FUDA EMPIRICAL EVALUATION
Development Experience Questionnaire (Used Documentation)

NOTE: This is a fillable PDF file. If you are not using a PDF writer, please make sure to print this file to a PS or PDF file to not lose the information.

Name: S8

Date: August 28, 2008

Concept: ☐ JFace – Context Menu   ☑ JFace – Content Assist

☐ Eclipse – Navigate   ☐ Eclipse – Table Viewer

Q.1: Were you able to implement the concept successfully?   ☑ Yes   ☐ No

Q.2: How much time did you spend on the concept's implementation? 50 minutes (3:05:30 PM - 3:54:42 PM)

Q.3: If not successful to implement the concept, what was the main reason in your opinion?

☐ Lack of experience.

☐ Not useful documentation.

☐ Not useful sample applications.

☐ Complexity of the concept.

☐ Other. Please specify: _____

Q.4: Did you refer to the example applications' source code to implement the concept?

☐ No. None of them.   ☐ Yes. One of them.   Please   ☑ Yes. Both of them.
specify: _____

Q.4.1: If yes, for what program statements and what kind of information?

I used the JavaEditor example to get/evaluate the statements within the SourceViewer, specifically, getContentAssistant and the inner class IContentAssistProcessor and its methods.

I used the JSPEditor example to realize the context of the SourceViewer relative to an editor. That is, the second example showed me that an editor creates a source viewer and that's the connection between the two. The JSPEditor example provided me with the final piece I needed to implement and understand better the concept. The documentation did not link well to the example however as I had to use the Eclipse "References..." functionality to find the links.

Q.5: How many documentations did you use in this experiment?

☐ None.   ☐ Only one.   ☑ Two.

Please specify: _____

Q.6: For each documentation, please specify which parts of the documentation did you read?

Doc1:   ☐ None   ☑ Only Relevant   ☐ A Big Portion   ☐ All of that
Parts

Doc2:   ☐ None   ☑ Only Relevant   ☐ A Big Portion   ☐ All of that
Parts

Q.7: Were you able to find all the required information for   ☐ Yes   ☑ No
implementing the concept in the provided documentation?

Q.7.1: If not, what kinds of information were missing in the provided documentation?

As I alluded to, I wasn't able to ascertain until much later that a Text editor must create its SourceViewer and that a Text Editor can't be its own sourceViewer. Obviously, both documents contained much more information (especially the JSP document) than needed to implement the concept we were interested in.

Q.8: Were you able to easily access the desired information in the   ☐ Yes   ☑ No
provided documentation?

Q.8.1: If not, what were the difficulties?

The JavaEditor document had good information about the SourceViewer itself but didn't say how it related to an editor. The JSP document made it very difficult to find the ContentAssist material at all due to the large scope of that document. I had to use the browser's search capabilities.

Q.9: In your opinion, was the documentation concise enough?   ☐ Yes   ☑ No

Q.10: Overall, in the range of 1-5, how do you rank the provided documentation in terms of usefulness to implement the concept?

☐ 1 = Not   ☐ 2   ☑ 3   ☐ 4   ☐ 5 =
Useful   Excellent

Q.11: Do you have any additional comments on this experiment?

I am glad you had recommended implementation time on the description of the concept because I got extremely frustrated for a while thinking I was taking too long to understand the concept.