Thesis structure

Each dot point hierarchy is a section of content / chapter and subchapters

* Title
* Academic Integrity stated
* Acknowledgements
* Abstract
* Contents
* List of Figures
* List of Tables
* Introduction
  + Background (HL)
    - Opening example to get the attention of the reader

*(brief example, maybe a quote from a story about a weird birth in greek mythology, e.g. Helen or Athena?)*

* + - Context (or even why do we care at all about genealogical graphs)

*The influence of greek mythology on modern civilisation.*  *Why should we care about this? E.g. explain existing mechanisms for reading genealogical information – indexes from books. But they do not show the flow of these relationships.*

* + Motivations (HL)
    - Existing graphs for greek myth genealogies + gaps in this area

*Research about existing methods of visualising greek myth relationships. None appropriately address unusual, contested, duplicated entities due to immortality).  
Why do we want to highlight these relationships?*

* + - Benefits of interactive digital platform over static image

*These are not yet available. Use this to explain the reasoning of why we want data cards – useful research tool. Much easier than index in a book.*

* + Contributions (HL)
    - Papers on attempts to show unusual relationships graphically + gaps in this area

*e.g. paper on polygamy chordal graphs, or TimeNets. No one has done anything similar.*

* + In response to the gaps, PROVIDE RESEARCH QUESTION
  + Method and approach

*Extracting genealogical data from MANTO and importing them into website using Python. Website built in React.*

*Conduct user interviews to determine the effectiveness of the solution. Outline of the thesis*

*Do we need to show the code? How much of the code?*

* *Code is on GitHub and should shout that this system works, this code is vailable on github, refer reader to github if they want to see it*
* Overview of Greek mythology, explain the importance
  + What is a disputed relationship
  + What are the different types of unusual relationships

*Go through each one and explain, e.g. autochthony. Give examples of each. Provide images, e.g. Helen of Troy and Athena*

* + Why this is a problem
* Basic Principles and backend/ontology (technical part, small parts of code) – essentially litierature review. Some of the development of the database, structure of the database has also been part of the research project. Be clear in the acknowledgements that have been working with a collaborator (Greta). Modified the datastructure based on work (used to have uncle and gender in the ties, and now we’ve removed those and kept them data neutral)
* Focus on the parts that represent genealogies
  + *Do I need to explain what ReactJS is? I’m not using other frameworks.*
  + Explain the MANTO database and what it contains.
  + Explanation of DOMS? CANVAS?
  + Explanation of NodeGoat?
* Existing Framework Possibilities (technical part, small parts of code)
  + Available data formats, pros & cons
    - *Data JSON*
    - *DOT Notation*
    - *GraphLib*
    - *GEDCOM*
  + Available graph rendering tools, pros & cons
    - *Ancestry.com*
    - *Roots*
    - *Legacy 9*
    - *GraphViz*
    - *DOT*
    - *DagreJS + D3*
    - *HTML canvas*
    - *OrgChart*
    - *Maybe show the prototypes I created out of some of these*
  + *More specifically review – the layout of the graphs used in laying out familial relationsships. Just don’t have a paragraph on each of the pros and cons of each of tho\se. Focus on those.*
  + Available graph formats

*Normally after this would be 3 chapters:*

1. *Backend development*
2. *Frontend development*
3. *Case study*

*HOW TO FIT IN THE FOLLOWING PARTS (should there be a chapter on each?)*

* First attempt
  + Graph
    - Created prototype 1 (D3 hiearchical DAG with DagreJS) – can interact with, can’t modify style of graph
    - Created prototype 2 (HTML canvas with JSON objects) – can modify style of graph, cannot interact with it
    - Drew up some styles of graphs that we could use – mention why no lines straight through middle of node; only around
  + Developed datacards according to Greta’s specifications
  + Drew up an interaction diagram to show how we interact with the different relationships
  + Realised we need a better idea of what people actually want. Created a website full of different kinds of graphs.
* User interview round 1 (process and questions, participants, motivations, results)
  + Highly-qualitative
  + Purpose was to find what types had the most potential, what stood out as important
  + Results:
    - Wanted how-to page and legend
    - Data cards interesting, wormholes
    - Graphs useful as long as they’re interactive
* Second attempt
  + Graph
    - Created prototype 3 using KonvaJS.
    - Made changes according to some of the user interview results
    - What changes we decided not to adopt
      * E.g. other kinds of graphs like DAG and timelines are better suited to other kinds of info, not genealogical. Like episodic and strength of connections.
      * E.g. other texts would make it more useful
      * See Greta’s comments on user interview round 1 feedback page
  + Discussed the different kinds of relationships, and the best way to represent them as to not cause confusion
    - List the different kinds of relationships, and explain the reasoning behind each design choice
* User interview round 2 (process and questions, participants, motivations, results)
  + Determine effectiveness of updated graph
  + Determine the effectiveness of the different unusual connections
  + What was the consensus?
* Conclusion
  + Future Work
* Appendix/Appendices
* Bibliography
* Use it to explore the possibilities of displaying other kinds of relationships due to unusual genealogies in modern day, e.g. polyamory, artificial insemination, adoptions. Particularly since most genealogical graphing systems can’t deal with those.

To researchers: which of these graphs mesh with the concept you’ve held in your head based on a decade of study. Conceptual model that exists in your head which is difficult to communicate to other people, e.g. big families, contested parts.

(Overall) Communicate the significance of families and family structures, contested aspect of it

Communicate traditions, attempts to show contested relationships.

Can you. Use digital medium to communicate complex familial relationships that you can’t communicate / people won’t communicate through analog means

There might be a huge number of users (body of users could be diverses) and peple can use it n many different ways.

My job is to create something that people find useful in general.

Prototype 1 and prototype 2 – how too link to user study?

Do we tell a story?

* Motivate an interesting problem
* Gaps to approaches taken
* Evidence-based, solve the problems proposed
* Avoid first-person
  + “Under my direction I changed the data structure”
  + But aside from this, use third-person.

Literature review

* What has been done to solve this problem in the past

Intro

Lit review

Contribution to the ontology of MANTO – body chapter 1

Here also explains how the data structure works

Design Phase 1 – body chapter 2

Prototype 1

Prototype 2

Design

* + - *Force-directed*
    - *DAG*
    - *Hierarchical*
    - *Ancestor fan*
    - *Timeline*
    - *Radial tree*
    - *Dendrogram*
    - *(or put this in the literature review section)*

Response (people wanted look nice and also interactive) – organise uer interview to test this

Vis, interface, technical side of building it and the user study

Results

Design Phase 2 – body chapter 3

Construction, response to the user study from round 1,

Conclusion

REGULARLY REFER TO THE WEBSITE IN THE BODY OF THE TEXT!

OR MAKE THE EARLIER VERSION LIVE (E.G. YAYALU.GITHUB.IO/GREEKGRAPHS-V1)

Write body chapters first, then lit review, then intro. Dot point them until then.