

Software Engineering: Knowledge and Performance

Narayanan SRINIVASARAGHAVAN[©]

A thesis

submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for award of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Information Sciences and Engineering

Faculty of Information Sciences and Engineering

University of Canberra

Canberra, Australia.

November 2010

Abstract

Software Engineering (SE) is a knowledge intensive activity. It is also a social process where individuals interact with each other in an organisational setting to achieve desired outcomes. The objective of this research is to explore the nature of the knowledge needed to conduct software development and the influence knowledge has on software development performance.

A survey of literature identifies that published works have attempted to examine the questions of knowledge and skill requirements to perform various roles in SE. However, this literature review reveals that while the need for some knowledge types is understood very well, other types have not been given adequate consideration. Further, it is important to understand knowledge and performance requirements based on solid foundational theories developed in fields such as cognitive psychology.

Cognitive theories on knowledge and action model how knowledge is stored, accessed and used in the human mind. On the other hand, the social origin theories of knowledge and expertise emphasise the importance of contextual or circumstantial knowledge to action. This research applies a reconciled model between these schools of thought to SE. Based on this model, both predominantly contextual and non-contextual cognitive knowledge are required to perform various roles in SE. A theoretical framework is developed that identifies nine types of knowledge required for an individual to perform SE roles. These knowledge types are 1) configuration knowledge (functional and technical knowledge about application systems), 2) social network knowledge, 3) process and procedural knowledge, 4) systems knowledge, 5) business domain area knowledge, 6) soft skills, 7) technique skills, 8) cultural and 9) heuristics knowledge. Using this framework, the research explores more broadly the knowledge required to perform various SE roles and examines the contribution that additional knowledge makes to perceived SE team performance improvement.

The theoretical framework has been tested using two research studies - first, using a case study of individuals in a software project setting and, secondly, using a survey of SE professionals to collect and analyse the knowledge requirements to perform their job. The analysis of survey data revealed a new classification schema of knowledge types for performing various SE roles. These are:

- Factor 1: Knowledge of organisational culture and relationships Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSA) (Including organisational culture and organisational relationships)
- Factor 2: Project software development KSA (Including technical skills, knowledge of application software items in the organisation and processes used in the SE team)
- Factor 3: Management skills (Including negotiation, management and organisational skills)
- Factor 4: Heuristic knowledge (including standards, guidelines, shortcuts and rules of thumb)
- Factor 5: Communication and team work skills
- Factor 6: Business functional KSA (Including business domain area knowledge, user interfaces, business analysis and testing)
- Factor 7: Problem solving abilities (Working with others in the team, the ability to investigate, analyse, propose and solve problems and issues)

The results empirically demonstrate the nature of both contextual and non-contextual cognitive knowledge types that are required to perform various SE roles. The research identified the knowledge types that are significantly required in various phases of Software Development Life Cycle. It is found that technique skills and configuration knowledge contribute most to improvements in performance after an individual joins a SE team.

This research formulated, tested and found empirical support to theory of knowledge and performance that is based on both contextual and non-contextual knowledge types. By arriving at the knowledge classification and relationships this research has contributed to the theoretical knowledge base. The results of this study are significant to SE practice as they assist organisations in formulating knowledge management (KM) strategies. By implementing these KM strategies success rates can be improved, failures reduced and productivity enhanced. Further, the identified knowledge types are important to academia for better curriculum design on SE.

Table of Contents

1	<i>Introduction</i>	1
1.1	Research objectives	1
1.2	Background	1
1.2.1	Software Engineering (SE).....	1
1.2.2	Knowledge	2
1.3	Research questions	3
1.4	Research motivation	3
1.4.1	Improve success rates and reduce failures.....	4
1.4.2	Theory development.....	4
1.4.3	Better curriculum design	5
1.4.4	Better knowledge management in practice.....	5
1.4.5	Summary	7
1.5	Chapter summary and Organisation of the thesis	7
2	<i>Literature review</i>	10
2.1	Introduction	10
2.2	Knowledge/skill requirements	11
2.2.2	Knowledge Types.....	13
2.2.3	Relative importance of knowledge types	23
2.2.4	Other considerations.....	24
2.2.5	Shortfalls in the literature	25
2.2.6	Summary	27
2.3	Performance	28
2.3.1	Introduction	28
2.3.2	Individual performance	28
2.3.3	Summary	29
2.4	Chapter Summary	29
3	<i>Theoretical framework</i>	30
3.1	Introduction	30
3.2	Cognitive origins of knowledge	32
3.2.1	ACT Theory	32
3.2.2	SE and its Cognitive origins.....	35
3.2.3	Summary	39
3.3	Social origins of knowledge	40
3.3.1	Introduction	40

3.3.2	Social origin theories.....	40
3.3.3	SE knowledge and its social origins.....	42
3.3.4	Summary	48
3.4	Reconciled Cognitive and Socio-cultural theories.....	49
3.4.1	Introduction	49
3.4.2	Reconciliation in Educational Psychology literature.....	49
3.4.3	Theory of internal and external cognition	50
3.4.4	Competency and Operational knowledge.....	51
3.4.5	Application to SE context	53
3.4.6	Summary	53
3.5	A theoretical framework for this research	55
3.5.1	Introduction	55
3.5.2	Theoretical framework	55
3.5.3	Summary	59
3.6	Chapter Summary	60
4	<i>Research design</i>.....	<i>61</i>
4.1	Introduction.....	61
4.2	Identification of research methods	63
4.2.1	Introduction	63
4.2.2	Research project context analysis.....	63
4.2.3	Chosen research design	65
4.2.4	Summary	66
4.3	Operationalisation of theoretical variables.....	67
4.3.1	Introduction	67
4.3.2	Difference between the case study and general-survey	67
4.3.3	Roles considered for this research.....	67
4.3.4	Operationalisation of Knowledge variables	68
4.3.5	Operationalisation of variables 2: Performance	76
4.3.6	Demographic profile	78
4.3.7	Summary	79
4.4	General-survey research design.....	82
4.4.1	Introduction	82
4.4.2	Questionnaire design	82
4.4.3	Pilot study of general-survey questionnaire	86
4.4.4	General-survey sampling design	88
4.4.5	Data Collection Method	89
4.4.6	Analysis plan for general-survey results	90
4.4.7	Limitations of the study.....	91

4.4.8	Summary	92
4.5	Case study research protocol	94
4.5.1	Introduction	94
4.5.2	Overall case study research design.....	94
4.5.3	Data collection	95
4.5.4	Analysis plan.....	100
4.5.5	Ethics.....	102
4.5.6	Bias due to researcher as a participant and key informant	103
4.5.7	Summary	103
4.6	Chapter Summary	104
5	<i>General-survey research findings.....</i>	<i>107</i>
5.1	Introduction.....	107
5.2	Analysis of Part A: Demographic profile.....	108
5.2.1	Introduction	108
5.2.2	Respondent profile	108
5.2.3	Respondent’s Organisational profile	109
5.2.4	Duties and responsibilities for different roles	111
5.2.5	Summary	112
5.3	Analysis of Part B: Knowledge requirements	112
5.3.1	Introduction	112
5.3.2	Quantitative results.....	112
5.3.3	Qualitative results.....	113
5.3.4	Discussion	115
5.3.5	Findings and conclusion.....	115
5.4	Analysis of Part C – Knowledge and Performance	117
5.4.1	Introduction	117
5.4.2	Qualitative results.....	117
5.4.3	Findings and conclusions	121
5.4.4	Summary	122
5.5	ANOVA with demographic profile.....	122
5.6	Limitations.....	126
5.7	Chapter Summary	128
6	<i>Case study research findings</i>	<i>129</i>
6.1	Introduction.....	129
6.2	The case study project environmental context	130
6.2.1	Description of the Case study project team.....	130
6.2.2	Researcher as key informant	130

6.2.3	Contextual knowledge items for use in project-questionnaire	131
6.2.4	Summary	133
6.3	Analysis of Part A: Participant profile	134
6.4	Analysis of Part B – Knowledge requirements.....	137
6.4.1	Quantitative results.....	137
6.4.2	Discussion	138
6.4.3	Findings and conclusions	152
6.5	Analysis of Part C – Knowledge and Performance.....	156
6.5.1	Quantitative results.....	156
6.5.2	Discussion	157
6.5.3	Findings and conclusions	164
6.6	Limitations of this research project	167
6.6.1	Issues in generalisation.....	167
6.6.2	Other limitations.....	167
6.7	Reflections on the study.....	169
6.7.1	Advantages of being an insider	169
6.7.2	Disadvantages of being an insider.....	169
6.8	Chapter Summary	169
7	<i>Integration and further exploration</i>	<i>171</i>
7.1	Introduction.....	171
7.2	Reconciliation of case study and general-survey findings.....	172
7.2.1	Introduction	172
7.2.2	Knowledge requirements to perform various roles	172
7.2.3	Knowledge factors to improved performance	174
7.2.4	Summary	176
7.3	Knowledge requirements: Re-classification using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)	177
7.3.1	Introduction	177
7.3.2	EFA Findings: Reclassified Framework	177
7.3.3	Knowledge requirements for role.....	186
7.3.4	Other findings.....	189
7.4	Chapter Summary	196
8	<i>Summary and Conclusions</i>	<i>198</i>
8.1	Summary.....	198
8.2	Conclusions.....	199
8.2.1	Knowledge required to perform SE.....	200
8.2.2	Knowledge factors contributing to performance	203

8.2.3	Implications for theory	205
8.2.4	Implications for practice.....	206
8.2.5	Limitations of the research.....	209
8.2.6	Possible future work.....	210
8.2.7	Final remarks.....	212
9	References.....	213
10	Glossary and Acronyms.....	235
11	Appendices.....	243
11.1	Knowledge index	243
11.2	Template for letter of informed consent for case study research	244
11.3	Case study research questionnaire	245
11.4	General-Survey Questionnaire	266
11.5	Relation between Total Professional Experience and contribution to performance .	278
11.6	Relation : Experience within SE team and contribution of knowledge types to performance.....	281
11.7	ANOVA results: Demographic profile information and re-classified factors	283
11.8	SDLC Phases and knowledge factors.....	291
11.9	Total Professional Experience and knowledge requirements	319
11.10	Experience within the project team and knowledge requirements	320
11.11	Factor correlation matrix.....	321
11.12	Additional statistics.....	322
11.13	SE Body of Knowledge (SWEBOK).....	323
11.14	People Capability Maturity Model (P-CMM).....	325
11.15	Profile of respondents.....	326
11.16	Summary of literature	328

List of Figures

Figure 1.1.	Flow chart: Organisation of the thesis.....	8
Figure 2.1.	Flow chart: Organisation of Chapter 2.....	10
Figure 3.1.	Basic theoretical model for this research	31
Figure 3.2.	Flowchart: Organisation of Chapter 3	31
Figure 3.3.	Anderson’s ACT theory (Anderson, 1982; Anderson, 1993)	33
Figure 3.4.	Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory: Triadic reciprocity.....	41
Figure 3.5.	Billett’s (1995) Model of Knowledge and Performance	50
Figure 3.6.	Basic theoretical model for this research	55
Figure 3.7.	Theoretical framework : Knowledge required to perform SE roles.....	58
Figure 4.1.	Flowchart: Organisation of Chapter 4.....	62
Figure 4.2.	Research design.....	65
Figure 4.3.	Sample of Part B of questionnaire to collect knowledge requirements ..	84
Figure 5.1.	Flowchart: Organisation of Chapter 6.....	107
Figure 6.1.	Flowchart: Organisation of Chapter 5.....	130
Figure 6.2.	Soft skills for various roles.....	139
Figure 6.3.	Core technique skills for various roles.....	141
Figure 6.4.	Process knowledge for various roles.....	142
Figure 6.5.	General systems knowledge for various roles.....	143
Figure 6.6.	Cultural knowledge for various roles	144
Figure 6.7.	Heuristics knowledge for various roles.....	146
Figure 6.8.	Social network knowledge for various roles	149
Figure 6.9.	Business domain area knowledge for various roles	150
Figure 6.10.	Configuration knowledge requirements levels for various roles.	151
Figure 6.11.	Comparisons for different roles ^{#1,#2}	153
Figure 6.12.	Knowledge factors : Mean contribution to increase in performance	158
Figure 6.13.	Contribution of dispositional reasons to increased performance	159
Figure 6.14.	Initial knowledge levels	162
Figure 6.15.	Current knowledge levels.....	162
Figure 7.1.	Flowchart: Organisation of Chapter 7	171
Figure 7.2.	Transformation of original theoretical framework.....	186
Figure 11.1.	Guide to SE Body of Knowledge – Part A (IEEE, 2004)	324
Figure 11.2.	Guide to SE Body of Knowledge – Part B (IEEE, 2004)	324
Figure 11.3.	Architecture of People-CMM (Curtis et al., 2003)	325

List of Tables

Table 2.1.	Key classifications on knowledge and skill requirements ^{#1}	12
Table 2.2.	Responsibilities of roles	25
Table 4.1.	Sample part of case study project-survey questionnaire	99
Table 5.1.	Role profile of respondents	109
Table 5.2.	Experience profile	109
Table 5.3.	List of technologies	110
Table 5.4.	Duties and responsibilities for various roles	111
Table 5.5.	Duties and responsibilities for other roles.....	112
Table 5.6.	Data on knowledge required for performing various roles*	113
Table 5.7.	Qualitative data on knowledge required to perform various roles	114
Table 5.8.	Cronbach's alpha for items based on original theoretical framework ..	115
Table 5.9.	Qualitative data Part I: Knowledge contribution to performance	119
Table 5.10.	Qualitative data-Part II: Knowledge contribution to performance.....	120
Table 5.11.	Ranking: Mean perceived contributions of knowledge types	121
Table 5.12.	ANOVA results: Total Professional Experience.....	123
Table 5.13.	ANOVA results: Experience within SE team	124
Table 5.14.	Relation: Role and Config. knowledge to increase in performance.....	125
Table 5.15.	Mean contribution: Config. knowledge to increase in performance	125
Table 6.1.	Number of participants and their roles	134
Table 6.2.	Educational level of participants in the case study	134
Table 6.3.	Averages requirements level for knowledge factors ^{#*}	138
Table 6.4.	Configuration knowledge requirements for various roles.....	138
Table 6.5.	Core technique skills for different roles.....	140
Table 6.6.	Findings: Knowledge requirements	153
Table 6.7.	Summary tabulation for case study results.....	157
Table 6.8.	Summary of averages for newcomer to project team.....	161
Table 6.9.	Mean: Individuals - experienced in org – newcomer to project team...	161
Table 6.10.	Mean: Individuals - experienced in systems as well as organisation....	161
Table 7.1.	Comparison of rankings from case study and general-survey	174
Table 7.2.	Rotated factor matrix.....	179
Table 7.3.	Factor analysis: statistical results.	180

Table 7.4.	ANOVA between role and knowledge factors.....	187
Table 7.5.	Pair-wise comparisons between Roles and Knowledge factors	188
Table 7.6.	Knowledge requirements for various roles based on re-classification..	188
Table 7.7.	Relation: Public/Private sector and Need for knowledge factors.....	189
Table 7.8.	Relation: Public/Private sector and need for knowledge factors.....	189
Table 7.9.	Private/Public sectors: Differences in Knowledge factor needs	190
Table 7.10.	Relation: Demographic profiles and Need for knowledge factors.....	191
Table 7.11.	Relation: SDLC and Need for knowledge factors.....	194
Table 7.12.	Relationship : Experience and skills	196
Table 8.1.	Final rankings	204
Table 11.1.	Knowledge Index calculation tabulation.....	243
Table 11.2.	Profile of respondents who marked 'other' roles	326
Table 11.3.	Count of respondents who marked multiple roles#.....	326
Table 11.4.	City based profile of respondents.....	327
Table 11.5.	Summary of literature.....	330

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Associate Professor Craig McDonald for mentoring, and guiding me through the long journey of research. He has been a source of encouragement, sound advice, constructive criticism and inspiration. Professor John Campbell started helping me in the second half of the research. I thank him for his encouragement, advice including on statistics and writing up the thesis.

My achievements, if any, in this research work is all founded upon my family. I owe it to my parents for building this passion for higher studies and research in me. Without the support, patience, sacrifices and constant encouragement from my wife, Sangeetha, this work would not have been possible. I am indebted to my brother for his help in seeing me through to higher studies. My sister has been a source of inspiration for me to complete the studies. I thank my parents-in-law and other family members for supporting me during the studies. My sincere love and thanks are owed to my children, especially my son, for their sacrifices and support.

The case study research was carried out in a major organisation. I thank the managers of this organisation for allowing me to conduct the case research. I thank the participants of the case study for contributing their invaluable time and insights for this research. I thank number of Data Collection Contacts (DCC) who helped me with collecting data for the general-survey. I would like to thank the numerous participants who filled the survey questionnaire. My work colleague Mr. Bruce Neindorf helped me improve my English by reviewing some of my earlier work during the research proposal stage. His help is very much appreciated.

Mr. David Pedderson, the UC statistical consultant, provided advice on statistical aspects of the research. I thank him for his valuable and insightful advice. I thank Ms Jennifer Bradley for the proof-reading and editorial support on the final thesis.

Narayanan SRINIVASARAGHAVAN