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Introduction
• Programming languages change for a variety of reasons.
New Programming Languages Features

- Programming languages change for a variety of reasons.
- To benefit from new language features, developers must be willing to adopt them.
• An empirical study assessing the adoption of a new language feature: default methods.
Empirical Study on Usage of Default Methods

- An empirical study assessing the adoption of a new language feature: default methods.
- Default methods are part of Java 8’s *enhanced* interfaces.
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Java 8 Default Methods

- Allow both method declarations and definitions.
- Implementers inherit the (default) implementation if none provided.
- Original motivation to facilitate interface evolution.
- Can also be used as a replacement of the skeletal implementation pattern (Goetz 2011).
  - Uses abstract class that interface implementers extend.
  - Makes interfaces easier to implement (Bloch 2008, Item 18).

```
interface Collection<E> {
    default void add(E elem) { // optional.
        throw new UnsupportedOperationException();}
}

class ImmutableList<E> implements Collection<E> {}

abstract class AbstractImmutableList<E> implements Collection<E> {
    @Override public void add(E elem) {
        throw new UnsupportedOperationException();}
}
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- Detail reactions of developers in adopting default methods in their projects.
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- Situations where these new constructs work well and where trade-offs must be made.
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- A popular approach for assessing language features involves a *postmortem* analysis.
- *Past* data of source repositories are analyzed.
- Surveys of previous coding activities are taken.
- Developers must discover new language features and integrate them themselves before any analysis of the construct can be done.
- Best practices and patterns that can normally be extracted from these studies are delayed.
- Developers may be unable to *manually* identify all opportunities where the new language construct can be utilized.
- Observing software histories may discover cases where new language features are *adopted* but may not easily identify those where they were *rejected* as these may not have been adequately documented.
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Our Proactive Approach

- A novel technique for assessing new language constructs *proactively*.
- The pull request changes in our study consist of transformations performed via an automated refactoring tool.
- Developers are immediately introduced to the new construct via a semantically equivalent transformation that they can either accept or reject.
- Their decisions can be studied early to assess the feature’s effectiveness, extracting best practices.
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• Assess the use of default methods in existing code.

• Substituting the skeletal implementation pattern is the only sensible use of default methods when not introducing new functionality.

• An acceptance of the refactoring is equivalent to acceptance of using default methods as a programming construct for existing code and vice-versa.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>pull ID</th>
<th>KLOC ‡</th>
<th>watches †</th>
<th>stars †</th>
<th>forks †</th>
<th>contribs †</th>
<th>+LOC</th>
<th>-LOC</th>
<th>Δ files</th>
<th>concrete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aalmiray/jsilhouette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aol/cyclops-react</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eclipse/eclipse-collections</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhl/bootique</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iluwatar/java-design-patterns</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>17,234</td>
<td>5,808</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jOOQ/jOOQ</td>
<td>5469</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>google/guava</td>
<td>2519</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>14,721</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>google/binnavi</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eclipse/jetty.project</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring-projects/spring-framework</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>12,463</td>
<td>9,575</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elastic/elasticsearch</td>
<td>19168</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>21,063</td>
<td>7,275</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jenkinsci/blueocean-plugin</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junit-team/junit5</td>
<td>5365</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReactiveX/RxJava</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>21,792</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>pull ID</th>
<th>KLOC ‡</th>
<th>watches †</th>
<th>stars †</th>
<th>forks †</th>
<th>contribs †</th>
<th>+LOC</th>
<th>-LOC</th>
<th>Δ files</th>
<th>concrete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfectsense/dari</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eclipse/jgit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rinfield/java8-commons</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criscris/koral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantageous/qbit</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>pull ID</th>
<th>KLOC ‡</th>
<th>watches †</th>
<th>stars †</th>
<th>forks †</th>
<th>contribs †</th>
<th>+LOC</th>
<th>-LOC</th>
<th>Δ files</th>
<th>concrete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>97,285</td>
<td>32,659</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At time of analysis.
† As of February 27, 2017.

**Table 1:** Pull requests. More info at [http://cuny.is/interefact](http://cuny.is/interefact).
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Question
In which situations do developers adopt default methods in their projects? What are the reasons?

Answers

- Interface Locality
  - Default implementation was mostly in terms of both methods and constant fields declared either within the same interface or one up its hierarchy.

- Parameter Locality
  - No new dependencies introduced by the default method by referencing only parameters.

- Optional Methods
  - Default implementation threw `UnsupportedOperationException` (self-documenting).

- Static Methods as Instance Methods
  - Allowed static methods to be called as instance methods via forwarding.
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**Question**
Are there situations where developers *do not* favor default methods?

**Answers**

**JDK Versions**
- Needed to maintain compatibility with legacy clients (e.g., Android).
- Developers must not only consider the language construct itself but also substantial reliance on platform backwards compatibility.

**Architecture**
- Developers did not always want to introduce new external dependencies into interfaces as some default methods required.
- Projects separated their APIs (interfaces) and an implementation of that API into separate modules.
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Question
Are there situations where developers do not favor default methods?

Answers

Clients
• Anxious about “inlining” skeletal implementations directly into interfaces, particular frameworks.
• Desired forcing clients to implement interfaces directly despite providing skeletal implementations in a separate classes.

Generality
• Skeletal implementations too narrow to be the “de facto.”
• Pattern allows for multiple implementations per method, enhanced interfaces do not.
• Skeletal implementations from tests were too specific.
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Question
What are the trade-offs of using default methods over the skeletal implementation pattern?

Answers

**Control**
- Contrary to pattern, default methods are available to *all* interface implementers.
- Explicitly presents implementers with a skeletal implementation.
- Implementers may or may not choose to override with their own.
- May have a **negative** effect if not applicable to implementer but choose *not* to override.
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**External Factors**

**Question**
Which external factors, if any, influence developer’s decisions in adopting default methods?

**Answers**

- **Java 8**: Projects that *previously* used (other) Java 8 features were more likely to accept.

- **Size**: Smaller change sets were *more* likely to be accepted.

- **Span**: Change sets spanning *multiple files* across *module boundaries* were *less* likely.

- **Abstractness**: Implementations originating from *abstract* classes *more* likely (more general).
Best Practices for Default Methods

Question
Are there best practices and/or patterns that can be extracted from these situations?

• Default methods should be simple.
• Reduces likelihood of complex dependencies in interfaces.
• Promote self-containment.
• Enhancement to the interface documentation.

• What optional methods do when called if they are not implemented?
• Take care in using default methods for new methods that interface implementers should override.
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• Call forwarding for deprecated interface methods.
  • Forward to replacement API, if applicable.
  • Self-documenting.
  • Eliminates any confusion over deprecation between interface and skeletal implementation class.

• Choose general default implementations.
  • General enough for all potential implementers.
  • If too narrow, use skeletal implementation pattern instead.
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