



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

2006 State of Software Measurement Practice Survey

Mark Kasunic
mkasunic@sei.cmu.edu

**Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense
© 2006 by Carnegie Mellon University**



Presentation Outline

- ❖ Introduction
 - Survey objectives & approach
 - The population being studied
 - Sampling plan

- ❖ Results
 - Response rates and outcome
 - Population demographics
 - Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
 - Measurement guidance used
 - Measures that are reported

- ❖ Summary Observations



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Survey Objectives

The objectives of this survey are to characterize

- the degree to which software practitioners use measurement when conducting their work
- the perceived value of measurement
- approaches that are used to guide how measures are defined and used
- the most common types of measures used by software practitioners



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Characteristics of the Survey

We used a structured, self-administered questionnaire that was available both via the World Wide Web and in paper form.

The questionnaire was designed to be short (17 questions) and easy-to-complete with questions phrased in close-ended format. Several questions allowed for short open-ended responses.

Stratified random sampling was used to select candidate respondents from a population comprised of members from three different subpopulations.

Candidate respondents were offered incentives to participate including

- platinum membership to the Software Engineering Information Repository (SEIR) that provides access to documents otherwise unavailable through regular membership
- early access to the survey results



The Population Being Studied

The population that we would have *liked* to have studied is the entire existing body of software practitioners in the world. However, such a representative database was unavailable to us.

The population that we did use for this study included individuals who:

- 1 were entered into the SEI customer relations database during 2004-2005
- 2 registered to gain access to the SEI's Software Engineering Repository (SEIR) during 2004-2005
- 3 became an SEI Member during 2004-2005



Sampling Plan


Subpopulation	Population Size	Sample Size	Adjusted Sample Size	Actual Sample Size
Customer Relations	6,398	603	2010	1670
SEI Members	1,242	434	1,242	951
SEIR registrants	7,540	612	2040	1539
Total	15,180	1,649	5,292	4,160

Calculated for:
precision of $\pm 2.5\%$
confidence of 95%

Adjusted based on estimated
30% response outcome.

- Invalid email addresses
- Non-responses
- Ineligible respondents

Important to Remember When Interpreting Survey Results





Presentation Outline

❖ Introduction

- Survey objectives & approach
- The population being studied
- Sampling plan




❖ Results

- Response rates and outcome
- Were subpopulations different?
- Population demographics
- Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
- Measurement guidance used
- Measures that are reported

❖ Summary Observations



Response Outcome Rates



Minimum Response Rate

$$RR1 = 42.4\%$$

Counts partial interviews as respondents

$$RR2 = 50.7\%$$


http://www.aapor.org/pdfs/standarddefs_4.pdf

84 Countries Represented






Respondents by Continent






Describe Your Organization



1893 Responses



Survey Respondents




1895 Responses



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Approximate Population Proportions


DoD & Government



Commercial



Number of Full Time Employees



1890 Responses



Presentation Outline

❖ Results

- Response rates and outcome
- Were subpopulations different?
- Population demographics



Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use

How are you involved with measurement?

Are purposes for measurement understood?

Does measurement help?

Is measurement used to understand product/service quality?

Documented measurement processes?

Measurement definitions understood and consistent?


Do measurable criteria exist for products and services?

Is corrective action taken when thresholds are exceeded?

- Measurement guidance used
- Measures that are reported




Involvement With Measurement



1892 Responses




Provides (only) or Uses (only)



289 Provider
321 User




Purpose for Measuring Is Understood






Purpose for Measuring Is Understood

1847 Responses






Believe That Measurement Helps (To Some Degree)



1868 Responses




Measurement Used to Understand Quality of Products & Services






Documented Process for Collecting Measurement Data






Documented Process for Collecting Measurement Data






Measurement Definitions Are Understood & Consistent



1868 Responses




Measurable Criteria Exist for Products & Services






Corrective Action Taken When Measurement Threshold Exceeded



1847 Responses



Action-Oriented Response to Measurement Information



- Measurable criteria established (frequently)
- Corrective action taken when threshold met (frequently)




Presentation Outline

- ❖ Introduction
 - Survey objectives & approach
 - The population being studied
 - Sampling plan
- ❖ Results
 - Response rates and outcome
 - Were subpopulations different?
 - Population demographics
 - Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
 - ➔ • Measurement guidance used
 - Measures that are reported
- ❖ Summary Observations




Measurement Methods Used



1868 Responses



“Other” Methods Used






Presentation Outline

- ❖ Introduction
 - Survey objectives & approach
 - The population being studied
 - Sampling plan
- ❖ Results
 - Response rates and outcome
 - Were subpopulations different?
 - Population demographics
 - Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
 - Measurement guidance used
 - ➔ • Measures that are reported
- ❖ Summary Observations



Measurements that Are Reported





Presentation Outline

- ❖ Introduction
 - Survey objectives & approach
 - The population being studied
 - Sampling plan
- ❖ Results
 - Response rates and outcome
 - Were subpopulations different?
 - Population demographics
 - Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
 - Measurement guidance used
 - Measures that are reported
- ➔ Summary Observations



Summary Observations - 1

In general, there were significant differences in response patterns when comparing management versus staff.

Management

Executive
Program Manager
Project Manager

Staff

Engineer
Analyst
Programmer

Statistical tests of significance demonstrated that the differences were significant with confidence of at least 99% in all cases and 99.9% in some cases.

- Hypothesis test for equality of proportions
- Chi-Square test for significance



Summary Observations - 2

When compared to staff, management responded more strongly that

- they understand the purposes for measurement
- measurement helps their team perform better than without it
- they use measurement more often to understand the quality of their products and services
- they follow a documented process more often for collecting and reporting measurement data
- measurement definitions are commonly understood and consistent in their organization
- measurable criteria exist for their products and services
- corrective action is taken when a measurement-based threshold has been exceeded

In general, the differences are statistically significant.




Summary Observations - 3

It is notable and a bit alarming that only 40.3% of all respondents reported that corrective action is taken when a measurement threshold has been exceeded.

Close to 20% of respondents reported that corrective action is rarely or *never* taken when a measurement threshold is exceeded.

Measurement doesn't help much unless the information is acted upon.





Summary Observations - 4

Methods Used

The CMMI M&A Process Area was identified as a measurement method used most often to identify, collect, and analyze measurement data.

- Approximately 56% of respondents reported using the CMMI M&A Process Area.
- 27.4% of all respondents reported that the CMMI M&A Process Area was the *only* method that they used

41% of all respondents stated that they used only a single method for identifying, collecting, and analyzing measurement data. (59% use two or more methods).

- ⚠ 21.1% (432 respondents) reported that they do not use any measurement method.



Summary Observations - 5

Measures Reported

Schedule and time-on-task measures are most often reported.

- 97% of respondents indicated that schedule progress was a measure most often reported.
- 93% indicated that effort applied to task was reported.
- In addition, some respondents listed other measures that they report and 19.2% of these were related to time tracking.





Summary Observations - 6

Measures Reported, continued

Code growth and Capability & Requirements Stability are measurements least reported by respondents.

- 27.3% do not report Code Growth
- 22.3% do not report Capability & Requirements Stability

Frequency of reporting measurement information varied depending on the measurement. However, most are reported on a weekly, monthly, or daily basis.



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Acknowledgements

Thanks to my SEMA colleagues who contributed their ideas for this survey. This work benefited from their good review and feedback.

Robert Ferguson
Wolf Goethert
Laura Malone

Dennis Goldenson
Jim McCurley
Robert Stoddard

Dave Zubrow
Michael Zuccher

Also, Linda Parker Gates and Erin Harper provided helpful feedback. I thank them for their contributions. Special thanks to Peter Capell for detailed review and helpful feedback he provided on multiple work products associated with this effort.

Thank you to Connie Sapienza, Jim McCurley, and Mike Zuccher for their assistance with organizing the database information used in this effort.

Thanks to Laura Malone and Michael Zuccher for their extra effort required to implement the survey incentive offer associated with the Software Engineering Information Repository (SEIR).

Thanks to Dave Zubrow for management support of this effort.

Finally, thank you to the individuals that took the time to assist us with this research by responding to this survey.