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This talk…

• Why
• How
• What
Why...

Model composition...

...really important and hard

...error-prone

...time-consuming

...the literature fails to provide empirical evidence
Why…

It is not clear to what extent

…the level of experience

…composition effort

….number of correctly composed models
There is a difference because the input models conflict with each other in some way.
Example: Integrating Feature Models
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Example: Integrating Feature Models

**Conflict** is a contradicting value assigned to the properties of feature models.
The first conflict is that we have one feature named as B in the base model, while we have the other feature named as C in the delta model.
The second conflict is that the relationship between the features A and B in the base model is optional, while the relationship between the features A and C in the delta model is mandatory.
In this case, the composed and intended models are inconsistent. Inconsistencies are contradicting values between the output-composed model and the output-intended model.
Example: Integrating Feature Models

In this case, we have two inconsistencies:

1. The first inconsistency is that the features B and C were inserted into the output-composed model, rather than just the feature B.
Example: Integrating Feature Models

In this case, we have two inconsistencies:

2. The second inconsistency is that an alternative relationship between the features A, B and C was created, rather than a mandatory relationship between the features A and B.
Therefore:

The output-composed model has just 25% of the output-intended model.

75% of the composed model conflict with the output-intended model.
How...

...performing a controlled experiment with 25 participants

...quantifying 250 compositions

...two research questions were formulated and investigated.

...following a well-known experimental process.

...quantifying effort and correctness of the composed models created by the 25 participants.
Methodology

Objective:

*Analyze the integration of feature models for the purpose of investigating their effects with regard to the effort and correctness from the perspective of students and professionals in the context of evolution of feature models.*
Methodology

Research questions:

**RQ1:** What is the effort to compose feature models?

**RQ2:** What is the rate of correctly integrated feature models?
Our experimental process has three steps:

**Step 1 – Training:**
- All participants were trained to ensure that they obtained the necessary familiarity with model integration techniques.

**Step 2 – Integration of feature models:**
- The 25 participants integrated feature models based on change descriptions of 10 evolution scenarios.
- The effort invested and the number of correctly composed model were quantified.

**Step 3 – Participant Data Collection**
- Data related to participants were collected, such as age and level of experience.
Experimental Process

Study participants:
- We had 25 participants, being 8 academic students, 7 professionals, and 10 technical students.

Total 25 participants
Results: Composition and Correctness

**RQ1:** What is the effort to compose feature models?

**RQ2:** What is the rate of correctly integrated feature models?

- **Finding 1:**
  Academic students invested *25% less effort* to integrate feature models and produced *6% more correctly composed feature models* compared to technical students.

- **Finding 2:**
  Academic students invested *2% less effort* to integrate feature models and produced *26% more correctly composed feature models* compared to professionals.
**Result: Composition and Correctness**

**RQ1:** What is the effort to compose feature models?

**RQ2:** What is the rate of correctly integrated feature models?

**Finding 3:**
Professionals invested **23% less effort** to integrate feature models than technical students. However, the technical students produced **20% more correctly composed models** than the professionals.

**Finding 4:**
Technical and academic students invested **12% less effort to integrate feature models** and produced **22% more correctly composed feature models** compared to professionals.
Conclusions

- **First exploratory study:**
  - evaluating the effort to apply composition technique, detect and resolve inconsistencies
  - analyzing the key factors that affect developers’ effort.

- **Main finding:**
  - The results show that professionals tend to invest less effort to integrate feature models, but they produced a lower number of correctly composed feature models compared to students.

- **Future work:**
  - Run this study in different contexts
  - Study the conflict-management problem more carefully
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