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A class of research questions

An eternal research question in software engineering:

• How do alternative methods, processes, technologies, notations, tools etc. compare?
  • With respect to ease of use, productivity, error-proneness, quality of results, learnability etc.

• Applicable to (for instance):
  • design methods
  • design notations
  • development process models
  • testing methods
  • programming languages
  • middleware technologies
  • etc.
Example:
Comparing programming languages

• For instance, assume we would like to compare a number of programming languages
• Questions:
  • How easily are they learned?
  • How productive are they? (time for solving a given problem)
  • How fast do the programs run?
  • How much memory do they need?
  • How many defects do they contain?
  • How reliably do they run?
  • How robust are they?
  • How safe are they? How secure?
  • How long are they?
  • How easy are they to understand, modify, test?
  • and many more
Research method of choice: Controlled experiment

In principle, the perfect research method for addressing these questions is a *controlled experiment*:

- Change one thing (here: The language used)
- Keep everything else the same (this is what is called *control*)
- Observe what happens in each case
  - i.e. write a program and investigate its properties
- Interpret the observations to answer your research questions
Research method problems: Generalizability

- No matter which task we choose for the program
  - it may be more suitable for language A than for B
  - but for a different program it could have been the other way round

- This means, we cannot guarantee that our results generalize to everything that can be done with the languages.
  - There is no solution to this problem
    - The best we could do is use several tasks, not just one.
    - And spread them over the spectrum of possible tasks.

- We should choose a task that can be considered either "typical" or "interesting"
  - Typical: Results describe frequent cases
  - Interesting: Results describe cases with high uncertainty
Research method problems: Criteria needed

- We need operationalizations for the individual attributes targeted by our questions
  - Repeatable procedures for obtaining an answer

- This is straightforward for some attributes, e.g.:
  - How fast do they run?
    - Choose an input, measure execution time in seconds

- It is very difficult for others, e.g.:
  - How many defects do they contain?
  - How safe are they? How secure?
  - How easy are they to understand, modify, test?
Research method problems: Control

- The worst methodological problem in our case, however, is control:
  How to keep "everything else constant"?

- We would need to keep the programmer constant!

- That is obviously impossible:
  - We cannot guarantee that somebody has equivalent knowledge of all languages
  - The programmer learns each time when solving the problem. We cannot erase or reset this experience.

- So we need a replacement for true constancy.
Keeping the programmer "constant"

- Obviously, we need to use a different programmer for each language.
  - How do we make them all the same?

Method 1: Grow them
- Find a large-enough set of monozygotic multiples
- Make sure they have all had the same youth and education
- Make sure they had no programming training yet
- Train each in a different language
  - Make sure each training has the same quality!
- Perform the experiment with them
  - Make sure they are all in identically good condition on that day!

This is practically impossible.
Keeping the programmer "constant" (2)

Method 2: Use averaging

- Find a large-enough set of roughly similar programmers for each language
- Make sure none of these groups is inherently inferior to another, programming-wise
- Have each of these persons solve the task
- When evaluating the results, use the average of the results of each language
  - And hope that all differences between the programmers cancel out
    - within each group
    - as well as across groups

This is possible.

We still need to operationalize "roughly similar" and find such
Variation among "roughly similar" programmers

- Each point represents one group (by task type): The worktime quotient of slowest to fastest quarter of participants
Variation among "roughly similar" programmers (2)
Problem of averaging

• Compare these interpersonal differences to the differences you would expect between languages
• With interpersonal variation this large, will we be able to (clearly) see the language differences at all?

Conclusion:
• It is important to get either
  • fairly similar programmers (not just roughly similar ones)
    • to reduce the interpersonal variation
  • or very many of them
    • The precision of an estimate of the mean is $\frac{\text{stddev}}{\sqrt{N}}$
Many or similar: When to use which

We will now shortly review two different studies:

- One used many roughly similar programmers to compare programming languages

- The other (currently in planning) attempts to use fewer, but more similar programmers to compare web development platforms
Example 1: jccpprtp

- The study jccpprtp compares Java, C, C++, Perl, Python, Rexx, and Tcl.

- It is based on a precise specification of a simple string processing program.

- 80 implementations were collected from 74 programmers:
  - Some in a controlled experiment on a different topic.
  - Others via a call in Usenets newsgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>language</th>
<th>progs</th>
<th>second</th>
<th>unusable</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C++</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perl</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Python</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcl</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
jccpprt task

- A fixed mapping from letters to digits is given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>JNQ</td>
<td>RWX</td>
<td>DSY</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>CIV</td>
<td>BKU</td>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>GHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>jnq</td>
<td>rwx</td>
<td>dsy</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>civ</td>
<td>bku</td>
<td>lop</td>
<td>ghz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The program receives as input a "dictionary" (list of words) and a list of "phone numbers"
- and must produce as output all possible encodings of the phone numbers by words according to the mapping

5624-82: mir Tor
5624-82: Mix Tor
4824: Torf
4824: fort
4824: Tor 4
10/783--5: neu o"d 5
10/783--5: je bo"s 5
10/783--5: je Bo" da
381482: so 1 Tor
Some jccpprt results:
Execution time for 1000 numbers

with a
73000-word dictionary
Some jccpprt results:
Observations

• The individual variation is **huge**
  • Note the scale is logarithmic!
  • Observe how wide the stderr dashes around the means (M) are!

• General trends are hence unclear

• But (looking at the medians), we find that scripting language programs are **not** generally much slower than programs in compiled languages
Some jccpprt results:
Work time required

![Box plot showing total time for programming in [hours] for different programming languages: tcl, rexx, python, perl, Java, C++, and C. The box plot displays the distribution of the data with quartiles and outliers.]
Some jccpprt results:
Observations

• It looks like the compiled languages require 2-3 times as long for solving the problem with them
  • and interpersonal variation is also larger there

But beware:
• The Java, C, C++ times were measured in a controlled experiment \(\rightarrow\) they are reliable
• The scripting language times are self-reported by participants found via Usenet postings
• Can we trust the latter?
Some jccpprt results:
Length of resulting program

![Bar chart showing program length for different languages]
Some jccpprt results:
Observations

- The length data are undisputable and confirm the work time data
  - if we assume that lines written per hour is language-independent

That leaves one problem:
- Are the length differences due to language differences or due to better qualifications of the script programmers?
  - Validation idea:
    Better-qualified programmers would write more lines per hour
Validation of comparability of programmer qualifications

source text productivity [LOC/hour]

tcl
rexx
python
perl
Java
C++
C
jccpprt summary

• Overall, the sheer mass of data points allows to overcome the significant problems of interpersonal variation
• and even (to a reasonable degree) the validity problems regarding the trustworthyness of some of the data

• So how about comparing web development platforms in the same manner?
Example 2: A contact

- Late in 2005, Gaylord Aulke, CEO of the web development service company 100days, contacted me roughly like this:

- "We are using PHP in our projects. I use jccpprt to argue that scripting languages are to be taken seriously. Couldn't we do a similar study for PHP?"
Comparing web development platforms:
The main problem

- The main success factor in jccpprt was the large number of implementations per language
- The large number was possible, because the task was small
  - Well under 10 person-hours for most participants, despite high reliability requirements and modest skills
- The task could be small, because the domain "language comparison" could be meaningfully addressed with an algorithmic problem.
  - The task was not more or less representative than any other.

- However web applications cannot reasonably be as small
  - The whole point of web development platforms is giving good support and reuse for many complex development tasks.
    - So those need to be present in the task
Which platforms?

- So we obviously have a scaling problem.
- Let's see how big that is.

First, which platforms would we need to look at?
- The "Big Money" platforms: Java Enterprise Edition, .NET
- The ubiquitous one: PHP
- The grand old lady: Perl
- Possibly younger contesters: Python, Ruby-on-Rails

- So we need to obtain 4 to 6 groups of implementations
Which aspects in the task?

Second, certain aspects should be present in the task to make the comparison meaningful:

- User registration, authentication, session tracking, forms and validation, dynamic results, reports, persistence, web services, ...

- So we need to have a task that is many times larger than that of jccpprt
How to make clear-enough differences likely?

Again, we have two possible approaches:
- Obtain a large number of implementations
- or obtain only a few, but from fairly similar programmers

Discussion:
- Which way to go?
- Why? How?
- How to ensure validity of the study?
One possible design: Plat_Forms

- Ensure validity by creating all implementations under supervision
  - same time, same place

- Make sufficient task size possible by inviting teams of 3 for 30 hours
  - A (hopefully sensible) balance of size and cost

- Reduce interpersonal variation by soliciting participation from top-class programmers only

- Make sufficient participation likely by advertising the study as a contest
  - an opportunity for software development service organizations to show off their capabilities
  - at most 3 teams will be admitted per platform
Current status

- The Plat_Forms contest and study has been announced by 'iX in their November 2006 issue
  - and on heise online Newsticker on October 11

- The contest is planned for January 25-26, 2007, in Nürnberg

- We are now looking for
  - sponsors
  - platform representatives who will help select teams from among the applicants
  - teams who want to participate
  - students who would like to participate in the scientific evaluation afterwards
Tasks during the evaluation

- Develop tests and criteria for correctness and usability
  - May require comparing apples and oranges meaningfully
- Obtain load testing software, design and set up load tests
  - May be difficult if a lot of Javascript is used
- Develop categories and criteria for describing the structure, size, and modularity of the solutions
  - Must accommodate the very different approaches of the platforms
- Develop scenarios for characterizing the flexibility and modifiability of the solutions
  - Requires sufficient understanding of each platform
- Perform all these evaluations and record results
  - during February, March, April
- Write result report
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