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ABSTRACT

Background: In our previous research, we built defect prediction models by using confirmation bias metrics. Due to confirmation bias developers tend to perform unit tests to make their programs run rather than breaking their code. This, in turn, leads to an increase in defect density. The performance of prediction model that is built using confirmation bias was as good as the models that were built with static code or churn metrics.

Aims: Collection of confirmation bias metrics may result in partially “missing data” due to developers’ tight schedules, evaluation apprehension and lack of motivation as well as staff turnover. In this paper, we employ Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm to impute missing confirmation bias data.

Method: We used four datasets from two large-scale companies. For each dataset, we generated all possible missing data configurations and then employed Roweis’ EM algorithm to impute missing confirmation bias data.

Results: In all datasets, when missing data percentage is less than or equal to 50% on average, our proposed model that used imputed data yielded performance results that are comparable with the performance results of the models that used complete data.

Conclusions: We may encounter the “missing data” problem in building defect prediction models. Our results in this study showed that instead of discarding missing or noisy data, in our case confirmation bias metrics, we can use effective techniques such as EM based imputation to overcome this problem.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

D.4.8 [Software Engineering]: Performance—modeling and prediction; D.m [Software Engineering]: Miscellaneous—software psychology
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1. INTRODUCTION

Along with many researchers in the community [16, 21], we have been building models, which employ data mining and Artificial Intelligence (AI) techniques to guide software developers, testers and project managers in decision making under uncertainty [21, 34, 35]. Such models use mostly product and process attributes of software to uncover certain patterns in software development process. The ultimate goal is to better allocate resources, to find more defects, improve product and process quality, to better estimate cost and duration of the project, to prioritize release decisions, and so forth.

On the other hand, besides product and process attributes, people aspect is also among the three pillars of software development (3Ps). Software development is a domain that is very much people dependent. Calling it an engineering field, and making it process driven does not change this fact much. Therefore, we need to better understand people in this process as individuals. In the literature there are prediction models, which employ people related aspects, such as organizational complexity [21], developer experience [40], and social interaction among developers [3]. However, among people related aspects, the thought processes and problem solving skills of people also have a significant impact on software quality [29, 32]. While solving problems in daily life, people use heuristics to solve problems. When heuristics fail to produce a correct judgment, it results in cognitive biases. Cognitive biases, which are defined as patterned deviations of human thought from the laws of logic and mathematics, are a likely cause of software defects [29].

As a starting point to better understand people as individuals, we have so far focused on a specific type of cognitive bias namely confirmation bias [5, 6, 7, 8]. Confirmation bias is defined as the tendency of people to seek evidence that verifies a hypothesis rather than seeking evidence to falsify a hypothesis and it might show up during daily software engineering activities [29]. In our recent research, we measured the confirmation biases of developers and testers in four different organizations in Canada and Turkey [5, 6, 7, 8]. For this purpose, we conducted written and interac-
tive tests with 227 subjects consisting of a pilot group of 28 people and 199 software engineers (i.e., developers, testers, analysts and project managers). As a result of the empirical analysis based on the outcomes of these tests, we found a direct correlation between confirmation biases of developers and the defect proneness of the code [7]. In our recent research, we also used confirmation bias metrics to build a defect prediction model and by using only confirmation bias metrics, we obtained defect prediction results, which are comparable with the results obtained by using static code and churn metrics [7]. Confirmation bias is just one aspect of cognitive biases, and biases are just tiny aspect of human cognition. Therefore, our results encourage us to deepen our understanding of people’s cognition to better understand the blind spots in software development and to use people’s cognitive metrics to build various prediction models.

Data collection in software development organizations has always been a problem [17, 35]. Collecting data through interviews and tests from the development team may also be quite challenging. As a result, during field studies involving people (i.e., software engineers), we may encounter “missing data” problem due to one or more of the following reasons:

- **Tight Schedules**: In many cases, developers have tight schedules to rush the code for the new release and therefore they may see the data collection process as waste of time.
- **Evaluation Apprehension**: Evaluation apprehension is a common problem and it is a threat to construct validity [36]. Many people are anxious about being evaluated, and some people are even phobic about testing and measurement situations. Due to evaluation apprehension, tests may not reflect actual performance. Subjects leading to noisy data. Moreover, people may not be willing about taking tests due to their anxiety about being evaluated, in which case we encounter the “missing data” problem.
- **Staff Turnover**: Some of the reused components of the software may have been coded by developers who left the company.
- **Lack of Motivation**: Developers may not see the direct benefit of participating such filed studies in their daily work. [17].

One way of tackling “missing data” problem is to use Artificial Intelligence (AI) techniques. There are various AI techniques that were used to handle missing data problem in other domains such as computer vision, robotics, health care, entertainment, etc. to build models/recommendation systems [2, 4, 19, 24, 33]. In empirical software engineering literature, some methods have been employed to handle missing data problem in especially cost estimation models [28, 30, 37]. In this paper, instead of ignoring incomplete data while building defect prediction models, we handle the “missing data” problem by employing Roweis’ Expectation-Maximisation [26] algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In section II we talk about confirmation bias as a human aspect in software development and the methodology to quantify confirmation bias. Section III discusses missing data problem in building prediction models. Section IV explains our proposed algorithm to handle the missing data problem. Details of our empirical work are given in Section V. We present the results of our empirical work in Section VI and address threats to validity in Section VII. Finally, we conclude and mention future research directions in Section VIII.

2. CONFIRMATION BIAS AS A HUMAN ASPECT IN SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT

In cognitive psychology, confirmation bias is defined as the tendency of people to seek for evidence that could verify their hypotheses rather than seeking for evidence that could falsify them. The term confirmation bias was first used by Peter Wason in his rule discovery experiment [38] and later in his selection task experiment [39].

In Wason’s Rule Discovery Task, subjects are asked to discover a simple rule about triples of numbers [38]. The experimental procedure can be explained as follows: Initially, the subject is given a record sheet on which the triple “2 4 6” is written and (s)he is told that “2 4 6” conforms to this rule. In order to discover the rule, the subject is asked to write down triples together with the reasons of his/her choice on the record sheet. After each instance, the examiner tells the subject whether the instance conforms to the rule or not. The subject can announce the rule only when (s)he is highly confident. If the subject fails to discover the rule at the first attempt, (s)he can continue giving instances together with reasons for his/her choice. This procedure continues iteratively until either the subject discovers the rule or (s)he wishes to give up. However, if the subject cannot discover the rule in 45 min, the experimenter aborts the procedure. Wason designed this experiment in such a way that subjects mostly shows a tendency to focus on a set of triples that were most specific than the correct rule. Consequently, the discovery of the correct rule is possible only by following a hypothesis testing strategy, which includes tendency to refute hypotheses [25].

In Wason’s Selection Task, the subject is given four cards, where each card has a letter on one side and a number on the other side. These four cards are placed on a table showing D, K, 3, 7, respectively. Given the rule “Every card that has a D on one side has a 3 on the other side”, the subject is asked which card(s) must be turned over to find out whether the rule is true or false [39].

2.1 Confirmation Bias in Relation to Software Development

Due to confirmation bias, developers may perform only the unit tests that make their program work rather than breaking the code. This may lead to an increase in software defect density. Ideally, during all levels of software testing, including unit testing, a systematic hypothesis testing procedure should be followed similar to the one followed by a scientist performing experiments in his/her laboratory. In general, scientific inferences are based on the principle of eliminating hypotheses while provisionally accepting the remaining ones. Therefore, similar to a scientist, a software developer should try test scenarios starting from the ones that are less likely to fail the code and then move to test scenarios that aim for the code to fail. In most cases, there are an infinite number of scenarios that require following a strategy to select the appropriate tests. Therefore, within
the context of software development and testing, we extend
the definition of confirmation bias to include one or both
of the following: (1) the tendency to verify software code
and (2) the incompetency to apply strategies to try to fail
software code.

2.1 Wason’s Rule Discovery Task in Relation to De-
veloper Performance

There are similarities between Wason’s rule discovery task
and functional (black-box) testing that are performed by
software developers to test the functional units of their codes
during unit testing. This similarity is also mentioned by
Teasley et al. [32]. According to the findings of Wason’s
rule discovery task, the subjects have a tendency to select
many triples (i.e., test cases) that are consistent with their
hypotheses and few tests that are inconsistent with them.
Similarly, program testers may select many test cases con-
sistent with the program specifications (positive tests) and a
few that are inconsistent with them (negative tests). More-
over, the number of possible test cases is either infinite or
too large to be tested within a limited amount of time. Con-
sequently, a strategic approach must be followed that covers
both positive and negative test cases while trying to make
the code fail during testing in order to find as many defects
as possible.

2.1.1 Wason’s Rule Discovery Task in Relation to De-
veloper Performance

There are similarities between Wason’s rule discovery task
and functional (black-box) testing that are performed by
software developers to test the functional units of their codes
during unit testing. This similarity is also mentioned by
Teasley et al. [32]. According to the findings of Wason’s
rule discovery task, the subjects have a tendency to select
many triples (i.e., test cases) that are consistent with their
hypotheses and few tests that are inconsistent with them.
Similarly, program testers may select many test cases con-
sistent with the program specifications (positive tests) and a
few that are inconsistent with them (negative tests). More-
over, the number of possible test cases is either infinite or
too large to be tested within a limited amount of time. Con-
sequently, a strategic approach must be followed that covers
both positive and negative test cases while trying to make
the code fail during testing in order to find as many defects
as possible.

2.1.2 Wason’s Selection Task in Relation to Devel-
oper Performance

Wason’s selection task measures the capability of the sub-
ject to use logical rules such as modus ponens and modus
tollens as well as his/her tendency to refute a given state-
ment. In unit testing when covering possible scenarios, log-
ical reasoning is required. Moreover, testing the correctness
of conditional statements in the source code during white
box testing also requires logical reasoning skills. In order
to explain the analogy between Wason’s selection task and
white box testing, we extend the example given by Stacy
and MacMillian [29] as follows: Suppose a developer wants
to make sure that every instance of a class named “Controller”
has been initialized throughout his/her code. In unit testing,
the developer would perform a test that could be thought of
as checking the validity of the following hypothesis: “If an
instance’s class is Controller, then it has been initialized.”
In that case, we can categorize parts of the code that may
need to be tested as follows:

- category #1: The parts of the code with instances of
  Controller that may or may not be initialized.

- category #2: The parts of the code with instances of
  a class other than Controller that may or may not be
  initialized.

- category #3: The parts of the code with initialized
  instances whose class is unknown.

- category #4: The parts of the code with uninitialized
  instances whose class is unknown.

Logical expression for the hypothesis “If an instance’s class is
Controller, then it has been initialized” would be “if p, then q”,
where p stands for the phrase “an instance’s class is
Controller” and q stands for the phrase “it (class) has been
initialized”. According to modus ponens, given that p is
true, “if p then q” is true only if q is true. Therefore, one
must check all instances of the class “Controller” to guar-
antee that they have all been initialized. This means that
the parts of the code that fall into category #1 must be
tested. However, this is not adequate. Since “if p, then q”
is equivalent to “if not-q, then not-p”, one must also check
the validity of the negated form of the hypothesis, which is “If
an instance has not been initialized, then the class of that in-
stance is not Controller”. According to modus tollens, given
that not-q is true, not-p must also be true. This means that
every instance that has not been initialized must be checked
to find out whether the class of that instance is “Controller”
or not. Therefore, a developer must also test the parts of
the code that fall into category #4.

2.2 Methodology to Quantify Confirmation Bias

In order to perform empirical analysis, it was necessary to
quantify/measure confirmation biases of software engineers.
For this purpose, we developed a methodology to define a
confirmation bias metrics set and to extract metrics values.
Details of our methodology to define and extract confirm-
ation bias metrics can be found in our previous work [7] and
it mainly consists of the following steps:

2.2.1 Preparation of the Confirmation Bias Test

Confirmation bias test consists of written questions and
an interactive question. Interactive question is Wason’s Rule
Discovery Task itself [39], while written test is based on Wa-
son’s Selection Task [38]. Written test consists of two parts:
the first part consists of 7 abstract and 7 thematic questions.
Abstract questions requires logical reasoning skills to be an-
swered correctly, while real life experience and/or memory
cuing [12] can help to answer thematic questions correctly.
Both abstract and thematic questions were prepared based
on the experiments conducted in cognitive psychology liter-
ature experiments to show the exitance of confirmation bias
among people [12, 38, 39]. The second part of the test con-
­sists of 9 thematic questions with software development and
testing theme. Initially, we administered confirmation test
to a pilot group consisting of 28 Computer Engineering PhD
candidates. Half of the participants in the pilot group had
at least two years of commercial software product develop-
ment experience. After pilot study, we administered the test
to software engineers in various large scale companies and
Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs). In addition to a pilot
group consisting of 28 subjects, so far we have administered
the confirmation bias test to 199 software engineers (129 de-
developers, 26 testers, 32 analysts and 12 project managers)
from 4 large scale companies and 3 SMEs.

2.2.2 Formation of the Confirmation Bias Metrics Set

Some of the metrics in the metrics set were inherited from
cognitive psychology literature, while the rest were defined
as a result of the observations we made during the adminis-
tration of the confirmation bias test. The initial metric suite
was formed concurrently with the preparation of the inter-
active question and the set of written questions. Statistical
analysis and feature selection techniques helped to eliminate
metrics that displayed a lower level of significance in the
measurement/quantification of confirmation bias. Our met-
rics set evolved as our research progressed [5, 6, 8] and took
its final form in [7]. Table 1 lists the final set of metrics ob-
tained from interactive question and the written questions.
Table 1: Confirmation Bias Metrics Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Test Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N_A$</td>
<td>Number of rule announcements</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_j$</td>
<td>Duration of interactive question session (in minutes)</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Indelim/enum$</td>
<td>Eliminative/enumerative by Wason</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{negative}$</td>
<td>Frequency of negative instances</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{IR}$</td>
<td>Immediate rule announcement frequency</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$avgLIR$</td>
<td>Average length of immediate rule announcements</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Instances/Time$</td>
<td>Number of instances given per unit time</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$UngReasons/Time$</td>
<td>Number of unique reasons given per unit time</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Rules/Time$</td>
<td>Number of rules announced per unit time</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$UngRules/Time$</td>
<td>Number of unique rules that are announced per unit time</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{Abs}$</td>
<td>Score in abstract questions</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{Th}$</td>
<td>Score in thematic questions</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{SW}$</td>
<td>Score in the second part of the written question set</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{Th-Abs}$</td>
<td>Time it takes to answer the first part of the written question set</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{SW}$</td>
<td>Time it takes to answer the second part of the written question set</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ABS_{CompleteInsight}$</td>
<td>Number of abstract questions answered with complete insight</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ABS_{PartialInsight}$</td>
<td>Number of abstract questions answered with partial insight</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ABS_{NoInsight}$</td>
<td>Number of abstract questions answered with no insight</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Th_{CompleteInsight}$</td>
<td>Number of thematic questions answered with complete insight</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Th_{PartialInsight}$</td>
<td>Number of thematic questions answered with partial insight</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Th_{NoInsight}$</td>
<td>Number of thematic questions answered with no insight</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$NF_{ falsifier}$</td>
<td>Total number of answers with only falsifying tendency</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{Verifier}$</td>
<td>Total number of answers with only verifying tendency</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{Matcher}$</td>
<td>Total number of answers with only matching tendency</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{None}$</td>
<td>Total number of answers with no defined tendency</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. MISSING DATA PROBLEM IN PREDICTION MODELS

Handling missing and noisy data has been a long time research problem in the field of artificial intelligence and data mining. Various imputation techniques have been used to deal with missing data while building prediction models in domains such as computer vision [4, 19], robotics [33], health care [24] and software cost/effort estimation [9, 28, 30]. Recommender systems, which are integral part of the e-commerce web sites such as Netflix and Amazon, and social web sites such as YouTube are often based on statistical models that are estimated from data sets containing a very high portion of missing ratings [2].

In the literature, there are various studies, which attempt to form a taxonomy of the techniques to handle missing data [10, 18]. According to the taxonomy proposed by Little and Rubin [18], we can categorize missing data methods as follows:

- **Procedures Based on Completely Recorded Units:**
  This method consists of discarding incompletely recorded parts of the data and only analyze the complete parts of the data. This method may give satisfactory results only in the case of small amount of missing data and it is very likely to lead to biases.

- **Weighting Procedures:** This method is used in the case of non-response in survey data. Such methods are not recommended except in special cases where the amount of missing information is limited [18].

- **Imputation Based Procedures:** Among these procedures, commonly used ones are “hot-deck imputation”, where recorded units in the sample are used to substitute values; “mean imputation”, where means from sets of recorded values are submitted; regression imputation, where the missing data are estimated by predicted value from the regression on the known part of the data. However, as indicated by Dempster [11] this kind of procedures have some pitfalls, since the imputed data have substantial biases.

  - **Model-Based Procedures:** These procedures are based on defining a model for the observed data and basing inferences on the likelihood or posterior distribution under that model. Advantages of these approaches are flexibility and the avoidance of ad-hoc methods.

  Another category of methods to handle missing data consists of machine learning techniques such as multi-layer perceptrons (MLP), self-organizing maps (SOM) k-nearest neighbour (kNN) [15, 31], decision trees [27] and Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) [1]. Moreover, there are various techniques, which are used to handle missing data in software cost estimation models such as mean imputation, list-wise deletion (LD), kNN, and Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithms. EM algorithms proved to be very powerful techniques [18, 37] leading to highest accuracy results [37].

  Among the model based approaches, EM algorithm is conceptually and computationally simple. Unlike ad-hoc interpolation methods, the EM algorithm estimates the maximum likelihood of the missing data directly at each iteration [13]. EM algorithm is so closely tied to the intuitive idea of filling in missing values and iterating. In other words, the EM algorithm handles missing data problem as follows:
1) Replace missing values by estimated values, 2) estimate parameters, 3) re-estimate the missing values assuming the new parameter estimates are correct, 3) re-estimate parameters, and continue iterating until convergence.

In our case, amount of missing data is high, consisting of the entire confirmation bias metrics for each entry. Therefore, rather than methods such as discarding missing data, weighting procedures and imputation based procedures, EM algorithms are suitable, in order to handle this specific missing data problem in our hand. However, one of the main drawbacks of EM algorithms is that it can be very slow to converge with large fractions of missing data. In some cases, the M-step may not have closed form so that the theoretical simplicity of the EM Algorithm does not convert to practical simplicity. In such cases the efficiency can be increased by combining the EM algorithm with various other practical techniques [20]. In this research, we employ a variation of EM algorithm, which is capable of efficiently handling missing data problem with large data in high dimensions.

4. ROWEIS’ EM ALGORITHM

Compared to other variations of the EM algorithm, which rely on complete-data computations, Roweis’ EM algorithm allows simple and efficient computation to handle the missing data problem while dealing with large data in high dimensions (e.g. up to $2^{17}$ data points in $2^{12}$ dimensions) [26]. Roweis’ algorithm also inspired Bell et al. to develop their prize winning matrix factorization algorithm to improve the accuracy of large recommender systems in the presence of high amount of missing data such as Netflix Cinematch [2]. For these all these reasons, we decided to employ Roweis’ EM algorithm to deal with developers’ missing confirmation bias data, while building defect prediction models.

Roweis’ algorithm originally aimed to perform PCA factorization in the presence of missing data. However, the algorithm can be employed to directly handle the missing data problem, as it was done by Bell et al. [2]. In order to explain the fundamentals of Roweis’ algorithm, we must refer to the goal of PCA, which is to find a mapping from the data Y in the original d-dimensional space to a new k-dimensional space where $k < d$, such that there is minimum loss of information.

$$X = w^T Y$$

Equation 1 is equivalent to $Y = CX$, where C is equal to $(w^T)^{-1}$. We can reformulate equation 1 as $X = C^{-1} Y = C^{-1} I Y$, where $I = (C^T)^{-1} C^T$ is the identity matrix. As a result the, “Expectation” step (E-step) of Roweis’ algorithm can be formulated as:

$$X = (C^T C)^{-1} C^T Y$$

In Equation 2, $Y$ is a dxn matrix of the original data and X is kxn matrix of the unknown states. The columns of C span the first k principle components of Y. The “Maximization” step (M-step) of the algorithm can be reformulated as in Equation 3:

$$C = Y X^T (X X^T)^{-1}$$

During the E-step of the EM algorithm, for any data entry $y$ in the data matrix $Y$ with some of its coordinates (i.e. attributes) missing, a unique pair $x^*$ and $y^*$ can be calculated such that $||C x^* - y||$ is minimized. In other words, missing values can be imputed by solving the least squares problem for $||C x - y||$.

5. EMPIRICAL STUDY

5.1 Datasets

In this study, we used datasets from four different projects as shown in Table 2. In order to build the defect prediction model, we took into account only the source code files whose development activities can be traced through the version control system. Only these active source code files were tested by the testing teams. Therefore, project managers needed guidance about defect-prone parts of these files to efficiently allocate their testing resources within tight release deadlines. In Table 2, the total number of maintained/developed files, file types and defect rates are listed for each dataset. The defect rate is the ratio of the number of defective files to the number of active files. Dataset ERP belongs to a project group that consists of six developers who are employees of the largest ISV (independent software vendor) in Turkey. The software developed by this project group is an enterprise resource planning (ERP) software. The snapshot of the software that was retrieved from the version management system dates back to March 2011, and it consists of 3,199 java files. The remaining three datasets come from the largest wireless telecom oper-
Table 2: Properties of datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th># of Active Files</th>
<th>Defect Density</th>
<th># of Developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>3199</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom1</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom2</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our goal in this research is to compare the defect prediction performance of a model that is built with the complete set of confirmation bias metrics with the models that are built with incomplete set of confirmation bias metrics. Therefore, we built prediction models for the complete form of each dataset. For each dataset, we also generated partially missing datasets corresponding to each possible combination of missing developers. This resulted in the formation of \(2^N - 2\) different missing data configurations. Later, we imputed each partially missing data by using Roweis’ EM algorithm and used the imputed dataset to build defect prediction models.

5.2 Methodology

In this study, we used the Naive Bayes algorithm since it combines signals coming from different attributes and it also performs well in software defect prediction [16, 21]. As shown in Table 2, the datasets are imbalanced; the number of defective files is far less than the number of defect-free files. Therefore, we used the under-sampling method, which is the most suitable sampling method for our datasets [21]. In order to overcome ordering effects, we shuffled the data ten times, and a ten-fold cross validation was used for each ordering configuration of input data. Therefore, for each ordering configuration, we created ten stratified bins: nine of these ten bins are used as training sets, and the last one is used as the test set [14]. As a result, during each experiment, the Naive Bayes algorithm with under-sampling is executed 10 \times 10 = 100 times for each dataset.

We formed the defect prediction analysis at the granularity level of “file” since defect data were not available at the granularity level of “method” in either of the two software companies. Each file is developed by a group, which consists of one or more developers. Therefore, in the input data, which is used to build the prediction models, each file is represented by the confirmation bias metrics of the corresponding developer group. We used three different operators to calculate the minimum, maximum and average values of the metrics of developers who committed code to the same source file. Assuming that \(A_{d, j}\) represents the \(j^{th}\) confirmation bias metric value of \(d^{th}\) developer, \(d \in G_j\) means that \(d^{th}\) developer is among the group of developers who created and/or modified \(j^{th}\) source file, and and finally, \(S_{j}^{max}\) represents the resulting \(j^{th}\) confirmation bias metric value of \(j^{th}\) source file when operator \(\text{op}\) is applied. \(\text{op}\) can be one of the operators \(\min\), \(\max\) or \(\text{avg}\) which are used to find minimum, maximum and average values of the \(j^{th}\) confirmation bias metric respectively. We can formulate the definition for the \(\min\), \(\max\) and \(\text{avg}\) operators as follows:

\[
S_{j}^{\min} = \min(A_{d, j})|d \in G_j (\text{4})
\]
\[
S_{j}^{\max} = \max(A_{d, j})|d \in G_j (\text{5})
\]
\[
S_{j}^{\text{avg}} = \frac{\sum_d (A_{d, j})|d \in G_j}}{\sum_d (1)|d \in G_j (\text{6})}
\]

5.2.2 Formation of Datasets with Partially Missing Data

As we have already stated, our goal in this experiment is to compare the performance of prediction models that are built with complete and partially complete data. In order to make a comparison, we assume that confirmation bias metrics of a subgroup of developers is unknown. This implies that confirmation bias metrics of any file created and/or updated by any member of this subgroup of developers is missing. \(2^N\) is the total number of subsets of the set of developers, where \(N\) is the total number of developers. After we exclude the empty set and the complete set of developers, we obtain \(2^N - 2\) missing data configurations. In other words, we exclude the following two cases: 1) Confirmation bias metrics of all developers are known, and 2) Confirmation bias metrics of none of the developers are known.

For each incomplete data set, we employ Roweis’ EM Algorithm. The pseudo code, which explains the details of Roweis’ EM Algorithm, is given in Figure 1. Output of Roweis’ Algorithm is the imputed form of the incomplete dataset (i.e., \(Y_{\text{imputed}} = CX\)). We build defect prediction models using each of these imputed confirmation bias metric sets as input. This results in the formation of \(2^N - 2\) defect predictors. Prediction performance of each of these predictors is compared with the performance of the prediction model that is built using the complete confirmation bias metric set. Percentage of missing data (i.e. missing \%) for each incomplete data set can be calculated as follows:

\[
\text{missing\%} = \frac{N_{\text{missing}}}{(N_{\text{missing}} + N_{\text{complete}})} (\text{7})
\]
In Equation 7, \(N_{\text{complete}}\) is total number of complete entries in the data set, and \(N_{\text{missing}}\) corresponds to total number of entries with missing confirmation bias metric values. Each entry in the data set corresponds to a source code file and it consists of the confirmation bias metric values of the group of developers who created and/or updated that file. Confirmation bias metric values of each developer are estimated from the outcomes of confirmation bias tests. In order to calculate confirmation bias metric values of each developer group we use, the operators defined by the Equations 4, 5 and 6. Therefore, missing confirmation bias developers, who created and/or updated a source code file, automatically implies that confirmation bias metrics for the developer group of that file are completely missing. In other words, the entry in the data set corresponding to that file is completely missing.

5.2.3 Performance Measurement Criteria

In order to evaluate the performance of the defect predictors built by using different metric suite combinations, we used the well-known performance measures which are probability of detection, false-alarm rate and balance [21].

Probability of detection \((pd)\) measures how good a predictor is in finding defective modules, where modules can be files, methods or packages depending on the granularity level. In the ideal case, we expect a predictor to catch all defective modules/files. This implies that \(pd\) is equal to 1.

Probability of false alarms \((pf)\) measures false alarm rates, when predictor classifies defect-free modules as defective. In the ideal case, we expect a predictor to classify none of the defect-free modules as defective. In other words, the value of \(pf\) is equal to 0.

Balance \((bal)\) is formulated to be the Euclidean distance from the sweet spot \((pd = 1\) and \(pf = 0\)) normalized by the maximum possible distance to this spot. In practice, the ideal case where a defect predictor has high probability of detecting defective files and low probability of false alarm is very rare. Therefore, we try to balance between \(pd\) and \(pf\) values. It is desirable that predictor performance is close to the sweet spot as much as possible.

\[
bal = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{(1 - pd)^2 + (0 - pf)^2}}{\sqrt{2}}
\]

\(pd\) and \(pf\) values are calculated using Confusion Matrix that is given in Table 3. In the confusion matrix, \(TP\) is the number of correctly classified defective modules, \(FP\) is the number of non defective modules that are classified to be defective, \(FN\) is the number of defective modules that are classified to be non-defective and finally \(TN\) is the number of correctly classified non-defective modules. Formulations for \(pd\) and \(pf\) in terms of confusion matrix values is given below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pd} &= \frac{TP}{(TP + FN)} \\
\text{pf} &= \frac{FP}{(FP + TN)}
\end{align*}
\]

6. EMPIRICAL STUDY RESULTS

As mentioned previously, for each dataset we prepared \(2^N - 2\) missing data configurations, where \(N\) is the total number of developers, who work in the project corresponding to that dataset. For each missing data configuration of a given dataset, we built defect prediction models after handling missing data by employing Roweis’ EM algorithm. We also built defect prediction models for the complete form of that dataset. The results of the corresponding missing data configurations are presented in Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7 for datasets ERP, Telecom1, Telecom2 and Telecom3, respectively. In Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7, defect prediction results of the complete form of the mentioned datasets (i.e., Missing\(\% = 0\)) are also given.

As shown in Tables 4-7, we categorized prediction performance results of missing data configurations of each dataset with respect to the corresponding missing data percentage estimated by Equation 7. For categorization purposes, we formed nine missing data percentage ranges \((n_1, n_2)\). For instance, if a missing data configuration results in 15\% missing data, then the corresponding defect prediction performance results belong to the missing data percentage range \((10, 20)\), since 15\% is greater than 10\% and less than or equal to 20\%. However, there might not be any missing data configurations, which fall within a missing data percentage range \((n_1, n_2)\). In dataset Telecom1, none of the missing data configurations results in a missing data percentage, which falls within the range 80\% - 90\%. On the other hand, none of the missing data configurations in the dataset Telecom2 fall in the ranges \((0, 10)\), \((10, 20)\), \((30, 40)\) or \((70, 80)\). This is due to only 12 missing data configurations (i.e. there are only 4 developers) in dataset Telecom2. This amount is small compared to the total number of missing data configurations in the rest of the datasets.

As shown in Table 4 imputed form of the dataset ERP yields lower \(pd\) values compared to the \(pd\) values obtained for dataset’s complete form. On the other hand, a decrease in the false positives (i.e. \(pf\) values) is observed especially for missing data percentage values that are greater then 50\%. A similar trend is observed also in the dataset Telecom1, as shown in Table 5. The reason why \(pf\) values fall as miss-

### Table 3: Confusion matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Defective (Predicted)</th>
<th>Non-Defective (Predicted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defective (Actual)</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Defective (Actual)</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Defect Prediction Performance Results with Missing Data for ERP Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing %</th>
<th>(pd)</th>
<th>(pf)</th>
<th>balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 – 10%)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 – 20%)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 – 30%)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 – 40%)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40 – 50%)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 – 60%)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 – 70%)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 – 80%)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80 – 90%)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Defect Prediction Performance Results with Missing Data for Telecom1 Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing %</th>
<th>pd</th>
<th>pf</th>
<th>balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 - 10)%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 - 20)%</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 - 30)%</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 - 40)%</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40 - 50)%</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 - 60)%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 - 70)%</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 - 80)%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80 - 90)%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Defect Prediction Performance Results with Missing Data for Telecom2 Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing %</th>
<th>pd</th>
<th>pf</th>
<th>balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 - 10)%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 - 20)%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 - 30)%</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 - 40)%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40 - 50)%</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 - 60)%</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 - 70)%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 - 80)%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80 - 90)%</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Defect Prediction Performance Results with Missing Data for Telecom3 Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing %</th>
<th>pd</th>
<th>pf</th>
<th>balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 - 10)%</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 - 20)%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 - 30)%</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 - 40)%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40 - 50)%</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 - 60)%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 - 70)%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 - 80)%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80 - 90)%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Methodology for the definition and extraction of confirmation bias metrics was defined in our previous research. Therefore, threats to validity regarding the definition and extraction of confirmation bias metrics was defined in our previous paper [7]. In this section, we explain the three major threats to the validity of our experiments: construct, internal and external. To avoid the construct validity threats in relation to measurement artifacts, we used three popular performance measures in software defect prediction research: the probability of detection (pd), the probability of false positives (pf) and balance values (bal). In order to avoid internal validity threats, we shuffled data ten times and used ten-fold cross validation for each ordering configuration of the input data to overcome ordering effects. Moreover, during under-sampling we shuffled each portion of the dataset ten times (which was used as an input to the Naïve Bayes algorithm). As a result, the Naïve Bayes algorithm with under-sampling was executed 100 times for each dataset during each experiment. In order to externally validate our results, we used datasets from four different developer groups, three of which were from a telecommunication company and one from an ISV specialized in the ERP domain. Hence, our datasets cover two different software development domains. We were also able to collect datasets from two different project groups within the telecommunication company. One project group developed software that is responsible for launching GSM tariff campaigns to its customers and mainly consists of user interfaces (Dataset Telecom1). The remaining two projects (Datasets Telecom2 and Telecom3) come from the billing and charging system pri-
marily comprised of database transactions, and there is no direct interaction with the customer via user interfaces.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In empirical software engineering, it is crucial to understand how people make decisions and solve problems throughout the software development process. However, we mostly encounter the “missing data” problem during empirical studies, which involve people. In this paper, we proposed a solution to deal with the “missing data” problem.

In our recent research, we have particularly focused on people’s decision making process, the cognition. Human cognition is a complex process to understand and model. We took into account only one trait of human cognition called confirmation bias. The reason why we picked confirmation bias is two folds: Firstly, it is one of the most researched topics in cognitive psychology including the grounded work by Watson and its extensive variations over the last sixty years [38, 39]. Secondly, there is empirical evidence showing the existence of confirmation bias among developers/testers [32]. In our recent research, we used confirmation bias metrics to build defect prediction models and by using only confirmation bias metrics, we obtained defect prediction results, which are comparable with the results obtained by using static code and churn metrics [7].

While building models/tools to guide software professionals in decision making, in most cases data is partially available or noisy. We argue that we need to find mechanisms to deal with this problem effectively, if we would like to help software engineers to run their operations more effectively and efficiently. In this paper, we employed an EM algorithm to impute missing confirmation bias metrics. Our empirical results showed that by using EM algorithm to impute missing confirmation bias metrics values and then by using the imputed data to build defect prediction models, we can achieve prediction results that are comparable with the results obtained by using complete data (i.e., confirmation bias metrics values).

Our future direction will be to include other cognitive bias types as well as to investigate different techniques to handle the “missing data” problem.
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