Editing Code

SWE 795, Spring 2017

Software Engineering Environments

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Today

- Part 1 (Discussion)(~60 mins)
  - Discussion of readings

- Break!

- Part 2 (Lecture)(60 mins)
  - Editing Code

- Part 3 (In class activity)(~20 mins)
  - Design exercise

Editing Code

- What types of edits do developers make?
- What mistakes occur? How can they be prevented?
- How can developers edit at a level of abstraction beyond lines and characters?

- Techniques we will examine today
  - Structured editors
  - Editable program views
  - Copy & paste reuse
  - Refactoring
  - Exploratory programming

Structured Editors: Motivation

- Syntax can be hard
  - Have to learn the right syntax (challenging for programming or language novices)
  - Getting syntax wrong creates errors
- What if we could have a development environment where it was impossible to have a syntax error

Structured Editors: Idea

- Developers edit code through commands that create program elements
  - e.g., create an if statement through a keyboard shortcut or drag & drop

- Edits are semantic rather than syntactic
  - Individual elements expose specific elements they support
  - Cannot make edits that crosscut element structure

Cornell Program Synthesizer

- Introduced key concepts

```
IF (condition)
    THEN statement
    ELSE statement
```

→

```
IF (k > 0   )
    THEN statement
    ELSE PUT SKIP LIST ('not positive');
```

Tim Teitelbaum and Thomas Reps. 1981. The Cornell program synthesizer: a syntax-directed programming environment. Commun. ACM 24, 9 (September 1981), 563-573.

What happened?

- Structured editors make unstructured edits hard
  - Hard to add / remove lines that crosscut structure
  - Hard to copy and paste in ways that crosscut structure
  - If you already know the syntax, may be slower to select syntax from command or drag and drop than it is to type

- But… if you don't know the syntax at all, can be helpful
  - —> Extensive use of syntax directed editors in programming environments for novice programmers

Example: Alice



http://www.alice.org/3.1/Materials/Videos/01.BriefTour.mp4

Alice: Lessons Learned from Building a 3D System for Novices. Matthew Conway, Steve Audia, Tommy Burnette, Dennis Cosgrove, Kevin Christiansen, Rob Deline, Jim Durbin, Rich Gossweiler, Shuichi Kogi, Chris Long, Beth Mallory, Steve Miale, Kristen Monkaitis, James Patten, Jeffrey Pierce, Joe Schochet, David Staak, Brian Stearns, Richard Stoakley, Chris Sturgill, John Viega, Jeff White, George Williams, and Randy Pausch, CHI 2000

Example: Scratch



https://vimeo.com/65583694

Mitchel Resnick, John Maloney, Andrés Monroy-Hernández, Natalie Rusk, Evelyn Eastmond, Karen Brennan, Amon Millner, Eric Rosenbaum, Jay Silver, Brian Silverman, and Yasmin Kafai. 2009. Scratch: programming for all. Commun. ACM 52, 11 (November 2009), 60-67.

Example: TouchDevelop



https://www.touchdevelop.com/home

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ve2E90wh-wk

Editable program views

- Expressing code edits through textual changes can be time consuming
  - extra boilerplate, code duplication, etc.
- Key idea: Enable developers to instead interact with abstracted view of code
  - Use edits to abstract view to edit underlying code

Linked Editing



Figure 2. (1) Adding a line to two clones. (2) Modifying one instance. (3) Deleting line in one instance.



Figure 3. An elided clone looks similar to a function definition and use

Michael Toomim, Andrew Begel, and Susan L. Graham. 2004. Managing Duplicated Code with Linked Editing. In Proceedings of the 2004 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages - Human Centric Computing (VLHCC '04). IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 173-180.

Registration-based language abstractions

```
public class WorkbenchHistoryPageSite implements IHistoryPageSite {

    GenericHistoryView part;  |Getter: public IWorkbenchPart get

    IPageSite site; |Getter: public getWorkbenchPageSite
                    |Delegates Implementation of IHistoryPageSite (3 of 8 methods):
                    |  public setSelectionProvider
                    |  public getSelectionProvider
                    |  public getShell
```

```
public static BundleDesc[] getDependentBundles(BundleDesc root) {
    BundleDesc[] imported = getImportedBundles(root);
    BundleDesc[] required = getRequiredBundles(root);
    BundleDesc[] dependents = imported + required;
    return dependents;
}
```

(a) An array-concatenation registration. The presentation uses an overloaded "+" to indicate the concatenation of two arrays through calls to `System.arraycopy`.

```
public static BundleDesc[] getDependentBundles(BundleDesc root) {
    BundleDesc[] imported = getImportedBundles(root);
    BundleDesc[] required = getRequiredBundles(root);
    BundleDesc[] dependents = new BundleDesc[imported.length + required.length];
    dependents[0 : *] = imported[0, imported.length];
    dependents[imported.length : *] = required[0, required.length];
    return dependents;
}
```

(b) Two arraycopy registrations. The notation "0 : *" indicates that the elements are copied into the indices starting at 0. An icon is used to disambiguate the syntax, by making it clear that the dependents array is not truncated to the length of the copied elements.

Samuel Davis and Gregor Kiczales. 2010. Registration-based language abstractions. In Proceedings of the ACM international conference on Object oriented programming systems languages and applications (OOPSLA '10). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 754-773.

Copy & paste code reuse

- A very common way to edit code is by copying existing code. —> copy & paste reuse
- Creates code duplication
  - But… ok if this code duplication does not represent new abstraction

- Studies have attempted to understand when code duplication introduced by copy & paste is bad

- Many tools to detect code clones introduced by copy & paste

Slides for this section adapted from 05-899D Human Aspects of Software Development Spring 2011, “Software Evolution” by YoungSeok Yoon

Why do developers copy & paste code?

- structural template (the most common intention)
  - relocate, regroup, reorganize, restructure, refactor
- semantic template
  - design pattern
  - usage of a module (following a certain protocol)
  - reuse a definition of particular behavior
  - reuse control structure (nested if~else or loops)

M. Kim, L. Bergman, T. Lau, and D. Notkin (2004), "An ethnographic study of copy and paste programming practices in OOPL," in *Proceedings of International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering (ISESE'04)*, pp. 83-92.

Why do developers copy & paste?

- Forking
  - Hardware variations
  - Platform variation
  - Experimental variation
- Templating
  - Boiler-plating due to language in-expressiveness
  - API/Library protocols
  - General language or algorithmic idioms
- Customization
  - Bug workarounds
  - Replicate and specialize

C. Kapser and M. W. Godfrey (2006), "'Cloning Considered Harmful' Considered Harmful," in *13th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering (WCRE '06)*, 2006, pp. 19-28.

Properties of copy & paste reuse

- Unavoidable duplicates (e.g., lack of multiple inheritance)
- Programmers use their memory of C&P history to determine when to restructure code
  - delaying restructuring helps them discover the right level of abstraction
- C&P dependencies are worth observing and maintaining

M. Kim, L. Bergman, T. Lau, and D. Notkin (2004), "An ethnographic study of copy and paste programming practices in OOPL," in *Proceedings of International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering (ISESE'04)*, pp. 83-92.

Code clone genealogies

- Investigates the validity of the assumption that code clones are bad
- Defines clone evolution model



- Built an automatic tool to extract the history of code clones from a software repository

Table 1: Description of Two Java Subject Programs

Program	*carol*	*dnsjava*
URL	carol.objectweb.org	www.dnsjava.org
LOC	7878 ~ 23731	5756 ~ 21188
duration	26 months	68 months
# of check-ins	164	905

Table 2: Clone Genealogies in *carol* and *dnsjava* (min_{token} **=30**, $sim_{th} = 0.3$)

# of genealogies	carol	dnsjava
total	122	140
false positive	13	15
true positive	109	125
locally unfactorable	70 (64%)	61 (49%)
consistently changed	41 (38%)	45 (36%)

11

M. Kim, V. Sazawal, D. Notkin, and G. Murphy (2005), “An empirical study of code clone genealogies,” in *Proceedings of the 10th European software engineering conference held jointly with 13th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on Foundations of software engineering (ESEC/FSE-13).*

Refactoring: Motivation

"Refactoring is the process of changing a software system in such a way that it ***does not alter the external behavior*** of the code yet ***improves its internal structure***." [Fowler 1999]

M. Fowler, K. Beck, J. Brant, W. Opdyke, and D. Roberts (1999), "*Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code*", 1st ed. Addison-Wesley Professional.

Slides for this section adapted from 05-899D Human Aspects of Software Development Spring 2011, "Software Evolution" by YoungSeok Yoon

First tool: A Refactoring Tool for Smalltalk



Figure 2 - Screenshot of Refactoring Browser during extract code as method refactoring

D. Roberts, J. Brant, and R. Johnson (1997), “A refactoring tool for smalltalk,” *Theory and Practice of Object Systems*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 253-263.

(Very) brief story of refactoring

- Started with academic work defining idea of refactoring
  - William F. Opdyke. Refactoring Object-Oriented Frameworks. PhD thesis, University of Illinois, 1992.
- Academic work for tools quickly followed (e.g., [Brant TPOS97])
  - Built in real IDE for Smalltalk from beginning
- Disseminated by agile thought leaders like Martin Fowler
- Adopted into mainstream IDEs like Eclipse, Visual Studio
- Became standard accepted feature of IDES
- Research continued
  - Do developers use refactoring tools?
  - Could they use them more?
  - How could refactoring tools better support developers?

Developers manually perform refactorings not yet supported by tools

- About 70% of structural changes may be due to refactorings
- About 60% of these changes, the references to the affected entities in a component-based application can be automatically updated
- State-of-the-art IDEs only support a subset of common low-level refactorings, and lack support for more complex ones

Type of refactoring	# detected	Eclipse support
Convert anonymous class to nested*[2]	12	√
Convert nested type to top-level	19	√
Convert top-level type to nested	20	×
Move member class to another class	29	√
Extract package	16	×
Inline package	3	×

Type of refactoring	# detected	Eclipse support
Pull up field/method	279	√
Push down field/method	53	√
Extract interface	28	√
Extract superclass	15	×
Extract subclass	4	×
Inline superclass	4	×
Inline subclass	7	×

Type of refactoring	# detected	Eclipse support
Extract constant interface	5	√
Inline constant interface	2	×
Extract class	95	×
Inline class	31	×

Type of refactoring	# detected	Eclipse support
Information hiding	751	×
Generalize type	107	√
Downcast type	85	×
Introduce factory	19	√
Change method signature	4497	√
Introduce parameter object*	4	×
Extract method*	45	√
Inline Method*	31	√

Z. Xing and E. Stroulia (2006), “Refactoring Practice: How it is and How it Should be Supported - An Eclipse Case Study,” in *Proceedings of 22nd IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM ‘06)*, 2006, pp. 458-468.

Larger study by Murphy-Hill

- Extensive study using 4 data sets spanning
  - > 13,000 developers, > 240,000 refactorings
    > 2500 developer hours, > 3400 commits

- Data sets
  - Users (collected by Murphy et al. in 2005)
  - Everyone (collected by Eclipse Usage Collector)
  - Toolsmiths (refactoring tool developers)
  - Eclipse CVS

E. Murphy-Hill, C. Parnin, and A. P. Black (2009), “How we refactor, and how we know it,” in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE 2009)*, p. 287–297.

Results

- The Rename refactoring tool is used much more frequently by ordinary programmers than by the toolsmiths
- About 40% of refactorings performed using a tool occur in batches (i.e., refactorings of the same kind within 60 secs)
- About 90% of configuration defaults or refactoring tools remain unchanged when programmers use the tools
- Messages written by programmers in commit logs do not reliably indicate the presence of refactoring
- Programmers frequently *floss refactor* (i.e., interleave refactoring with other programming activities)
- About half of the refactorings are not high-level.—> refactoring detection tools that look exclusively for high-level refactorings will not detect them
- Refactorings are performed frequently
- Almost **90%** of refactorings are performed **manually**, without the help of tools
- The kind of refactoring performed with tools differ from the kind performed manually

Exploratory Programming

- Developers sometimes explore programs without knowing a priori what behavior they want to create or the best way to implement it
- Goal: enable developers to explore *variations* in programs

Backtracking in programming



Fig. 1. An example of a node evolution history, which contains three backtracking instances. The node first appeared in the code as "getHeight();" (v1), changed a few times (v2 through v5), and finally ended up back at the original code (v6). The different contents are symbolized as capital letters A, B, and C. There are three backtracking instances in this node history indicated as black backward arrows.



Fig. 2. An example output of our analyzer, showing the history of a statement node. Each row maps to each version (v1,v2, ..., v5). This node contains a single backtracking instance, which is v1...v5. The edit operation IDs were originally 6-digits long (e.g., 184263), but were shortened for brevity.



Fig. 3. Distribution of all the detected backtracking sizes



Fig. 5. The identified backtracking tactics

Y. S. Yoon and B. A. Myers, "A longitudinal study of programmers' backtracking," 2014 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC), Melbourne, VIC, 2014, pp. 101-108.

Supporting backtracking



http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~azurite/

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=blbIBdlUGIc

Young Seok Yoon and Brad A. Myers. 2015. Supporting selective undo in a code editor. In Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Software Engineering - Volume 1 (ICSE '15), Vol. 1. IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 223-233.