


2006 IEEE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON

# GLOBAL SOFTWARE ENGINEERING




Florianopolis, Brazil • 16–19 October 2006

  
IEEE  
COMPUTER  
SOCIETY

  
IEEE



Proceedings



# 2006 IEEE International Conference on Global Software Engineering

ICGSE 2006

16-19 October 2006  
Florianopolis, Brazil

Sponsored by

# SIEMENS

**DELL**™



IEEE  
**COMPUTER  
SOCIETY**

**IEEE**

Los Alamitos, California  
Washington • Tokyo

---



Copyright © 2006 by The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.

All rights reserved

*Copyright and Reprint Permissions:* Abstracting is permitted with credit to the source. Libraries may photocopy beyond the limits of US copyright law, for private use of patrons, those articles in this volume that carry a code at the bottom of the first page, provided that the per-copy fee indicated in the code is paid through the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923.

Other copying, reprint, or republication requests should be addressed to: IEEE Copyrights Manager, IEEE Service Center, 445 Hoes Lane, P.O. Box 133, Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331.

*The papers in this book comprise the proceedings of the meeting mentioned on the cover and title page. They reflect the authors' opinions and, in the interests of timely dissemination, are published as presented and without change. Their inclusion in this publication does not necessarily constitute endorsement by the editors, the IEEE Computer Society, or the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.*

IEEE Computer Society Order Number P2663

ISBN 0-7695-2663-2

ISBN-13 978-0-7695-2663-8

Library of Congress 2006929177

*Additional copies may be ordered from:*

IEEE Computer Society  
Customer Service Center  
10662 Los Vaqueros Circle  
P.O. Box 3014  
Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314  
Tel: + 1 800 272 6657  
Fax: + 1 714 821 4641  
<http://computer.org/cspress>  
[csbooks@computer.org](mailto:csbooks@computer.org)

IEEE Service Center  
445 Hoes Lane  
P.O. Box 1331  
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331  
Tel: + 1 732 981 0060  
Fax: + 1 732 981 9667  
[http://shop.ieee.org/store/  
customer-service@ieee.org](http://shop.ieee.org/store/customer-service@ieee.org)

IEEE Computer Society  
Asia/Pacific Office  
Watanabe Bldg., 1-4-2  
Minami-Aoyama  
Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-0062  
JAPAN  
Tel: + 81 3 3408 3118  
Fax: + 81 3 3408 3553  
[tokyo.ofc@computer.org](mailto:tokyo.ofc@computer.org)

*Individual paper REPRINTS may be ordered at: [reprints@computer.org](mailto:reprints@computer.org)*

Editorial production by Silvia Ceballos

Cover art production by Alex Torres

Printed in the United States of America by The Printing House

  
IEEE  
COMPUTER  
SOCIETY

 **IEEE**

IEEE Computer Society

**Conference Publishing Services**

<http://www.computer.org/proceedings/>



# 2006 IEEE International Conference on Global Software Engineering

ICGSE 2006

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>Welcome</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>Executive Committee Biographies</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>Conference Organizers</b> .....	<b>xvi</b>
<b>Program Committee Members</b> .....	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Keynote Talks</b> .....	<b>xviii</b>

---

### **Research Papers I: GSE Management**

Global Software Development Challenges: A Case Study on Temporal, Geographical and Socio-cultural Distance.....	3
<i>Helena Holmstrom, Eoin Ó Conchúir, Pär Ågerfalk, and Brian Fitzgerald</i>	
Outsourcing Decisions and Models – Some Practical Considerations for Large Organizations.....	12
<i>Justin Stark, Mario Arlt, and Derek H. T. Walker</i>	
A Reference Model for Global Software Development: Findings from a Case Study .....	18
<i>Rafael Prikladnicki, Jorge Luis Nicolas Audy, and Roberto Evaristo</i>	

#### **PANEL**

<b>Road Blocks and Enablers for Global Software Engineering Projects</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Christof Ebert</b> <b>Alcatel</b>	

### **Research Papers II: Managing Global Software Development Teams**

Project Management within Virtual Software Teams.....	33
<i>Valentine Casey and Ita Richardson</i>	
Comparison of Selected Survey Instruments for Software Team Communication Research.....	43
<i>Raghava G. Gowda and Donald J. Polzella</i>	



## Short Papers I: Managing Global Software Development Teams

Cultural Differences in Temporal Perceptions and its Application to Running Efficient Global Software Teams.....	55
<i>Richard W. Egan, Marilyn Tremaine, Jerry Fjermestad, Allen Milewski, and Patrick O'Sullivan</i>	
Delegation in Virtual Team: the Moderating Effects of Team Maturity and Team Distance .....	62
<i>Suling Zhang, Marilyn Tremaine, Jerry Fjermestad, Allen Milewski, and Patrick O'Sullivan</i>	

### PANEL

<b>Requirements Engineering in Distributed Projects.....</b>	<b>69</b>
--	-----------

**Daniela Damian  
University of Victoria, Canada**

## Industry Papers I: GSE Management

Success of Offshore Relationships: Engineering team structures .....	73
<i>Sidharth Narayanan, Sumonta Mazumder, and Raju R</i>	
Managing Software Performance in the Globally Distributed Software Development Paradigm.....	83
<i>Gaurav Caprihan</i>	
IT Application Aessment Model for Global Software Development.....	92
<i>Ravishankar Kuni and Navneet Bhushan</i>	

## Short Papers II: Culture

Culture and Shared Understanding in Distributed Requirements Engineering .....	101
<i>Yvonne Hsieh</i>	

## Short Papers III: GSE Methodologies

Could Global Software Development Benefit from Agile Methods? .....	109
<i>Maria Paasivaara and Casper Lassenius</i>	
Collaborative International Usability Testing: Moving from Document-Based Reporting to Information Object Sharing .....	114
<i>Ian Douglas</i>	
Collaborative Software Engineering with a Digital Ecosystem .....	119
<i>Thomas Heistracher, Thomas Kurz, Giulio Marcon, and Claudius Masuch</i>	

## Short Papers IV: Technology

- Towards Awareness in the Large.....127  
*Anita Sarma and Andre van der Hoek*
- MasePlanner: A Card-Based Distributed Planning Tool for Agile Teams.....132  
*Robert Morgan and Frank Maurer*

## Research Papers III: Coordination

- Sisyphus: Enabling Informal Coordination in Global Software Development.....139  
*Bernd Brugge, Allen H. Dutoit, and Timo Wolf*
- Leveraging Expertise in Global Software teams: Going outside Boundaries.....149  
*Kate Ehrlich and Klarissa Chang*
- Exploring the Assumed Benefits of Global Software Development.....159  
*Eoin Ó Conchúir, Helena Holmstrom, Pär Ågerfalk, and Brian Fitzgerald*

## Industry Papers II: Test Infrastructure

- A Test Specification Method for Software Interoperability Tests in Offshore  
Scenarios: A Case Study.....169  
*Brahim Sakout Andaloussi and Andreas Braun*
- Experience Developing Software Using a Globally Distributed Workforce .....179  
*Alberto Avritzer, Thomas Ostrand, and Elaine J. Weyuker*
- Tool Support for Distributed Software Engineering.....187  
*Hans Spanjers, Maarten ter Huurne, Dan Bendas, Bas Graaf, Marco Lormans,  
and Rini Van Solingen*

### PANEL

- Coping with Cultural Diversity in GSE Environments..... 199**  
**Alberto Avritzer**  
**Siemens Corporate Research, Inc.**

## Research Papers IV: Technology

- Siemens Global Studio Project: Experiences Adopting an Integrated  
GSD Infrastructure .....203  
*Neel Mullick, Matthew Bass, Zak El Houda, Daniel J. Paulish, Marcelo Cataldo,  
Jim D. Herbsleb, Len Bass, and Ragvinder Sangwan*
- Supporting Distributed Software Development with Fine-Grained Artefact Management.....213  
*Bernd Bruegge, Andrea De Lucia, Fausto Fasano, and Genoveffa Tortora*
- Technology Selection to Improve Global Collaboration .....223  
*Gabriela N. Aranda, Aurora Vizcaíno, Alejandra Cechich, and Mario Piattini*

**PANEL**

**Methods and Tools for Collaboration in GSE Environments ..... 233**

**Daniel J. Paulish**

**Siemens Corporate Research, Inc.**

**Posters**

Toward a Unified Model for Requirements Engineering .....237  
*Brian Berenbach and Mark Gall*

Leveraging Lessons Learned for Distributed Projects Through Communities  
of Practice.....239  
*Mauricio Cristal and Juliano Reis*

Architecture-Centric Global Software Processes.....241  
*Henrique Rocha de Faria and Gary Adler*

Exploring the Relationship between Dependencies and Coordination  
to Support Global Software Development Projects .....243  
*Sebastião B. Fonseca, Celidson R. B. de Souza, and David F. Redmiles*

Practices and Supporting Structures for Mature Inquiry Culture in Distributed  
Software Development Projects.....245  
*Vesna Mikulovic, Michael Heiss, and James D. Herbsleb*

The Test Community of Practice Experience in Brazil .....247  
*Elizângela Andrade Paiva*

Global Software Development Offshore Insourcing Organizations  
Characteristics: Lessons Learned from a Case Study .....249  
*Leonardo Pilatti and Jorge Luis Nicolas Audy*

MuNDDoS: A Research Group on Global Software Development .....251  
*Rafael Prikladnicki, Sabrina Marczak, and Jorge Luis Nicolas Audy*

Improving Productivity of Local Software Development Teams in a Global  
Software Development Environment .....253  
*Marcelo Blois Ribeiro, Ricardo M. Czekster, and Thais Webber*

IMART: An Interoperability Model for Artifacts of Distributed Software  
Development Environments .....255  
*Igor Scaliente Wiese and Elisa Hatsue Moriya Huzita*

TDE UML Editor – A Success Development Case of a Software Extension.....257  
*Daniel D. Vanzin, Ivan L. Martins, and João Bosco A. Pereira Filho*

IBM Software Development Leveraging Geographically Distributed  
Teams -The Interactive Solution Marketplace 2.0 (ISM) Case Study.....259  
*Vito Vitale*

**Author Index.....261**

## Welcome to ICGSE 2006

ICGSE 2006 is the first truly international conference on Global Software Engineering (GSE). It brings together experts from academia and industry to take leadership on the evolution of this fast growing field. The ambition of this first conference in a series is to shape the community and discipline of GSE. The idea of a dedicated conference on GSE started, as it should, within a distributed, asynchronous, and culturally diverse environment. For several years now, the GSE community has promoted workshops such as in Portland in 2003, Edinburgh in 2004, and Paris in 2005. It was during a dinner meeting organized by Siemens where industry offshoring experts and researchers from a number of universities distributed around the world first imagined a focused international conference on Global Software Engineering. Based on these diverse research and expert initiatives the Organizing Committees of ICGSE 2006 were formed.

The GSE subject is timely and relevant. Almost all of today's large software development projects need to pay serious attention to cultural, operational and technical aspects when dealing with globally distributed development teams. Globalization is one of the three major drivers of the current IT and software industry, aside from industrialization and consolidation. GSE is not yet 'complete' in its research and empirical basis and certainly not mature in its communication and education aspects. Therefore, it was clear to us that a successful conference on GSE must balance industrial and academic participation. The composition of the Program Committee and the papers that were selected reflect an ideal balance between research and practitioner experience.

Research on GSE is necessary because it is potentially a huge paradigm change in software development. Dealing with world-wide distributed software development teams is far more complex than the past everybody in the same location approach. Such change presents challenges and difficulties that vary from very concrete problems such as working across different time zones and geographic distances, to more subjective aspects such as cultural differences. Operational problems must be addressed within this new global context. Requirements engineering, architecture specification, code generation, testing, processes, methods, and tools for communication must be adjusted to be successful in this new world of distributed software development. The GSE community is currently poised for a very promising future environment where great achievements, innovative technologies, and first class research will be done. The technical, scientific, and social merits of GSE have been acknowledged by the IEEE Computer Society by granting IEEE sponsorship to this conference.



The choice of Brazil to host this first ICGSE was a composition of interests to clearly indicate the global makeup of the conference and, obviously, to allow the participants to enjoy the outstanding natural beauty of the Brazilian coast. The Costão do Santinho venue, in particular, was chosen to host the conference since we believe a well-organized initiative will benefit from the natural qualities of an offshore site for enhancing the efficient exchange of new ideas. On behalf of all the ICGSE organizational committees we would like to welcome you to our conference, and we hope you may benefit from the technical, scientific, and social environment you are about to experience at ICGSE 2006.

Executive Committee



Paulo Fernandes  
PUCRS, Brazil  
General Chair



Daniela Damian  
U.Vic., Canada  
Program Chairs



Christof Ebert  
Alcatel, France



Alberto Avritzer  
Siemens, USA  
Finance Chair



Daniel Paulish  
Siemens, USA

We acknowledge the generous financial support of our sponsors

# SIEMENS



# CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS

## **General Chair**

Paulo Fernandes, *PUCRS, Brazil*

## **Program Chairs**

Daniela Damian, *University of Victoria, Canada*

Christof Ebert, *Alcatel, France*

## **Posters and Demos Chair**

Allen Milewski, *Monmouth University, USA*

## **Finance Chairs**

Alberto Avritzer, *Siemens, USA*

Ronald Dauscha, *Siemens, Brazil*

Sangwan Raghvinder, *Penn State Univ, USA*

## **Proceedings Chair and Editor**

Alberto Avritzer, *Siemens, USA*

## **Publicity Chairs**

Matthew Bass, *Siemens, USA*

Marcia B. Cavalvante, *Siemens, Brazil*

Patrick Keil, *TUM, Germany*

Neel Mullick, *Siemens, USA*

Rafael Prikladnicki, *PUCRS, Brazil*

## **Local Organization**

Ricardo M. Czekster, *PUCRS, Brazil*

Luciano C. Ost, *PUCRS, Brazil*

Sandra Rosa, *PUCRS, Brazil*

Thais Webber, *PUCRS, Brazil*

## **Executive Committee**

Alberto Avritzer, *Siemens, USA*

Daniela Damian, *University of Victoria, Canada*

Christof Ebert, *Alcatel, France*

Paulo Fernandes, *PUCRS, Brazil*

Daniel Paulish, *Siemens, USA*



## PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Steve Abrams, *IBM, USA*  
Jorge Audy, *PUCRS, Brazil*  
Alberto Avritzer, *Siemens, USA*  
Suttamally Balasubramaniyan, *Wipro, India*  
Liam Banon, *University Limerick, Ireland*  
Gautam Brahma, *Flextronics, India*  
Andreas Braun, *T-Systems, Germany*  
Bernd Bruegge, *TUM, Germany*  
Li-Te Cheng, *IBM, USA*  
Andrea De Lucia, *University Salerno, Italy*  
Roberto Evaristo, *University Illinois-Chicago, USA*  
Brian Fitzgerald, *University Limerick, Ireland*  
Paul Gruenbacher, *University of Linz, Austria*  
James Herbsleb, *Carnegie Mellon, USA*  
Andre van der Hoek, *University of California, USA*  
Ross Jeffery, *UNSW, Australia*  
Dehua Ju, *East China University Science and Tech, China*  
Philippe Kruchten, *UBC, Canada*  
Filippo Lanubile, *University Bari, Italy*  
Frank Maurer, *University Calgary, Canada*  
Allen Milewski, *Monmouth University, USA*  
Audris Mockus, *Avaya Labs, USA*  
N.G.Nagaraj, *Infosys, India*  
Linda Northrop, *SEI, USA*  
Heather Oppenheimer, *Lucent, USA*  
Harold Ossher, *IBM, USA*  
Tom Ostrand, *AT&T Research, USA*  
Frances Paulisch, *Siemens, Germany*  
Daniel Paulish, *Siemens, USA*  
Dewayne Perry, *University Texas, USA*  
Ita Richardson, *University Limerick, Ireland*  
Raghvinder Sangwan, *Penn State University, USA*  
Kevin Schneider, *University of Saskatchewan, Canada*  
Wolfgang Strigel, *QA Labs, Canada*  
Kishor Trivedi, *Duke University, USA*  
Elaine J. Weyuker, *AT&T Research Labs, USA*

# Technology Selection to Improve Global Collaboration

Gabriela N. Aranda

GIISCo Research Group

Universidad Nacional del Comahue

Computing Sciences Department

Buenos Aires 1400 - 8300 Neuquén, Argentina

*garanda@uncoma.edu.ar*

Aurora Vizcaíno

ALARCOS Research Group

Information Systems and Technologies Department

UCLM-Soluziona Research and Development Institute

Escuela de Informática, Univ. de Castilla-La Mancha

Paseo de la Universidad 4 - 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain

*aurora.vizcaino@uclm.es*

Alejandra Cechich

GIISCo Research Group

Universidad Nacional del Comahue

Computing Sciences Department

Buenos Aires 1400 - 8300 Neuquén, Argentina

*acechich@uncoma.edu.ar*

Mario Piattini

ALARCOS Research Group

Information Systems and Technologies Department

UCLM-Soluziona Research and Development Institute

Escuela de Informática, Univ. de Castilla-La Mancha

Paseo de la Universidad 4 - 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain

*mario.piattini@uclm.es*

## Abstract

*Global software development projects face up a variety of challenges respect to communication and control that need to be solved or, at least, minimized. For that reason, processes crucially based on communication, like software requirements elicitation; have to be rethought in such a new context. Since requirement elicitation is a human-centred process, we propose using techniques from the field of cognitive psychology to define a strategy for selecting technology. With this goal, this paper introduces our approach and illustrates how cognitive styles might be used to improve a distributed process by selecting suitable groupware tools and elicitation techniques according to the characteristics of stakeholders.*

## 1. Introduction

Previous works have analyzed the more problematic factors of Global Software Development (GSD), concluding that lack of face to face interaction, time difference between different sites and cultural diversity affect communication [7]. Also during software requirement elicitation, lack of fluent communication is one of the most important challenges in discussion [19]. For those reasons, when analyzing virtual teams working on requirements definition, minimizing

communication problems becomes crucial to assure the quality of the software in construction.

Having the main goal of improving communication in virtual teams during the requirement elicitation process, we looked at concepts from two research areas: CSCW (Computer-Supported Cooperative Work) and Cognitive Informatics. On the one hand, since people are distributed along many distanced sites, they must communicate each other using software, called groupware, which is part of the studies of CSCW, a research area that focuses on the development of technology for communication as well as the study of humans when working in group. Some examples of groupware tools used during multi-site developments are e-mails, newsgroups, mailing lists, forums, bulletin boards, shared whiteboards, document sharing, chat, instant messaging, and videoconferencing [7, 13]. They can be classified as synchronous or asynchronous depending if the users have to work at the same time or not [8]. According to GSD literature, both categories are important in group work, because asynchronous collaboration allows team members to construct requirements individually and contribute to the collective activity of the group for later discussion (especially when groups are distributed across time zones), and real time collaboration and discussions are necessary components of group Requirements Elicitation (RE) sessions to give stakeholders the chance of having instant feedback [11]. However, is also true that sometimes people are



keener on one kind of collaboration than the other. So, as communication among people involves aspects of human processing mechanisms that are analyzed by the cognitive sciences, we decided to look for references into the Cognitive Informatics, an interdisciplinary research area that applies concepts from psychology and other cognitive sciences to improve processes in engineering disciplines like software engineering [17].

After analyzing varied psychological issues, we set our interest in using some techniques called Learning Style Models (LSMs), which may be useful to select groupware tools and elicitation techniques according to the cognitive style of stakeholders [2, 3]. Most of related works using LSMs in informatics concern only educational purposes, such as their influence when learning recursion or programming [16, 18]; and also to define frameworks for designing multimedia courses [4, 15]. On the contrary, few related works use psychological techniques to solve communicational problems in Software Engineering. One work on this direction is the use of cognitive styles as a mechanism for software inspection team construction [14], that describes an experiment to prove that heterogeneous software inspection teams have better performance than homogeneous ones, where heterogeneity concept is analyzed according to the cognitive style of participants. Even when they also used the concept of cognitive styles to classify people, our approach is different because, as we have explained previously, we do not try to say which people seem to be more suitable to work together. On the contrary, our goal is choosing the best strategies to improve communication for an already given group of people.

Having this in mind, we will give an introduction to some basic concepts about cognitive informatics and learning styles models, and we will introduce a methodology, based on concepts from fuzzy logic, to select groupware tools and requirement elicitation techniques. The last sections will present the results of an interesting survey we have carried out, as well as conclusions and guidelines for future work.

## 2. Relating Cognitive Psychology and Software Engineering Processes

Cognitive Informatics relates cognitive sciences and informatics by using cognitive theories to investigate and look for solutions to informatics, computing, and software engineering problems [6]. That give us a base to use concepts from cognitive psychology (which concern the way people attend and gain information and how these information processing mechanisms affect human behaviour), to improve the requirement elicitation process.

Part of cognitive psychology theories are cognitive styles, which classify people's preferences about perception, judgment and processing of information [14], with the goal of analyzing and understanding differences in human behaviour. With the same idea, learning styles models (LSMs) classify people according to a set of behavioural characteristics that concern the ways people receive and process information, while their goal is improving the way people learn a given task.

So far, LSMs have been discussed in the context of analyzing relationships between instructors and students but we propose taking advantage of this kind of models by adapting it to virtual teams that deal with distributed elicitation processes. To do so, we consider the following analogy between stakeholders and roles in LSMs: as Hickey and Davis have mentioned, elicitation is about learning the needs of the users [12]. From our point of view, users and clients also learn from analysts and developers (for instance, they learn how to use a software prototype or a new vocabulary). Taking this into account we can say that during the elicitation process everybody "learns" from others.

The model we have chosen as the basis for our research is called the Felder-Silverman (F-S) Model. This model was selected after studying different LSMs. The analysis shows that the F-S model is the most complete because it covers the categories defined by the most famous LSMs (like the Myers-Briggs Indicator Type, the Kolb model, the Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument, etc.) and, additionally, the F-S model has been widely and successfully used with educational purposes in engineering fields [10]. The F-S Model introduces four categories (Perception, Input, Processing and Understanding), each of them further decomposed into two subcategories (Sensing/Intuitive; Visual/ Verbal; Active/Reflective; Sequential/Global) as it is shown in figure 1.




Figure 1: Felder and Silverman categories and subcategories

Characteristics of each subcategory [9] are:

- *Sensing people* prefer learning facts and solving problems by well-established methods, while *Intuitive people* prefer discovering possibilities and relationships, and dislike repetition.
- *Visual people* remember best what they see (such as pictures, diagrams, flow charts, time lines, films, and demonstrations). On the contrary, *Verbal people* get more out of words, and written and spoken explanations.
- *Active people* tend to retain and understand information by doing something active with it (discussing or applying it or explaining it to others). In contrast, *Reflective people* prefer to think about information quietly first.
- *Sequential people* tend to gain understanding in linear steps, with each step following logically from the previous one, whereas *Global people* tend to work in large jumps, absorbing material almost randomly without seeing connections, and then suddenly "getting it".

People are classified into the different categories by filling a multiple-choice test, available on the WWW (<http://www.engr.ncsu.edu/learningstyles/ilsweb.html>), which returns a rank for each subcategory. Depending on the circumstances, people may fit into one category or the other, being for instance, sometimes active and sometimes reflective; so preference for one category is measured as strong, moderate, or mild.

According with their authors, people with a mild preference are balanced on the two dimensions of that scale. People with a moderated preference for one dimension are supposed to learn more easily in a teaching environment which favours that dimension. Finally, people with a strong preference for one dimension of the scale may have difficulty learning in an environment which does not support that preference. With the goal of making everybody feel comfortable in the virtual environment, we propose choosing groupware tools and elicitation techniques more according to their learning styles, as we explain in the next section.

### 3. Supporting Personal Preferences in Distributed Requirement Elicitation

In order to support personal preferences when selecting technologies for virtual teams we propose a methodology that comprehends a series of phases which are summarized in figure 2.

Our methodology of selection is based on concepts from fuzzy logic and fuzzy sets [1], which are used to

obtain rules from a set of representative examples, in the way of patterns of behaviour.

The methodology is divided into two big stages: the first one is independent of any project and comprehends phases 1 to 4, and the second one is dependent of a given project and covers phases 5 and 6.

**Phases 1 to 3** are about looking for a set of examples (which are real data about preferences of stakeholders in their daily use of groupware tools and requirements elicitation techniques), and analyzing them to discover their relationship with classifications in the F-S model.

During the **Phase 1** we ask a wide set of people to fill the learning style test and obtain their classification for F-S Model. In **Phase 2** the same people are required to express their preference about groupware tools ("Which is the groupware tool you feel more comfortable using it to communicate with your partners?"). And in **Phase 3** people are required to express their preference about requirement elicitation techniques ("Which is the requirement elicitation technique you feel more comfortable using it during an elicitation process?"). The way we can obtain examples for groupware tool is quite straightforward: people use email, instant messaging, and chat quite normally in their life and even if they have never used videoconferencing or shared whiteboards they can easily imagine how they would feel about them, so a simple question is enough to get an output variable for our model. On the contrary, selecting a requirement elicitation technique it is not so easy because analysts usually know a couple of techniques and users and clients usually do not know any. Then, in order to get a ranking of preferences for elicitation techniques we need to develop a series of experiments so as, after some training in a set of requirement elicitation techniques, we could ask stakeholders about their experience with each one.

Once phases 1 to 3 have been completed, we would count with two sets of examples:  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , where  $\theta_1$  represents stakeholders' preferences for groupware tools and  $\theta_2$  represents stakeholders' preferences for requirement elicitation techniques.

Each set of examples would be represented like  $\theta = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$ , where each example  $e_i$  has the form  $\{(x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3}, x_{i4}), y_j\}$ . In such a context the values  $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3}, x_{i4}$  represent the rank for each category of the F-S Model, and  $y_j$  is the output variable that represents the preference of a particular person. Each  $x_{ij}$  takes a value from a set we have defined for each category of the F-S model, for instance by using the adverbs (and their correspondent abbreviations): Very (V), Moderated (M) and Slight (S), that correspond to *strong*, *moderate* and *mild*, respectively, in the F-S



model (we have chosen the adverbs in that way to avoid confusion with respect to the use of the first letter).

For instance, the probable values for the variable  $x_{13}$  that represents the preferences for the category Reflective-Active, would be: Very active (VAc), Moderately active (MAc), Slightly active (SAc), Slightly reflective (SRe), Moderately reflective (MRe), Very reflective (VRe).

Following the same format for the rest of the categories in F-S model, a possible instantiation of an example in the set  $\theta_1$  would be {(MIn, MVi, VAc, SSq), videoconference} and for the set  $\theta_2$  would be {(SIn, VVi, VAc, VSq), prototype}.

Once we count with both sets of examples,  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , it is time to obtain the preference rules that will support the technology selection in future. To do so, in **Phase 4**, we propose using a machine learning algorithm to analyze the examples in a systematic way, and generalize common features or patterns of behaviour.

The algorithm we have chosen to obtain the preference rules is the one proposed in [5] that finds a finite set of fuzzy rules that reproduce the input-output system's behaviour. We have selected this algorithm because it was designed to obtain rules with a maximum degree of generality. To do so, it reduces the antecedent part of the rules as much as possible so as to obtain rules that can be easily understood and highly approximated to the real-life examples.


In short, the mechanism can be explained as follows:

- Convert each example in one rule.
- Remove from the initial set those rules that are the same.
- Analyze every initial rule so that (whether it is possible) to extend it and generate a definitive rule.

Using this machine learning algorithm we can obtain rules such as *Ro: if X1 is VVi then Y1 is Instant Messaging*, which is interpreted as: "If a user has a strong preference for the Visual subcategory, the groupware tool that this person would prefer is Instant Messaging".

Once both sets of preference rules are obtained we would finished the *project independent* part. At this point we should remark that our methodology has the characteristic that the example and preference rule databases can be improved along surveys are applied on more and more GSD projects.

The remaining phases consist of the application of our methodology to a specific GSD project during a requirement elicitation process, so that it is called the *project dependent stage*.



**Figure 2: Phases to define and analyze personal preferences to choose appropriate technology in Virtual Teams**

First of all, we would need to obtain the personal preferences of every person who will work in a virtual team by asking him to fill the learning style test (**Phase 5**). This information will be stored in a database that can be accessed every time a group of people needs to communicate to each other.

In **Phase 6**, the technology selection process itself is done. To do so, the personal preferences of a set of stakeholders that need to communicate to carry out a given task, are studied and confronted, by means of an automatic tool, to choose and suggest the most appropriated set of technology. As we have explained in [3] such strategies must take into account other factors besides cognitive profiles of stakeholders, like time difference between sites, the degree of sharing of a common language, and the current situation at the requirement elicitation process.

#### 4. A case study

In order to obtain useful information for illustrating our approach, we have designed a survey to inquire about personal preferences of stakeholders and to look for patterns of behaviour. As a first attempt, we have focused on the preferences about groupware tools, leaving the analysis of preferences about requirement elicitation techniques as future work.

The subjects under study were software developers and users that were accustomed to use groupware tools and had some proficiency using at least two of them (email, instant messaging, chat, forum, videoconference). Part of the interviewees worked for private organizations that develop software for third parties; and the rest were academic staff of universities that cooperate with software development projects and users of software systems at different organizations.

The first task for everyone was filling the learning style test and sending us the results. Then we asked them to fill a survey about their preferences during their daily work with groupware tools. The questions we had prepared explored preferences by asking people to give a rank to a set of groupware tools. To have the chance of analyzing differences, we separated questions to ask for preferences when they had to work with only one partner or with a group of them, but in this article we only present the results for answers that consider communication between more than two stakeholders.

The people who returned the survey were 43, but as the number of examples was not large enough to analyze each tool separately, we decided to analyze preferences taking into account two big groupware tool groups – asynchronous and synchronous – according to the classification proposed in [8]. Thus, we have email and forum as asynchronous tools and chat (or instant messaging in a one-to-one version) and videoconference as synchronous. As we have mentioned before, this separation is not capricious, since it is usually taken into account in GSD literature [7, 13] to analyze how their use affect, or not, global software development.

Once we had our initial set of examples, we firstly decided to analyze the preferences of stakeholders respect to their gender; to be sure that data was independent of such a factor. We confirmed that results did not present any important difference between male and female answers.

As it is shown in figure 3, approximately the same percentage of representatives of each gender choose synchronous and asynchronous tools respectively, so we can conclude that gender is not a factor that influences the type of groupware tool people prefer using.




Figure 3: Relating preferences about Asynchronous and Synchronous Groupware Tools according to gender.

Later, we analyzed the preferences of stakeholders with respect to their age, setting intervals of 10 years each. We decided this because it is a general thought that younger people are keener on synchronous tools (like instant messaging) than elders. Again, as figure 4 shows, results did not present any important difference between preferences of people with different age. That means that the age of the stakeholders does not seem to be a factor that influences the preference for synchronous or asynchronous tools neither.




Figure 4: Relating preferences about Asynchronous and Synchronous Groupware Tools according to the age of stakeholders

Only in a next stage we analyzed preferences of stakeholders in relation with their learning style. The results of such a comparison are shown in figure 5, and by studying them we found out that there are no significant differences when preferences for the subcategories are slight or moderated. That means, most of slight and moderated preferences for all the

categories of the F-S model keep the same relationship between the numbers of people adhering to every group of groupware tools.







Figure 5: Relating preferences about Asynchronous and Synchronous Groupware Tools according to F-S model classification categories



With respect to the strong preferences, the number of stakeholders who chose between synchronous and asynchronous tools is not similar, especially for the Visual-Verbal category that presents the wider difference. In this case, when preference for the Visual subcategory is strong, the difference between preferences for both types of tools is about 15% for asynchronous against 85% for synchronous tools. This shows that, generally speaking, people with strong preference for the Visual category would prefer using synchronous tools instead of asynchronous.

But, why to know that can be important? As we have said before, requirement elicitation is crucially based on communication between analysts, users and clients, and the quality of the process affects the quality of the final product. If the use of only one type of groupware tools is possible and some people in the group have a strong preference that make them feel uncomfortable with the technology in use, it is possible that their lack of motivation would lead the group to a poor collaboration that can be reflected on quality of the final product. Since groupware tools, as well as elicitation techniques, are commonly chosen in an arbitrary way because of personal preferences of managers or analysts, our intention is offering a strategy that takes into account information from all the stakeholders. From our point of view, information about cognitive characteristics of stakeholders can be easily gathered and can be worthwhile for doing a first approach to technology selection.



## 5. Lessons Learnt

During the case study we have learnt some issues that we consider are important to remark:

- People that work on global software development processes are willing to collaborate with research that may help finding strategies for technology selection, mainly because they are conscious about the need of such methodologies.
- Also, we noticed that stakeholders do not think that filling a test that takes 15 or 20 minutes is impossible to do, and since the methodology has a psychological approach it is easy to understand even for people that are not professionals on informatics.

Specifically from the analysis of the results of the survey:

- We found out that neither gender nor age influences the way people prefer communicating with a co-worker.
- We could discern some tendency for preferring synchronous tools when preference for the Visual subcategory is stronger.
- Tendencies for the rest of the subcategories are not visible in this case study. To improve these results we need much more examples involving people with strong preferences. Currently we are designing new surveys to increase the gathered information.

## 6. Discussion

Our research focuses on learning styles of stakeholders as a source of information for technology selection in GSD.

In a first approach to validate our proposal, we have designed a survey whose results show that people prefer using synchronous collaboration when their preference for the visual subcategory is stronger. Even when the separated analysis of each category is an important factor, it cannot be conclusive for technology selection by itself. Otherwise, the combination of the preferences for the four categories must be taken into account. That is why we propose taking advantage of fuzzy sets theory to find patterns of behaviour in real life people's preferences when working with groupware tools and requirement elicitation techniques. With such an idea, we are currently working on the implementation of the machine learning algorithm that will offer us rules that combine different values for each category. As an

example, a rule we have obtained so far (which needs to be validated) is:

*If  $X1$  in  $\{VAc, VRe\}$  and  $X2$  not in  $\{SSe, SIn\}$  then Chat*

which is interpreted as "if stakeholders have a strong preference for subcategories Active and Reflective and do not have a slight preference for Sequential and Intuitive subcategory, they would prefer using chat"

Also, we are aware that our model faces a challenge regarding the possibility of having people in a virtual group whose preferences are the opposite. To deal with such cases we are currently working on designing strategies that take into account not just a "unique" appropriate technology, but a ranking for each style, so as when conflicts between personal preferences appear, they could be solved by looking for the technology (groupware tool or requirement elicitation technique) closer to all the participants, that could not be the first option for all of them.

## 7. Conclusions and Future Work

Many organizations have adopted a distributed structure where members communicate through groupware tools. In such a scenario requirement elicitation can face some kind of problems if technology is not selected in a proper way. To help in this selection we propose a methodology that can bring several advantages to GSD. First of all, the most suitable elicitation techniques and groupware tools are chosen by analysing stakeholders' cognitive profiles. Consequently, it is expected that by improving the channels of communication the elicitation process also improves, for instance, by reducing the number of mistakes produced during this stage.

On the other hand, our approach also takes into account other aspects that affect the GSD such as different culture and language. A suitable selection of groupware tools can help to minimize the effects of these aspects, too. Therefore, the stakeholders would feel more comfortable and the number of misunderstandings probably would also decrease. However, we must test these hypotheses in real groups in order to validate them.

Current effort focuses on defining strategies to select technology when cognitive profiles in a virtual team are opposite. In order to accomplish this, we are working on the application of a machine learning algorithm at different levels of preferences, so as to define a ranking of preferences for each cognitive profile. Having such a ranking, it would be possible to define technology selection strategies that take into account most stakeholders' preferences in the virtual

team. Moreover, we are analyzing and classifying collaborative tools with the goal of finding what tools can be considered "neutral" and could be used under most circumstances since are accepted by almost all profiles, reducing in this way, the problem of having stakeholders' with opposite preferences.

Additionally, our current work should be extended to analyse combined influences on selection, for example, cognitive profiles, background, organizational knowledge, and motivation. So far, we are following a step-by-step approach trying to consolidate preliminary results before focusing on more complex analyses.

## Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by the MAS project (TIC2003-02737-C02-02), Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnologıa; the ENIGMAS project (PBI-05-058), Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha, Consejerıa de Educacion y Ciencia, both from Spain; the CompetiSoft project (506PI0287); and the 04/E059 project, Universidad Nacional del Comahue, from Argentina.

## References

- [1] Aranda, G., Cechich, A., Vizcaino, A., and Castro-Schez, J.J. "Using fuzzy sets to analyse personal preferences on groupware tools". In *X Congreso Argentino de Ciencias de la Computacion, CACIC 2004*. San Justo, Argentina, October 2004, pp. 549-560.
- [2] Aranda, G., Vizcaino, A., Cechich, A., and Piattini, M. "A Cognitive-Based Approach to Improve Distributed Requirement Elicitation Processes". In *4th IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Informatics (ICCI'05)*. Irvine, USA, August 2005, pp. 322-330.
- [3] Aranda, G., Vizcaino, A., Cechich, A., and Piattini, M. "Towards a Cognitive-Based Approach to Distributed Requirement Elicitation Processes". In *WER 2005, VIII Workshop on Requirements Engineering*. Porto, Portugal, June 2005, pp. 75-86.
- [4] Blank, G.D., Roy, S., Sahasrabudhe, S., Pottenger, W.M., and Kessler, G.D., "Adapting Multimedia for Diverse Student Learning Styles". *The Journal of Computing in Small Colleges*, 18(3): 2003, 45-58.
- [5] Castro, J.L., Castro-Schez, J.J., and Zurita, J.M., "Learning Maximal Structure Rules in Fuzzy Logic for Knowledge Acquisition in Expert Systems". *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 101(3): 1999, 331-342.
- [6] Chiew, V. and Wang, Y. "From Cognitive Psychology to Cognitive Informatics". In *Second IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Informatics, ICCI'03*. London, UK, August 2003, pp. 114-120.
- [7] Damian, D. and Zowghi, D. "The impact of stakeholders geographical distribution on managing requirements in a multi-site organization". In *IEEE Joint International Conference on Requirements Engineering, RE'02*. Essen, Germany, September 2002, pp. 319-328.
- [8] Ellis, C.A., Gibbs, S.J., and Rein, G.L., "Groupware: Some Issues and Experiences". *Communications of ACM*, 34(1): 1991, 38-58.
- [9] Felder, R. and Silverman, L., "Learning and Teaching Styles in Engineering Education". *Engineering Education*, 78(7): 1988 (and author preface written in 2002), 674-681.
- [10] Felder, R. and Spurlin, J., "Applications, Reliability and Validity of the Index of Learning Styles". *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 21(1): 2005, 103-112.
- [11] Herlea, D. and Greenberg, S. "Using a Groupware Space for Distributed Requirements Engineering". In *7th IEEE Int'l Workshop on Coordinating Distributed Software Development Projects*. Stanford, California, USA, 1998 1998, pp. 57-62.
- [12] Hickey, A.M. and Davis, A. "Elicitation Technique Selection: How do experts do it?" In *International Joint Conference on Requirements Engineering (RE03)*. Los Alamitos, California: IEEE Computer Society Press, September 2003, pp. 169-178.
- [13] Lloyd, W., Rosson, M.B., and Arthur, J. "Effectiveness of Elicitation Techniques in Distributed Requirements Engineering". In *10th Anniversary IEEE Joint International Conference on Requirements Engineering, RE'02*. Essen, Germany, September 2002, pp. 311-318.
- [14] Miller, J. and Yin, Z., "A Cognitive-Based Mechanism for Constructing Software Inspection Teams". *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 30(11): 2004, 811-825.
- [15] Moallem, M. "The Implications of Research Literature on Learning Styles for the Design and Development of a Web-Based Course". In *International Conference on Computers in Education, ICCE 2002*. Auckland, New Zealand, December 2002, pp. 71-74.
- [16] Thomas, L., Ratcliffe, M., Woodbury, J., and Jarman, E. "Learning styles and performance in the introductory programming sequence". In *33rd SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. Cincinnati, Kentucky, USA, February 2002, pp. 33-37.
- [17] Wang, Y. "On the Cognitive Informatics Foundations of Software Engineering". In *Third IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Informatics, ICCI'04*. Victoria, Canada, August 2004, pp. 22-31.
- [18] Wu, C.C., Dale, N.B., and Bethel, L.J. "Conceptual Models and Cognitive Learning Styles in Teaching Recursion". In *Twenty-ninth SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. Atlanta, Georgia, United States, February 1998, pp. 292 - 296.
- [19] Young, R., "Recommended Requirements Gathering Practices". *CROSTALK The Journal of Defense Software Engineering*: 2002, 9-12.