

# RESEARCH METHODS IN SE

Atul Gupta

## Software Engineering (SE)

- A **multi-disciplinary** field
- We need to investigate
  - ▣ Which **tools, techniques, and processes** they use?,
  - ▣ What **social and cognitive** processes surrounding them?
  - ▣ How individual **software engineer** develop software?
  - ▣ How **teams and organizations** coordinate their efforts?



# Research Methods

- Controlled Experiments (including Quasi-Experiments)
- Case Studies (both exploratory and confirmatory)
- Survey Research
- Ethnographies
- Action Research

# Empirical Investigations

- Common tasks
  - ▣ Identify goals, questions and measures (metrics)
  - ▣ Choosing research method(s)
  - ▣ Planning, designing, and carry out investigations
  - ▣ Data collection,
  - ▣ Data Analysis
  - ▣ Results
  - ▣ Validity considerations
  - ▣ Conclusions

# Two Motivating Examples

- To assess the effectiveness of a novel fisheye-view file navigator
- To assess how developers in industry use (or not) UML diagrams during software design

## Research Questions

### Kind of research questions

- RQ. *“Is a fisheye-view file navigator more efficient than the traditional view for file navigation?”*
- Ambiguous !
  - ▣ Who?
  - ▣ File navigation?
  - ▣ Circumstances?
  - ▣ Efficiency?
- RQ. *“how widely are UML diagrams used as collaborative shared artefacts during design?”*
- Ambiguous !

Defining the precise meaning of terms is Crucial !

# Formulating exploratory Questions

- Existence Questions
  - ▣ Ex: “Does X exists?”
- Classification Questions
  - ▣ Ex: “What is X like?”
- Descriptive-Comparative Questions
  - ▣ Ex: “How does X differ from Y?”

# Formulating Base-rate Questions

- Frequency and distribution questions
  - ▣ Ex: “How often does X occur?”, “What is an average amount of X?”
- Descriptive-Process questions
  - ▣ Ex: “How does X normally work?”
- Relationship questions
  - ▣ Ex: “Are X and Y related?”
  - ▣ Correlation and Causality

# Formulating Base-rate Questions

- Causality Relationship questions
  - ▣ Causality questions -“Does X cause Y?”
  - ▣ Causality-Comparative questions - “Does X cause more Y than does Z?”
  - ▣ Causality-Comparative Interaction “Does X or Z cause more Y under one condition but not others?”

# Choosing a Research Method

- Depends
  - ▣ available resources,
  - ▣ access to subjects,
  - ▣ opportunity to control
  - ▣ the variables of interest,
  - ▣ the skills of the researcher
  - ▣ how closely the method aligns with the question(s) that have been posed

# Controlled Experiments

- Investigation of a testable hypothesis suggesting causal relationships
- Identification of study variables and instruments
  - ▣ Independent , dependent, block variables
  - ▣ Subjects, objects
- Design of experiments
- More of a quantitative than qualitative method
- Theory driven
- Validity consideration

## Controlled Experiment

- Strengths
  - ▣ Theory driven
  - ▣ Exercise maximum degree of control over study variables
  - ▣ Repeatable
  - ▣ Better generalization is possible
  - ▣ A tool for SE education

# Controlled Experiments

---

- Weaknesses or Limitations
  - ▣ Small Scope
  - ▣ Underlying assumptions may be wrong
  - ▣ Tends to be artificial

# Case Studies

---

- “An empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.”  
[Yin 2002]
- Exploratory vs. confirmatory
- Selection of a case is a crucial step
  - ▣ Purposive sampling vs. random sampling
- Quantitative as well as qualitative

# Case Studies



## □ Strengths

- ▣ Offer in-depth understanding of a phenomenon in real situations
- ▣ Situations where effects are expected to be wide ranging, or take a long time (e.g. weeks, months, years) to appear
- ▣ situations where the context is expected to play a role in the phenomena

# Case Studies



## □ Weaknesses

- ▣ the data collection and analysis is more open to interpretation and researcher bias
- ▣ Limited generalization



# Surveys



- Characteristics of a broad population of individuals
- Use of interviews/questionnaires for data collection
- Selection of a *representative sample* from a well-defined *population*
  - ▣ More of a qualitative than quantitative

# Surveys



- Strengths
  - ▣ Small to large scope
  - ▣ Generalizable

# Surveys

---

- Weaknesses

- control for sampling bias
- Low response rate can be problematic
- Inappropriate survey questions
- Difficult to interpret or less insightful

# Ethenographics

---

- Field studies
- Study a *community* of people
- focus on a broad technical community (e.g. Java programmers in general), or a small, closely knit community (e.g. a single development team)
- Researcher as an observer or a participant observer
- The biggest challenge is to perform detailed observation, data collection, and analysis

# Action Research

- Solving a real-world problem while simultaneously studying it
- A long drawn method
- An iterative approach to problem solving
- Immaturity as an empirical method (tends to be ad hoc)
- An appealing framework for mixing research with professional activities

## Mixed-Mode Approaches

- All methods have limitations
- Weaknesses of one method can be compensated for by the strengths of other methods
- Key decisions involve
  - ▣ the strategy for data collection
  - ▣ the sequence in which different methods are employed
  - ▣ quantitative and qualitative data
- Three general approaches
  - ▣ *Sequential explanatory strategy*
  - ▣ *Sequential exploratory strategy*
  - ▣ *Concurrent triangulation strategy*

# Data Collection Techniques



- Separate lecture

## Empirical Validity



- **Construct validity:**
  - ▣ the “right” (relevant and minimal) metrics, design
  - ▣ “Are we actually measuring what we intend to measure?”
- **Internal validity:**
  - ▣ the “right” data values.
  - ▣ “Does the data really follow from the experimental concepts?”
- **Conclusion validity:**
  - ▣ the right (appropriate) data analysis?
- **External validity:**
  - ▣ the “right” (representative) context
  - ▣ “Can the results of the experiment be generalized?”

# Threats to validity

## Examples:

- ❑ Violated assumptions of statistical tests
- ❑ Researchers may influence the results by looking for a specific outcome.
- ❑ If the group is very heterogeneous there is a risk that the variation due to individual differences is larger than due to the treatment.
- ❑ Incorrectly designed Experiment
- ❑ Effect of confounding factors
- ❑ Research bias
- ❑ ...

## Other Dangers

- ❑ Manipulating several explanatory variables simultaneously so the effect on the response variable cannot be interpreted
- ❑ Over-complex design
- ❑ Carryover effects or learning
- ❑ Insufficient subjects (lack of power)
- ❑ Unrealistic task/environment
- ❑ Unrepresentative subjects - usually students

# Confounding Effects in SE Experiment

- Technique Learning Effect
- Object Learning Effect
- Boredom Effect
- Enthusiasm Effect
- Experience Effect
- Procedure Effect

## Practical Considerations

- Relate to time, budget and personnel resources, and access to data
- Methods that are primarily qualitative
  - ▣ Designing good research question
  - ▣ Researching skills – Observation, recording social behavior, patience,
- Methods that are primarily quantitative
  - ▣ Require more significant time in the planning
  - ▣ Pilot studies
  - ▣ Researching Skills – critique, management, innovation

# Conclusions

---

- An overview of research methods
- Each has its own strengths and weakness
- Use of mixing-methods
- Validity considerations

# References

---

- Guide to Advanced Empirical Software Engineering, Forest Shull, Janice Singer, and Dag I.K. Sjøberg, Springer 2008