

# 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: S9 Date: Aug 28th 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? 41min

**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?

The doc has a good amount of correlation to the JavaEditor example. I quickly browsed it to figure out which classes need to be extended and their relationship and also tried to traverse the document and find the related methods and read them at the same time as reading the document in that example. The second example I only quickly looked into (since it had a better organization for content assist feature as it was encapsulated into a separate package) to get a reconfirmation of my idea of what should be implemented. A good bulk of this task was trying to figure out what is \*NOT\* needed for the rather minimal requirement of the task (Such as ContextInfo, hooking to actions etc.)

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

None.

Only one.

Two.

Please specify: Content Assist Eclipse Help

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

Doc1:  None

Only Relevant  
Parts

A Big Portion

All of that

Doc2:  None

Only Relevant  
Parts

A Big Portion

All of that

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

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

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

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

The document was in the form of a walkthrough, and didn't clearly isolate the different features of this framework. I am not a big fan of these types of documentations, but overall it was okay. I would have started with a more generic description of what the framework has to offer and the key classes for each and then go through the example. I'd rather start with such a high-level description, walk through the example myself while checking things in Javadocs and then consult a walkthrough if there is something I can't find.

**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  
Useful

2

3

4

5 =  
Excellent

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

I don't know if this was intended or not, but the second example (JSPEditor) had some dependency problems in my platform (some wst packages). I assumed this to be intentional and the offered source code was a read-only-but-not-try kind of example.