



HAL
open science

Eliciting Strategies and Tasks in Uncertainty-Aware Data Analytics

Nadia Boukhelifa, Marc-Emmanuel Perrin, Samuel Hurrion, James Eagan

► **To cite this version:**

Nadia Boukhelifa, Marc-Emmanuel Perrin, Samuel Hurrion, James Eagan. Eliciting Strategies and Tasks in Uncertainty-Aware Data Analytics. IEEE Conference on Visual Analytics Science and Technology (IEEE VAST 2016) [Poster Paper], Oct 2016, Baltimore (Maryland), United States. hal-01404022

HAL Id: hal-01404022

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01404022>

Submitted on 28 Nov 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Eliciting Strategies and Tasks in Uncertainty-Aware Data Analytics

Nadia Boukhelifa*

Marc-Emmanuel Perrin†

Samuel Hurron‡

James Eagan§

Télécom ParisTech & LTCI, Université Paris-Saclay

ABSTRACT

Uncertainty plays an important and complex role in data analysis and affects many domains. To understand how domain experts analyse data under uncertainty and the tasks they engage in, we conducted a qualitative user study with 12 participants from a variety of domains. We collected data from audio and video recordings of think-aloud demo sessions and semi-structured interviews. We found that analysts sometimes ignore known uncertainties in their data, but only when these are not relevant to their tasks. More often however, they deploy various coping strategies, aiming to *understand*, *minimise* or *exploit* the uncertainty. Within these coping strategies, we identified five high level tasks that appear to be common amongst all of our participants. We believe our findings and further analysis of this data will yield concrete design guidelines for uncertainty-aware visual analytics.

1 INTRODUCTION

Before visualization designers can express a need for specifically tailored tools to explore uncertain data, we have to understand how, in practice, analysts treat uncertainty information. Such investigation can help shed light into what analysis tasks we need to support when building uncertainty-aware visual analytics tools and the evaluation tasks to use for more ecological validity. Indeed, existing user-studies dealing with uncertainty visualization have largely dealt with simplified low-level detailed tasks, making it unclear how applicable the results of these studies are in the real-world [1, 2]. When high level tasks are used, their choice is seldom justified.

Our hypothesis is that uncertain data may require special types of analysis tasks and exploration strategies. To this end we designed a qualitative user study to identify the coping strategies and the tasks that domain experts engage in when they are confronted with uncertainty. In this work, we identified *three* key strategies and *five* main processes (high level tasks) common amongst our participants. We believe that further analysis of the collected data will result in a more detailed characterisation of uncertainty-aware data analytics and can yield a concrete set of design guidelines and open research questions relevant to the visual analytics research community.

2 STUDY DESIGN

We conducted semi-structured interviews and think-aloud demos with domain experts to identify their uncertainty coping strategies and the tasks they engage in when exploring uncertain data.

2.1 Participants

We interviewed 12 domain experts (9 female) aged 26–56 (mean 38) from 11 different organisations (entreprise and research). Participants were self identified as working with uncertainty. The analysts ranged from PhD students to experienced data scientists. In

this paper, we use the term “analyst” to refer to anyone whose primary job function includes working with data to answer questions that inform business or research decisions.

2.2 Study Procedure and Task

Interviews were one-to-one and lasted from 45 minutes to 2 hours. We asked open-ended questions and encouraged interviewees to describe their lived experiences. The interview had three parts: general, scenario and think-aloud demo, and prospectives (a wish list). Whenever possible, we asked participants to show us their tools and data sets. All interviews were video recorded.

2.3 Data Analysis

We collected 681 minutes of recordings in total, which were then transcribed by one author (92,151 words). To analyse this data, we followed a structured procedure based on grounded theory. Two authors independently open coded the transcripts, highlighting interesting snippets of text, or key ideas that were frequently mentioned. We then crossed checked the selected excerpts before extracting them into a data table. In total, we analysed 787 snippets using iterative coding and affinity diagramming.

3 INITIAL FINDINGS

Our participants contributed their own definitions of what uncertainty means for their respective domains. These uncertainties generally fall into one of four layers: *data*, *model*, *interface*, and *cognitive*. At the data layer, uncertainty pertains to the data set itself, such as uncertainty about particular values in the data or their provenance (e.g. errors; imprecise or inaccurate data; missing or unknown data; and vagueness, ambiguity, and fuzziness). At the model layer, uncertainty pertains more to the processing that was applied to the data, such as to fit them to a particular model (e.g. model accuracy and error). The interface layer deals with the software that acts as an interface between the data and the user, such as in a visualization (e.g. algorithmic errors and inconsistency between the system and interface). Finally, uncertainty at the cognitive level relates to how the user interprets and makes sense of the data (e.g. ambiguity in sense-making and inter-personal dynamics).

3.1 Strategies to Cope with Uncertainty

The analysis of our data revealed two categories of uncertainty coping strategies: *active* and *tacit*. Most important are the active strategies where analysts deploy tools and techniques to *understand*, *minimise* or *exploit* the underlying uncertainties. Although all participants view uncertainty as an important aspect to consider during data analysis, they sometimes chose to ignore it. This happens when the category of uncertainty itself was not relevant to the analysis or business needs, or because it was difficult to control. Tacit strategies reflect accepted domain practices with regards to uncertainty. They have an influence on the type of active strategy, if any, that analysts choose to use.

3.2 Processes and Tasks in Uncertain Data Analysis

Our analysis revealed five processes frequently used by our participants: acquire, manipulate, reason, characterise and present. Key to data analysis are the manipulate, characterise and reason processes. We differentiate between these processes by the output they each

*e-mail: nadia.boukhelifa@telecom-paristech.fr

†e-mail: marc-emmanuel.perrin@telecom-paristech.fr

‡e-mail: samuel.hurron@telecom-paristech.fr

§e-mail: james.eagan@telecom-paristech.fr




Figure 1: Participants' analysis workflows using the five uncertainty processes: *acquire*, *manipulate*, *characterize*, *reason* and *present*.




Figure 2: A flow-diagram describing the variety of ways analysts interact with uncertainty information during data analysis and sense-making. Characterising uncertainty being a distinctive step to uncertainty-aware data analysis and can happen at any stage.

produce: *manipulate* generates data; *characterise* generates meta-data and *reason* generates thoughts. The *characterise* process is particular to uncertain data analysis.

Acquire Almost all participants start their process by acquiring data and half of them would repeat this process at least once during the analysis. The acquisition process comprises tasks involving collecting, generating, enriching and storing data. The result of this process is often a database. Our participants acquired images, sensor data, log data, DNA sequencing tables, and documents.

Manipulate This process consists of applying computerised tools that transform data. We have observed four groups of data manipulations: *transform* by applying statistical operations (e.g. normalisation) and aggregation; *correct* often to clean data or correct known biases; *remove* such as for filtering outliers; and *enrich* through data fusion, extrapolation, duplication and estimation. These operations can be manual or automatic. The output of this process is typically a transformed or a new database. All our participants manipulated data or models of it; and used one or more of the aforementioned data manipulation tasks.

Characterise Uncertainty This process involves any operation which tries to qualify or quantify uncertainty, thus generating information about uncertainty. All our participants engaged in this activity. Characterisation tasks can be of three types, ordered from least informal to formal as follows: (a) *Annotate uncertainty*: here participants assigned notes to data, to describe their thoughts, doubts and their own or collaborative informal assessments of data quality. The output of this task are often text annotations and comments, stored as metadata fields in a database; (b) *Compute uncertainty*: often through statistical assessments of data quality (e.g. calculating the mean and standard deviation), or by defining a quality threshold manually or through learning and clustering algorithms; and (c) *Model uncertainty*: A few participants engaged in this activity where they tried to build a model that takes uncertainty into account or model the uncertainty in itself. All these models had a confidence attribute to characterise predictions or estimations.

Reason Reasoning encapsulates all tasks that result in the generation of thoughts, insight or decisions, as an individual or a collaborative task. The outcome of this process is currently not stored

or exploitable in an automatic process. In this category, we include the following re-occurrent tasks: infer, interpret, make a hypothesis, cross check, compare, search, derive insight, conclude and validate with experts. All of our participants performed uncertainty-aware reasoning tasks during their analysis.

Present In the present process, participants produced artefacts such as written reports, presentations and plots for the purpose of exploration, communication and dissemination. All participants used this process, usually towards the end of their analysis workflow. However, only a few participants used the present process to explore intermediate results.

3.3 Uncertainty-aware Data Analysis Workflows

To understand how the five processes of analysis under uncertainty relate to each other, we did the following steps: (a) we analysed video and transcript data from our study to produce 12 workflow diagrams that were then validated by our participants; (b) we open coded participants' activities using our process labels. The results of this analysis are shown in Fig. 1. The visual analysis of these processes shows no common overall sequencing between participants. However, what is shared, is that many participants started their analysis with data acquisition and finished with a presentation of their findings. Data manipulation, is at the core of the analysis, interleaved with reasoning and uncertainty characterisation. Similar to data acquisition and manipulation, but with a higher frequency is the uncertainty characterisation process. It appears that the majority of participants used this process extensively, often using two or more characterisation operations in a row. Interestingly, uncertainty characterisation is never at the end of the analysis. This is because for all of our participants, managing uncertainty was an aspect of analysis and not the goal. Reasoning also happens at various places in the analysis. This is understandable, as participants form hypotheses that inform all other steps of data analysis.

We translated these findings into the process model in figure 2. The diagram illustrates our observation that the five data analysis processes can occur at anytime during the analysis. The links between the process boxes indicate possible sequence paths.

3.4 Implications for Uncertainty-Aware Analytics

Based on our study findings, we discuss three design implications for uncertainty-aware analysis tools. *First*, our study showed that a great deal of uncertainty characterisation was manual. Experts used their knowledge to assess data quality, disambiguate objects and remove outliers in their data. There is need to create tools that capture and encode analysts' annotations, and specifically with regards to uncertainty. *Second*, whereas tools to gain a basic understanding of data quality and to minimise the uncertainty are widely accessible (e.g. by removing uncertain data or adding annotations), uncertainty exploitation tools are scarce (e.g. to make inferences). Therefore, we see more need for developing uncertainty exploitation tools. *Third*, in real life, analysts collaborate with other "data workers", data providers, managers and other parties. Each of them has a different role to play along the analysis workflow. We envision collaborative uncertainty-aware data analysis tools that take into account sources of uncertainty in the data as well as in the model, interface, and cognitive and relational levels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to the Chair Big Data & Market Insights at Télécom ParisTech.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. S. Quinan, L. M. Padilla, S. H. Creem-Regehr, and M. Meyer. Towards Ecological Validity in Evaluating Uncertainty. In *VIS Workshop Proc. on Visualization for Decision Making Under Uncertainty*, 2015.
- [2] M. Skeels, B. Lee, G. Smith, and G. G. Robertson. Revealing uncertainty for information visualization. *Information Visualization*, 9(1):70–81, 2010.