

2006 State of Software Measurement Practice Survey

NDIA CMMI Technology and Users
Conference

Mark Kasunic
November 15, 2006



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon

© 2006 Carnegie Mellon University

Agenda

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 that is used
- Measures that are reported

Summary Observations



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



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 Information Repository (SEIR) during 2004-2005
- 3 became an SEI Member during 2004-2005



Important to Remember When Interpreting Survey Results



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



Agenda

Introduction

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


→ Results

- Response rates and outcome
- Population demographics
- Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
- 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




Survey Respondents



1895 Responses



Approximate Population Proportions



Agenda

❖ 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?


- Measures that are reported



Involvement With Measurement




Provides (only) or Uses (only)



289 Provider
321 User




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




Measurement Definitions Are Understood & Consistent



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)



Agenda

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 that is used
- Measures that are reported


Summary Observations




Measurement Methods Used



“Other” Methods Used



Those Using “CMMI M&A Process Area”



Agenda

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 that is used
- ➔ Measures that are reported

Summary Observations



Measurements that Are Reported



Agenda

Introduction

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

Results

- Response rates and outcome
- Population demographics
- Attitudes and beliefs about measurement use
- Measures that are reported

→ Summary Observations



Influence of Role on Response - 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



Influence of Role on Response - 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.



Influence of Organizational Size - 1

	Number in Organization		
	≤ 100	101 - 499	≥ 500
Using measurement-based data helps my team to perform better than without using it.	78.4%	81.5%	86.8%



* Percent that Agree or Strongly Agree.

There exist measurable criteria for the products and services to which I contribute.	37.0	46.4	54.7%
I use measurement to understand the quality of the products/services that I work on.	35.1%	41.1%	46.2%
My team follows a documented process for collecting measurement data.	65.7%	71.6%	72.1%



* Percent that responded, "Frequently" to the listed questionnaire item.



Comparing Industry to Government

	Industry	Government
Using measurement-based data helps my team to perform better than without using it.	84.5%	80.0%
Definitions of measures used in my organization are commonly understood & consistent.	37.1%	31.9%

** Percent that Agree or Strongly Agree.*

Differences statistically significant with confidence 95%.



Comparing USA to Other Countries

	USA	Other
Using measurement-based data helps my team to perform better than without using it.	80.1%	85.9%
Definitions of measures used in my organization are commonly understood & consistent.	31.3%	42.4%

** Percent that Agree or Strongly Agree.*

Differences statistically significant with confidence 99%.




Using Measurement to Improve

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.



To be published this year:

The State of Software Measurement
Practice: Results of 2006 Survey

TECHNICAL REPORT

CMU/SEI-2006-TR-009
ESC-TR-2006-009



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.





Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon

2006 State of S/W Measurement Survey
Mark Kasunic, 11-15-2006

© 2006 Carnegie Mellon University