-based**: based on forms, which can be seen as a rectangular grid of other components (subforms, groups of cells, a combination of cells, etc.) that group objects in a named collection regarding its structure. Forms and tables are similar, but contrary to the tables, forms allow nesting. Thus, forms can be seen as a generalization of tables. In this approach, the relationships can be represented among cells, cells subsets, or even the overall set, providing to the user three information levels;

- **Diagram-based**: usage of graphical representations, such as graphs, charts and diagrams to better transmit the relationships among data. The aim is to use visual representations to help the understanding of the relationships between concepts which are represented by textual labels;

- **Icon-based**: as the opposite of the diagram-based, this type of interfaces tries to facilitate the understanding of the concepts instead of relationships. So, are used Icons, which are visual segmented objects to transmit a message or information, using analogies and metaphors with the real-world objects, or even conventions that are used to express no tangible objects, as computer processes;

- **Hybrid**: these approaches can combine the previous visual formalisms in order to select the best combination of advantages to the application usage domain.

In order to compare different interfaces, it is essential to analyse what a query language has to support to build the query. Accordingly, Table 3.1 presents the query creation required specifications, comparing them with the respective indication in SQL.

Table 3.1: Query Language Requisites

Specification	Description	SQL Indication
Data Source	Entities and attributes which will be presented in the query	Using SELECT and FROM statements
Merge Type	Define how will be merged attributes of different entities	Using JOIN clauses
Filtering Criteria	Criteria that can be used to filter records, presenting in the result only those that fulfil a set of conditions	Using WHERE clause
Sorting Criteria	Define what are the criteria to sort the records of the result	Using ORDER BY or HAVING clauses
Aggregation Functons	Group a set of records by comparison or using mathematical functions	Using GROUP BY statements or SQL functions, such as MIN, MAX, COUNT, AVG and SUM
Calculated Attributes	Attributes added, based on existing ones	Using SELECT statement
Distinct Values	If only different values will be considered in the result (removing duplicated values)	Using SELECT DISTINCT statement
Unions	Combine the result of two different queries	Using UNION operator
Subqueries	Defining a query that uses other queries, for example, to filter the result	Nesting SELECT statements

Nevertheless, there are two relevant aspects, according to the last requisites presented: the interaction process to indicate the query specifications, the overview of what data wants to be retrieved using the current query. Both are fundamental since a good visual query language aims to simplify not only, the query formulation process but also, the query readability, promoting an efficient and effective recognition of what are the desired data.

Data Source:

Chartio [7] has two components to query databases visually: using the Data Explorer [8] or using the new Visual SQL [10]. Regarding the data source specification, these two systems use different strategies to select and present the entities and attributes related to the query. In the Data Explorer, the user can expand the items of a list of tables in a scrollable and searchable tree view, which is pinned in one side of the window, to choose the desired attributes. This system divides the attributes into two different types: Measures and Dimensions. Usually, measure refers to quantitative data and dimensions to categorical data. So, to insert the attributes in the query, users can drag and drop the required attributes to the form-based interface that contains the Measures, Dimensions and Filters of the query (Figure 3.1a) [8].

On the other hand, the new component of Chartio, the Visual SQL provides a different interface to select the data sources. Contrary to the previous approach, in this interface, there is none fixed list to choose the attributes. In this way, there is only a search text component that is activated when the user clicks on "add column" action. When this action occurs, is presented a pop-up style component that has a list, similar to the referred above, where is possible to preview some data entries of the table (Figure 3.1b) [10].

In the systems referred above the columns are added one by one sequentially, but other systems have different methods to select the table's columns. For example, in Tableau Prep [46] there is checkbox list to chose the intended attributes (Figure 3.1c), and in Microsoft Power BI [25] the table is chosen using a list, and all its attributes are added automatically. Also, users can remove, the columns not desired after. [47] [26]

Other systems, as Devart dbForge Query Builder [15] uses a diagram-based interface to select the entities and attributes of the query. In this system, the user can drag and drop the desired tables to the diagram area, and select through checkboxes the intended attributes, that are presented in the database schema diagram (Figure 3.1d).

Merge Type:

Merges are used when it is necessary to extract data from different tables, so it is necessary to establish what is the join kind to merge the data. Therefore, the interface needs to adopt an interaction and representation technique to specify it. To define a join in Devart dbForge Query Builder [15], the user can only select the attributes' checkboxes of the different tables and the system generates an inner join automatically. In this system, there are buttons on the toolbar to select all rows of one table, of another, or both, allowing to perform left, right and outer joins respectively [14].

25

(a) Chartio Data Explorer [8]

(b) Chartio Visual SQL [10]

(c) Tableau Prep [47]

(d) Devart dbForge Query Builder [15]

Figure 3.1: Different approaches to select the entities of the query.

Another approach used by some systems, such as Chartio Data Explorer [8] and Microsoft Power BI [25], is a form-based interface to insert a join. In the former, two queries can be merged clicking on a button to popup a form which can be used to select the merge type and the first columns that will be merged using dropdowns [8] (Figure 3.2a). Also, if there are null values on the merge related columns, there is an option to include or not the null values match rows [9]. Similarly, the latter provides a button to merge queries that opens a modal where can be chosen the attributes that will be used on the merge (viewing also a table preview) and the join kind, using a dropdown [26] (Figure 3.2b).

Tableau Prep [46] provides two options to start a join between two tables: clicking on a "add join"hover button above the table visual representation with suggestion of related tables, or merge the visual representation of two tables using a drag and drop action. After this selection, the inner join type is selected automatically by the system according to the tables relationship. [44] [43] However, the user can configure the join in a dedicated section (Figure 3.2c) where it is possible to define the join type using a Venn Diagram, to manage the join clauses using dropdown lists to select the fields, including also some

join clause recommendations based on the database schema. Moreover, a summary of the join result that contains counters with the values included and excluded by each table, in a visual way using diagrams is provided. Finally, there is presented a list of the values included and excluded, where the red values represent the values excluded, as well as a preview of the join result [44].


(a) Chartio Data Explorer [8]

(b) Microsoft Power BI [26]

(c) Tableau Prep [44]

Figure 3.2: Data merging approaches.

Filtering Criteria:

To represent and manage the filtering criteria of the queries, usually is used text to indicate the logical conditions. However, some systems are trying to optimize the usability, helping the user in the specification process through some autocompletes. These diminish the necessity to remember all the syntax and the name of the functions. Besides, other systems present the logical conditions using a more structured layout, although keeping resorting in a textual representation. An example is Devart dbForge Query Builder [15] that represents the WHERE and HAVING clauses in a tree where the user can organize the conditions into groups [13].

Furthermore, some query systems also allow the user to view the query result, providing a shortcut in the column's name to insert filters. So, the user can change the query while is viewing the results. In this way, the user can apply a filter and view its effect

almost immediately. Power BI Query Editor [25] is an example of a system which uses this approach.

Different interfaces can be used to select filters regarding the field data type. The advantages of the graphical interfaces could support the filtering criteria definition. For example, if a filter is applied to constraint dates, then a date input box with a visual calendar can be useful to simplify the date typing. In this way, some softwares, such as Chartio Visual SQL [10] and Chartio Data Explorer [8], not only helps in the data typing, but also provide dropdown lists that contain operators that can be applied to the referred data type (e.g. less than, contains, like, etc) to helps the user in the boolean operator specification [8] [11].

Tableau Prep [46] follows this in a more strict way, distinguishing between data types when filtering criteria are indicated. It provides different forms depending on the data type. The main difference of this system is that not only provides a more diversity of controls, as integrating range selectors, radio button, and the option to include or exclude fields through an action accessible near its value, but also gives to the user to option to use a calculation form where the interaction style is more textually and more extensible [45].

3.4 Discussion

PROPOSED SOLUTION

After the problem contextualization, and the description of the related concepts, techniques and studies, this chapter presents the work already prepared. Starting with the requirements analysis which includes user interviews and extraction of metrics to conclude, in quantitative manners, what type of cases could lead to SQL usage. A current progress state of the solution developed will be presented, describing the actual development state and a foreseeing schedule of the work plan for the remaining time until the final of the dissertation.

4.1 Requirements Analysis

The project has started with an exploration of the OutSystems Platform data querying tool, the Aggregates, to understand its functionalities and visual approaches used to perform queries visually, as has been described in section 2.2.2. Meanwhile, not only were identified the expressiveness problems of the visual language, previously mentioned in section 1.3, but also usability problems could be perceived in the performance of available actions.

After that, user interviews have been prepared to explore limits of the tool and understand the impact of the problems on user actions. So, in the interviews, after perceiving the background of the participant, more directed questions were asked to pick up the first responses of the users about the advantages and disadvantages of the visual query tool. Next, it was asked what are the situations when SQL usage was preferred to obtain insights about the reasons not to use the visual tool to perform these queries. Also, it was required that users present examples to explain the problems they have, whenever possible, because this strategy can be useful to understand the impact level of the problem and sometimes show other problems not primarily identified. In addition, when the users did

not mention anything about expressiveness problems of the visual tool, direct questions about if they never needed to use these operations in Aggregates were colocated to cover the possibility of forgetting to mention that aspect.

The results reveal that the most novice users, with less than six months of experience, feels that Aggregates are easy to use and covers his necessity, referring also that were simpler to learn than SQL. The most experienced users, who use the OutSystems platform to develop applications, every day, for professional purpose, and have a technological background, reported that in the visual tool they cannot have a good understanding of the global view of the query, mainly if many tables, columns and business rules are involved. Switch between tabs in the interface to view the data sources, and the filtering and sorting criteria were other issue presented, as well as the lack of control on the query output [1]. Asked about the aggregation functions [2], they do not refer any problem with the approach interaction strategy adopted. Furthermore, other usability problems that decrease the users' satisfaction have been pointed out, like the difficulty to search for a column in the query result, when there are numerous columns.

The analysis were complemented with a metric study on queries executed on the Outsystems cloud, in order to find patterns that could justify users reasons to use SQL instead of Aggregates. Ultimately, the interview responses would converge with the findings on the cloud projects. The queries analysed, which have been extracted in July 2019 from customers' projects, were built using Advanced Queries [3].

Firstly, the data set is composed of 214.400 statements, but only 60.8% were used in this study since only the queries were important for this context and not other instructions, such as inserts, updates, deletes and transactions. Since the last set, which includes 125.613 queries, has duplicated queries, these were removed and the final queries set used to extract information comprehends 67.828 queries. The operators and clauses were figured out using a SQL Parser developed in JavaScript [4].

After the abstract syntax trees of the queries were obtained in a JSON file, these were analysed in a program to count the operators and the clauses that were present in the queries. A first analysis can measure the operators that are not supported by the visual tool, since the textual language is the only way to perform these operations. Figure 4.1 summarizes the number of queries that contain these operations, where the intersection is not null, so there are queries that have two or more of the indicated operations. Thus, each percentage represents the subset of queries that have the operation inside, no matter if they have other operations or not.

Furthermore, it was measured how many queries are performed using the textual language but could be designed using Aggregates. Figure 4.2 represents a chart of the

---

[1]As referred on section 2.2.2.2, when a user adds an entity to an Aggregate, all its attributes are added automatically and if the user hides them the output of the query does not change.

[2]Funtionality added when Simple Queries have been replaced by Aggregates (Section 2.2.2.1)

[3]The option of the OutSystems Platform, invoked on section 2.2.2.1, that allows the query design in a textual way using a language based on SQL.

[4]js-sql-parser repository page: https://github.com/JavaScriptor/js-sql-parser

Figure 4.1: Number of the queries that contain operations not supported by Aggregates

results obtained that divide the queries performed in three categories:

- Not Supported: Queries which include operations not supported by Aggregates, such as IN, NOT IN, EXIST, NOT EXIST, Unions, Distincts and Subqueries;

- Supported by Aggregates: Queries which could be designed totally using Aggregates. These are divided into two subcategories:

  - Simpler: Queries which include only operations supported by aggregates excluding the indication of sorting criteria and the use of aggregation functions (e.g. GROUP BY or SUM, AVG, MIN, MAX, COUNT);

  - More Complex: Queries that are supported by Aggregates excluding the above (simplers).

Since user interviews suggested that aggregation functions and sorting criteria were not the main problems. The queries supported by Aggregates were divided to compare the quantitative analysis with the qualitative analysis extracted in interviews. This is important because these operations can be specified using a different interaction techniques where the user changes the query when he is interacting with the query result, as mentioned in section 2.2.2.2.

4.2 Scope Definition

The results of the quantitative analysis show that are in conformity with the qualitative analysis results (user interviews). Both of the analysis, conclude that the main priority of the project should be the usability improvement of the visual querying tool interface. In

Figure 4.2: Relationship between the queries that could be designed using Aggregates and the queries which this tool does not support.

the set of the queries analysed, around 58% could be designed using Aggregates, being evidence that the lack of support of some SQL expressions might not be the main problem.

Although the results show a small set of queries that are not supported, these expressiveness problems of the visual tool can influence users to change to the textual languages. So, as the visual approach does not support some features users may want to change to the textual language where can perform all the queries.

Under the circumstances, the results were discussed together with the stakeholders. It was determined the main problematic was the usability of the system. Regarding the improvement of the visual interface expressiveness it was defined that the main priorities were the IN / NOT IN and the DISTINCT operations. Thus, along the project, the main focus will be the improvement of the usability and if it is possible conciliating to these two new features of visual expressiveness.

4.3   Proposed Implementation

According to the analysis made and the results concluded, the implementation covers an iterative design process aiming an improve on the usability of Aggregates, the component of the OutSystems Platform to build queries visually. The prioritized improvements of the visual query language expressiveness (IN / NOT IN and DISTINCT) will be included in the project, if possible, depending on the development progress of the usability issues. If in the next stages of development it is found that it is possible to address these expressiveness problems without impairing the development related to improving usability, these will be designed and developed, otherwise, the focus will be only the usability improvement.

As mentioned above in Section 2.2.2.2, the actual visual tool include in the interface sections to design queries visually and to view their results. Therefore, the aim is to design and evaluate how these two parts of the interface can be changed to improve the usability of the system. In an nutshell, there are two aspects that need be taken into account, in order to guide the design process: the simplicity, efficiency and effectiveness to construct queries independently of how many tables or conditions, and the readability of the global query to perceive what data of the database the query will be gathering.

The design and development process shall be divided into an initial preparation and analysis phase and the iterative design process phase:

- **Preparation and analysis phase**: before the development of the prototypes, it should be analysed and characterized the users and the tasks of the systems, as well as should be started sketching as a mean to bring up ideas that could represent starting points to tackle the existing problems. Therefore, this preparation process before the development of the prototypes will include the following tasks:

  - **Data Extraction**: although there are results obtained in the interviews and in the quantitative analysis process detailed in 4.1, also more data about the queries designing using aggregates will be extracted. It could be important to the process to understand the user's usage of the existing visual tool since the results obtained are only about the queries built using the textual language;

  - **User and Task Analysis**: users and tasks of the system will be characterized and classified regarding the concepts presented in section 2.1.3.3 and also on the related work presented in sections 3.1 amd 3.2, which was studied the interaction of different user types with database systems. This description and classification will be used not only as a reference point throughout the design process but also to define the most important trade-offs on usability attributes;

  - **Sketching**: the phase where the first sketches of possible solutions will be designed. The most important is the initial exploration of several possibilities to tackle the problems through a low-level and faster approach. As referred in section 2.1.3.2 it is useful to discover new ideas, keeping register the first approaches to tackle the problems. At the later phases, the sketched could be useful to remember the starting point of the design process;

- **Iterative design**: this method starts with low-level prototypes and in each iteration these are evaluated to create higher fidelity prototypes in the next iteration. However, as referred in section 2.1.3.2, there are different strategies to reuse or not the prototypes over iterations. In this project, will be adopted an evolutionary strategy where the prototypes developed are used as basis for the next design iteration. Moreover, the design process will include three iterations:

– **Paper Prototype (1st iteration)**: regarding the information obtained in user and task analysis, and the main ideas raised on the sketching stage, a first functional paper prototype will be built. The evaluation of the entire concept of the first interaction strategies is the main concern of this phase. Cognitive Walkthrough and Observational Methods of user testing will be the evaluation techniques used on this phase;

– **Low-fidelity Protoype (2nd iteration)**: using the results of the previous iteration, the idea is to develop a low-fidelity computer prototype on technologies, such as Balsamiq [3] or Mockingbird [27], which although do not create native applications, allow the employment of visual components and animations more similar with the intended in the final solution. So, more aspects can be tested regarding a higher complexity and fidelity of the interface. At this stage, Heuristic Evaluation will be used by experts and more user tests will be performed. The type of user tests to be made will depend on the results obtained. However, it is likely that not only Observational Methods are performed. Experimental Methods could be necessary to test specific hypothesis or discuss what is the better option between a set of possible implementations. Moreover, Query Methods, like questionnaires, could be valuable as well, to understand the user's satisfaction;

– **Final Prototype (3rd iteration)**: computer prototype integrated in the OutSystems Platform. The development focuses in the presentation layer of the application due to improve the Aggregates interface and user experience, using the new results obtained. Being the last prototype and consequently the final result of this project, it will be evaluated also by users and experts to summarize the final results of all the design and development process;

4.4 Work Plan

According to the proposed implementation approach, Figure 4.3 represents a work plan until the final of the thesis, scheduling each one of the tasks explained in the previous section throughout the remaining weeks. The tasks are assigned to its respective major phases, and the focus on the writing of the document is primarily at the end of each phase or iteration to summarize all the contents addressed meanwhile these periods, although the report can be updated every time it reveals useful.

Phases	Tasks \ Weeks	March					April				May				June					July				August				September		
		2	9	16	23	30	6	13	20	27	4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	20	27	3	17	24	31	7	14	21
Analysis & Preparation	Data Extraction	▓	▓																											
	User & Task Analysis			▓	▓																									
	Sketching					▓																								
1st Iteration	Paper Prototype Design						▓																							
	Paper Prototype Implementation							▓																						
	Paper Prototype Evaluation								▓	▓																				
2nd Iteration	Low-Fidelity Prototype Design										▓																			
	Low-Fidelity Prototype Implementation											▓	▓																	
	Low-Fidelity Prototype Evaluation													▓																
3rd Iteration	Development Environment Set Up														▓															
	Final Prototype Design															▓														
	Final Prototype Implementation																▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓						
	Final Prototype Evaluation																								▓	▓	▓			
Report	Writing of the Document			▓	▓				▓	▓			▓	▓												▓	▓	▓	▓	▓

Figure 4.3: Task Scheduling throughout the weeks until the final of the project.

Bibliography

[1] G. D. Abowd and R. Beale. "Users, systems and interfaces: a unifying framework for interaction." In: *HCI'91: People and Computers* VI (1991), pp. 73–87.

[2] A. Alshamrani and A. Bahattab. "A comparison between three SDLC models waterfall model, spiral model, and Incremental/Iterative model." In: *International Journal of Computer Science Issues (IJCSI)* 12.1 (2015), p. 106.

[3] Balsamiq. *Balsamiq.* URL: https://balsamiq.com/ (visited on 01/29/2020).

[4] T. Catarci, M. F. Costabile, S. Levialdi, and C. Batini. "Visual query systems for databases: A survey." In: *Journal of Visual Languages & Computing* 8.2 (1997), pp. 215–260.

[5] T. Catarci and G. Santucci. "Diagrammatic vs textual query languages: a comparative experiment." In: *Working Conference on Visual Database Systems.* Springer. 1995, pp. 69–83.

[6] D. D. Chamberlin and R. F. Boyce. "SEQUEL: A Structured English Query Language." In: *Proceedings of the 1974 ACM SIGFIDET (Now SIGMOD) Workshop on Data Description, Access and Control.* SIGFIDET '74. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Association for Computing Machinery, 1974, 249–264. ISBN: 9781450374156. DOI: 10.1145/800296.811515. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/800296.811515.

[7] Chartio. *Chartio.* URL: https://chartio.com/ (visited on 02/07/2020).

[8] Chartio. *Chartio Data Explorer | Documentation.* URL: https://chartio.com/docs/data-explorer/ (visited on 02/07/2020).

[9] Chartio. *Chartio FAQs: Joining Data Across Databases.* URL: https://chartio.com/docs/visual-sql/actions/ (visited on 02/10/2020).

[10] Chartio. *Chartio Visual SQL (beta) | Documentation.* URL: https://chartio.com/docs/visual-sql/ (visited on 02/07/2020).

[11] Chartio. *Visual SQL Actions | Chartio Documentation.* URL: https://chartio.com/docs/visual-sql/actions/ (visited on 02/10/2020).

[12] H. Desurvire, J. Kondziela, and M. E. Atwood. "What is Gained and Lost When Using Methods Other than Empirical Testing." In: *Posters and Short Talks of the 1992 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '92. Monterey, California: Association for Computing Machinery, 1992, 125–126. ISBN: 9781450378048. DOI: 10.1145/1125021.1125115. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/1125021.1125115.

[13] Devart. *Building WHERE or HAVING Clause*. URL: https://docs.devart.com/querybuilder-for-sql-server/building-queries-with-query-builder/building-where-and-having-clause.html (visited on 02/10/2020).

[14] Devart. *Making Joins Between Tables*. URL: https://docs.devart.com/querybuilder-for-sql-server/building-queries-with-query-builder/making-joins-between-tables.html (visited on 02/10/2020).

[15] Devart. *Query Builder Tool in dbForge Studio for SQL Server*. URL: https://www.devart.com/dbforge/sql/studio/query-builder.html (visited on 02/07/2020).

[16] A. Dillon and C. Watson. *User analysis in HCI: the historical lesson from individual differences research*. 1996. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10150/105824.

[17] A. Dix, A. J. Dix, J. Finlay, G. D. Abowd, and R. Beale. *Human-computer interaction*. Pearson Education, 2003.

[18] J. Gehrke and R. Ramakrishnan. *Database management systems*. McGraw-Hill, 2003.

[19] Google. *Google Sheets*. URL: https://www.google.com/sheets/about/ (visited on 02/05/2020).

[20] H. Henriques, H. Lourenço, V. Amaral, and M. Goulão. "Improving the Developer Experience with a Low-Code Process Modelling Language." In: *Proceedings of the 21th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*. MODELS '18. Copenhagen, Denmark: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, 200–210. ISBN: 9781450349499. DOI: 10.1145/3239372.3239387. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/3239372.3239387.

[21] ISO. *ISO 9241-11:2018(en) Ergonomics of human-system interaction — Part 11: Usability: Definitions and concepts*. 2018. URL: https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:9241:-11:ed-2:v1:en (visited on 01/27/2020).

[22] P. Jennifer, R. Yvonne, and S. Helen. "Interaction design: beyond human-computer interaction." In: *NY: Wiley* (2002).

[23] J. V. M.A. "I. On the diagrammatic and mechanical representation of propositions and reasonings." In: *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 10.59 (1880), pp. 1–18. DOI: 10.1080/14786448008626877.

[24] Microsoft. *Microsoft Excel*. URL: https://products.office.com/en/excel (visited on 02/05/2020).

[25] Microsoft. *Microsoft Power BI*. URL: https://powerbi.microsoft.com/en-us/ (visited on 02/07/2020).

[26] Microsoft. *Tutorial: Shape and combine data in Power BI Desktop*. URL: https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/power-bi/desktop-shape-and-combine-data (visited on 02/07/2020).

[27] Mockingbird. *Mockingbird*. URL: https://gomockingbird.com/home (visited on 01/29/2020).

[28] J. Nielsen. "Iterative user-interface design." In: *Computer* 26.11 (1993), pp. 32–41. ISSN: 1558-0814. DOI: 10.1109/2.241424.

[29] J. Nielsen. *Usability Engineering*. San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1994. ISBN: 9780080520292.

[30] J. Nielsen and R. Molich. "Heuristic Evaluation of User Interfaces." In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '90. Seattle, Washington, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1990, 249–256. ISBN: 0201509326. DOI: 10.1145/97243.97281. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/97243.97281.

[31] OutSystems. *Evaluation Guide (Developing with OutSystems*. URL: https://www.outsystems.com/evaluation-guide/developing-with-outsystems/ (visited on 02/01/2020).

[32] OutSystems. *Low-Code Development Platform for Enterprise Applications*. URL: https://www.outsystems.com/platform/ (visited on 01/31/2020).

[33] OutSystems. *Service Studio Overview - OutSystems 11 Documentation*. URL: https://success.outsystems.com/Documentation/11/Getting_Started/Service_Studio_Overview (visited on 02/02/2020).

[34] OutSystems. *What's new in OutSystems Hub Edition 2.0*. 2003. URL: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wkKESumKhJbwK6aoeW2DGU4-TMq-snOp/view (visited on 02/03/2020).

[35] OutSystems. *What's new in OutSystems Hub Edition 2.2*. 2004. URL: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B7C37RyL27_oNHF4UmFRX3pFM1pMTV1CWnV5dzJCcmhRS2tj/view (visited on 02/03/2020).

[36] OutSystems. *Agile Platform What's New in Version 5.0*. 2009. URL: https://www.outsystems.com/home/document-download/542/31/0/0 (visited on 02/03/2020).

[37] OutSystems. *OutByNumbers - Benchmark Overview Repor*. Tech. rep. 2013.

[38] P. G. Polson, C. Lewis, J. Rieman, and C. Wharton. "Cognitive walkthroughs: a method for theory-based evaluation of user interfaces." In: *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 36.5 (1992), pp. 741 –773. ISSN: 0020-7373.

[39] M. Revell. *What Is Low-Code?* 2020. URL: https://www.outsystems.com/blog/what-is-low-code.html (visited on 01/24/2020).

[40] T. Simões. *What's (Not) New in OutSystems: A Product Timeline*. 2018. URL: https://www.outsystems.com/blog/posts/not-new-product-timeline/ (visited on 02/03/2020).

[41] C. Souther. *Low-Code vs. No-Code: What's the Real Difference*. 2019. URL: https://www.outsystems.com/blog/posts/low-code-vs-no-code/ (visited on 01/25/2020).

[42] C. Stephanidis. "User interfaces for all: New perspectives into human-computer interaction." In: *User Interfaces for All-Concepts, Methods, and Tools* 1 (2001), pp. 3–17.

[43] Tableau. *Add More Data in the Input Step - Tableau*. URL: https://help.tableau.com/current/prep/en-us/prep_add_input_data.htm (visited on 02/10/2020).

[44] Tableau. *Aggregate, Join, or Union Data - Tableau*. URL: https://help.tableau.com/current/prep/en-us/prep_combine.htm (visited on 02/10/2020).

[45] Tableau. *Filter Your Data - Tableau*. URL: https://help.tableau.com/current/prep/en-us/prep_filter.htm (visited on 02/10/2020).

[46] Tableau. *Tableau Prep*. URL: https://www.tableau.com/products/prep (visited on 02/07/2020).

[47] Tableau. *What's New in Tableau Prep Builder*. URL: https://help.tableau.com/current/prep/en-us/prep_whatsnew.htm (visited on 02/07/2020).

[48] M. Unsöld. "Measuring Learnability in Human-Computer Interaction." Master's thesis. 2018.