
Research

Assessing the capability of internal metrics as early indicators of maintenance effort through experimentation



Marcela Genero Bocco^{1,*}, Daniel L. Moody^{2,3} and Mario Piattini¹

¹*Department of Computer Science, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain*

²*Department of Computer Science, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland*

³*Department of Cybernetics, Czech Technical University (CVUT), Prague, Czech Republic*

SUMMARY

The complexity of software artifacts is widely believed to be an important determinant of maintenance effort. This paper conducts an experimental analysis of the impact of complexity on the maintenance of the Unified Modeling Language (UML) class diagrams. This represents an analysis of the effect of an internal quality attribute on an external quality attribute. A range of complexity metrics are proposed based on an ontological analysis of the UML language and previous research. The relative influence of these metrics on maintenance effort is then evaluated using a laboratory experiment. A within-subjects design was used, with subjects required to modify a range of UML class diagrams with different levels of complexity. Only two of the metrics emerged as significant determinants of maintenance effort: number of methods and number of associations. Together these explain around 28% of the variation in maintenance effort. While these findings are encouraging, further research is necessary to explore the ability of these metrics to predict maintenance effort. Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

KEY WORDS: complexity; Unified Modeling Language (UML); class diagram; object-oriented (OO) modeling; experimental research; software quality

*Correspondence to: Marcela Genero Bocco, Paseo de la Universidad, N° 4, 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain.

†E-mail: marcela.genero@uclm.es

Contract/grant sponsor: Consejería de Ciencia y Tecnología de la Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha; contract/grant number: PCC-03-003-1

Contract/grant sponsor: Dirección General de Investigación del Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología; contract/grant number: TIC2003-07804-C05-03



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Maintainability of information systems

The adaptability of a system to changes in its environment is considered to be one of a system's most important characteristics [1,2]. In practice, maintenance represents the major source of work for software organizations [3]. It is estimated that 61% of the professional life of programmers is devoted to maintenance [4]. Also, maintenance costs represent two thirds of the total lifetime costs of information systems in commercial mainframe environments [5]. For this reason, *maintainability* is an important issue in the design of information systems. However in practice, it is often given relatively little attention in the interests of completing development projects 'on time, on budget'. The result is that information systems often have substantially reduced operational lifetimes, and are sometimes obsolete before they are delivered [6,7].

Maintainability is generally accepted to be an important aspect of software quality, and is one of the six software quality characteristics defined in the international standard for software quality: ISO/IEC 9126 [8]. Maintainability is defined as 'the capability of the software to be modified' and consists of four subcharacteristics:

- *analyzability*, the capability of the software to be diagnosed for deficiencies or causes of failures in the software, or for the parts to be modified to be identified;
- *changeability*, the capability of the software product to enable a specified modification to be implemented;
- *stability*, the capability of the software to minimize unexpected effects from modifications of the software; and
- *testability*, the capability of the software to enable modified software to be validated.

Maintainability is an external quality characteristic, as it relates to the external behavior of the product [9]. However, internal quality characteristics (characteristics of the product which are not visible to the user) are the key to satisfying external quality characteristics. Internal quality characteristics define the 'hows' by which external quality characteristics or 'whats' will be met [10]. Understanding the relationship between internal and external quality characteristics is essential for developing software which satisfies user needs [11].

1.2. The effect of complexity on maintenance effort

Software complexity has long been recognized as a determinant of maintenance effort [12–20]. There are several reasons why complexity affects maintenance effort.

- Complex systems are more difficult to understand, and understanding a system is a prerequisite for making changes to it [21,22]. Empirical studies show that humans have a strictly limited capacity for processing information [23–25]. Once the level of complexity exceeds this limit, a state of *information overload* ensues and comprehension degrades rapidly [26–29]. Both field and experimental studies show that information overload results in reduced performance on cognitive tasks [24,29]. This relates to the *analyzability* subcharacteristic in ISO/IEC 9126 [8].
- More complex systems will tend to have higher *entropy* because of the number of interacting components, which increases their volatility and susceptibility to change [30,31]. This increases



the number of changes required, thus contributing to maintenance effort. This relates to the *stability* subcharacteristic in ISO/IEC 9126 [8].

- As systems increase in complexity, the impact of changes becomes more complex and unpredictable, which increases the effort required to implement changes [32–34]. Changes to one part of the system are more likely to affect many other parts of the system, often referred to as the ‘ripple effect’ [2,32,35]. This relates to the *changeability* subcharacteristic in ISO/IEC 9126 [8].

1.3. Objectives of this research

Most previous research on maintainability [16,17,36–38] has focused on the maintainability of the final system (i.e., code-level maintenance). Our focus is different in the sense that we are interested in evaluating maintainability from the early stages of software development. For that reason, this paper investigates the relationship between complexity (an internal quality characteristic) and maintainability (an external quality characteristic). The specific focus of this research is on the Unified Modeling Language (UML) *static structure models*, commonly called *class diagrams* [39]. We evaluate the effect of a set of metrics for measuring complexity of UML class diagrams [40,41] on maintenance effort through a controlled experiment.

We performed a previous controlled experiment [42], pursuing a similar objective. In that experiment, as in this, the independent variable was UML class diagram complexity. In the previous experiment the dependent variables were three maintainability subcharacteristics (understandability, analyzability and modifiability) measured by means of subjective ratings on a seven-point scale. Even though the results obtained in the previous experiment (through correlation analysis) reflect that the metrics proposed were related to class diagram maintainability, we are aware that the dependent measures were subjective and therefore less reliable. Therefore, we decided to carry out another experiment measuring the dependent variable in a more objective way, which is the experiment presented in this paper.

The outline of the paper is as follows:

- Section 2 defines a set of candidate metrics for measuring complexity of UML class diagrams;
- Section 3 describes the experimental design used to evaluate the metrics;
- Section 4 presents the results of the experiment and evaluates their validity; and
- Section 5 summarizes the findings and discusses the main contributions of the research.

2. METRICS FOR MEASURING COMPLEXITY OF UML CLASS DIAGRAMS

This section defines a set of metrics for measuring complexity of UML class diagrams.

2.1. UML class diagrams

UML defines an industry standard approach to modeling object-oriented (OO) systems [39]. So far there has been very little research into the maintainability of UML models. However, UML is usually used in a *model-driven* development approach, so changes to systems should be driven by changes to



the underlying models. Class diagrams define the architecture of an OO system—the objects and their behavior—and represent the starting point for all changes to an OO system.

2.2. Metrics for UML class diagrams

A set of candidate metrics was developed for measuring the complexity of UML class diagrams. These have been published in [41,42], but are summarized here to provide context for understanding the experiment. The metrics were developed based on:

- an analysis of the ontological structure of UML class diagrams;
- a review of the OO metrics literature.

2.2.1. Ontological analysis

According to general systems theory [21,31], the complexity of a system is determined by the *number and variety of elements and the number and variety of relationships between them*. In developing measures of complexity for UML class diagrams, a natural starting point therefore is to define the types of elements and relationships such diagrams may contain: the *ontological structure* of the notation [2]. At the requirements level, a UML class diagram may consist of the following constructs [39].

- Classes, which consist of:
 - attributes (with their name, type and visibility scope);
 - methods (with their name, list of parameters, return type, visibility and scope).
- Relationships, which may be of four types:
 - association;
 - aggregation: this includes both composition relationships and part-whole relationships as defined in UML 1.4;
 - generalization;
 - dependency.

Potential measures of UML class diagram complexity include counts of each construct. This results in seven (simple) measures of complexity.

- M1. Number of classes: the number of classes in a class diagram. This metric corresponds to OA1 in [43], DSC (Design Size in Classes) in [44] and C_s in [45]. This is the most common measure of class diagram complexity used in the literature.
- M2. Number of methods: the number of methods defined in a class diagram, including those defined at class and instance level, but not including inherited methods (this would lead to double counting). This is a modification of the WMC (Weighted Method per Class) metric [46], in which: (a) the weightings of all methods are 1; and (b) the value is totaled across all classes (as WMC is a class-level metric). Weightings are not applicable at the requirements stage because the code for methods is not available. This also corresponds to the NOM (Number of Methods) metric in [17,44] and the combination of NIM (Number of Instance Methods) and NCM (Number of Class Methods) in [47] (although all of these metrics are defined at the class level).



- M3. Number of attributes: the total number of attributes defined in a class diagram, including those defined at class and instance level, but not including inherited attributes or attributes defined within methods. This is a generalization of the NOA (Number of Attributes) metric [45] to the class diagram level.
- M4. Number of associations: the number of association relationships in a class diagram. This is a generalization of the NAS (Number of Associations) metric [48] to the class diagram level.
- M5. Number of aggregations: the number of aggregation relationships in a class diagram.
- M6. Number of dependencies: the number of dependency relationships in a class diagram.
- M7. Number of generalizations: the number of generalization relationships in a class diagram (each parent–child pair in a generalization relationship).

Together these metrics enable measurement of ‘the number and variety of elements and the number and variety of relationships between them’ in a UML class diagram, as required by our definition of complexity.

2.2.2. Review of OO metrics literature

A thorough review of the OO metrics literature was conducted in order to identify additional metrics for measuring the complexity of UML class diagrams at the requirements stage. Most research on OO software measurement has focused on the measurement of code and detailed design artifacts [9,45,49,50]. However, there are now a significant number of proposals for metrics which can be applied at the analysis level [17,43–48,51–55]. Of these, most are defined at the class level, but some can be generalized to the class diagram level. A number of proposals evaluate the complexity of the UML notation itself (*meta-level* complexity), so are not applicable in this research [53–55]. Based on these previous proposals, we identified four additional metrics.

- M8. Number of generalization hierarchies (NGenH): the number of distinct generalization hierarchies in a class diagram. This corresponds to the OA2 metric in [43] and the NOH metric in [44].
- M9. Number of aggregation hierarchies (NAggH): the number of distinct aggregation hierarchies in a class diagram. This is a generalization of M8 to aggregation hierarchies.
- M10. Maximum depth of inheritance (MaxDIT): the maximum DIT value for all classes in a class diagram. The DIT value for a class in a generalization hierarchy is defined as the length of the longest path from the class to the root of the hierarchy. This is a generalization of the DIT metric in [45] to the class diagram level.
- M11. Maximum height of aggregation (MaxHAgg): the maximum HAgg value for all classes in a class diagram. The HAgg value for a class in an aggregation hierarchy is defined as the length of the longest path from the class to the leaves. This is a generalization of M10 to aggregation hierarchies.

All of the metrics (M1–M11) satisfy the ISO/IEC 9126 required properties for measures used for comparison, as they are objective, empirical and repeatable [8]. They are also simple, which Fenton and Neil [56] argue is a desirable property for software metrics in general. Another issue is that the proposed metrics could also allow designers and conceptual modelers to make better decisions when they are modeling class diagrams. In particular, they allow selection among several class diagram alternatives with equivalent semantic content. Moreover, they could be useful for predicting, for example,



the maintenance effort needed for modifying UML class diagrams. This last potential capability of the proposed metrics needs to be empirically investigated.

2.2.3. Predicted impact of the metrics on maintenance effort

The metrics M1–M7 (which represent counts of individual UML constructs) are expected to increase maintenance effort, as adding a construct of any type will increase overall complexity of the class diagram. However, some types of elements are likely to affect complexity more than others e.g., adding a new class is likely to increase complexity more than adding a new attribute. Thus, we would expect overall complexity of a class diagram to be a *weighted sum* of these measures.

- We predict that the number of classes (M1) will have the greatest effect on maintenance effort. The reason for this is that the number of classes corresponds to the number of distinct concepts or ‘things’ in the model. Based on theories of human cognition, increasing the number of concepts will increase the effort required to understand the model, which in turn will increase maintenance effort [23–25,57,58]. This is also consistent with software estimation models, in which the number of entities (which correspond to classes in an OO environment) is the most influential determinant of software size [59–61].
- We predict that the metrics corresponding to the number of relationships (M4–M7) will be the next most influential. According to *cognitive load theory*, cognitive load is increased by the level of interactivity among elements (the number of relationships among concepts) [62,63]. Increasing cognitive load reduces understanding and is therefore likely to increase maintenance effort.
- The metrics M2 and M3 provide measures of the internal complexity of classes. One would expect a class diagram with high internal complexity (many methods and attributes per class) to be more difficult to understand than a model with the same number of classes and relationships (external or system complexity) but lower internal complexity. However, this is expected to have a weaker impact than external complexity.

Because generalization hierarchies and aggregation hierarchies define subsystems within the class diagram, we predict that the metrics M8 and M9 will *reduce* complexity and therefore reduce maintenance effort. Given two models with the same number of classes, we would expect one with more generalization and/or aggregation hierarchies to be easier to understand, because hierarchical structures facilitate ‘chunking’ and thus reduce load on working memory [23,24,64].

Finally, we predict that M10 and M11 will increase maintenance effort. The rationale for this is that human classification hierarchies tend to be limited in depth, usually to around three levels [27]. Thus, very deep hierarchies may overtax powers of human information processing [65,66]. The literature has shown conflicting results for the effects of inheritance hierarchies on maintenance: for example, Basili *et al.* [67] found that the larger the DIT value, the greater the probability of fault detection, Daly *et al.* [68] found that systems with three levels of inheritance had lower maintenance time than those with no inheritance and Cartwright [69] found that three levels of inheritance reduced maintenance time. On the other hand, Unger and Prechelt [70] found that inheritance depth had no effect on maintenance effort, Harrison *et al.* [71] found that systems with no inheritance are easier to modify than systems with three or five levels, while Poels and Dedene [72] found that extensive use of inheritance leads to models that are more difficult to modify.



In summary, we predict that the metrics will influence maintenance effort in ascending order of influence:

- M1 (corresponding to the number of elements or concepts);
- M4, M5, M6, M7 (corresponding to the number of relationships or interactivity);
- M2, M3 (corresponding to the internal structure of elements);
- M10, M11 (corresponding to depth of hierarchies);
- M8, M9 (expected to reduce complexity and therefore maintenance effort).

We are conscious that these predictions must be empirically evaluated to extract final conclusions.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research objectives

The purpose in generating the initial set of metrics was to be as complete as possible—to try to measure all possible aspects of UML class diagram complexity. However, some of these metrics are likely to be more influential than others in determining maintenance effort. The purpose of this research is to empirically evaluate the relative influence of all of these metrics on maintenance effort and use this to build a prediction model. The validity of each of the predictions stated in Section 2.2.3 (related to the order of influence) is out of the scope of the paper and will be pending for further research.

3.2. Experimental design

The experimental design is summarized in Figure 1. A *within-subjects* design was used, in which each participant was given nine UML class diagrams of different levels of complexity. Participants were required to make a number of prescribed changes to each model and to record how long it took them to complete the task.

3.3. Participants

There were 30 participants in the experiment: 20 final-year Computer Science students and 10 Software Engineering academics at the University of Castilla-La Mancha. All participants had prior experience using UML to develop software. The student participants had all completed at least two software engineering courses in UML. All participants were also given an intensive ‘refresher course’ in UML class diagrams prior to the experiment.

3.4. Materials

Participants were given a guide summarizing UML notation and nine UML class diagrams representing different application domains. The experimental models had different levels of complexity, covering a broad range of metric values (see Table I). Each experimental model included a brief description of the underlying problem domain and an associated maintenance task. An example of one of the class diagrams used (CD5) and maintenance task is included in Appendix A (all experimental materials




Figure 1. Summary of experimental design.

Table I. Complexity metrics for the experimental models.

	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10	M11
CD1	7	11	22	1	0	0	5	1	0	2	0
CD2	8	12	31	1	6	0	1	1	1	1	2
CD3	3	17	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CD4	10	12	21	15	3	0	0	0	2	0	1
CD5	9	19	29	3	3	0	3	1	3	2	1
CD6	7	16	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CD7	23	33	66	4	5	2	16	3	2	3	3
CD8	20	30	65	6	5	0	14	3	4	3	2
CD9	23	65	80	20	3	2	3	1	3	2	3
AVG	12.22	23.89	38.33	6.44	2.78	0.44	4.67	1.11	1.67	1.44	1.33
STD DEV	7.63	17.3	25.27	6.65	2.33	0.88	6.12	1.17	1.5	1.24	1.22

are available upon request to the corresponding author). The experimental models were given to participants in random order, to control for learning effects.

3.5. Experimental task

Each experimental model had an associated experimental task, consisting of two new requirements to be incorporated into the model. The activities that the subjects had to perform fit into the category



of *enhancive maintenance*, according to the taxonomy of software maintenance activities proposed by Chapin *et al.* [73], as they involved adding new functionality to the system. The tasks defined for each class diagram were all of equivalent complexity (in terms of number of diagram elements added, modified or deleted), so the only source of variation in effort to perform the tasks should be model complexity. An example of one of the experimental tasks is included in Appendix A. Each subject had to modify the class diagrams according to the specifications and to record the time taken for each task—they were asked to write down their start time (to the nearest second) prior to beginning the task, and then to write down their finish time at the end. Each subject was allowed an elapsed calendar time of one week to carry out the experimental task.

3.6. Independent variable

The independent variable was the complexity of the experimental models. This was measured by the metrics previously defined—these represent empirical indicators of the underlying theoretical construct. While there is only one *latent* independent variable (complexity), there are 11 *observed* independent variables (M1–M11). The *levels* of the independent variable are embodied in the different experimental class diagrams: each model represents a different combination of metric values (Table I).

3.7. Dependent variable


The dependent variable in this experiment was maintenance effort, which was defined as ‘the effort required by a participant to make the prescribed changes to an experimental model’. This was measured by the time taken to perform the experimental task, expressed in seconds. This includes the time to comprehend the class diagram, to analyze what changes were required and to complete them. The dependent variable thus incorporates the subcharacteristics of *analyzability* and *changeability* defined in ISO/IEC 9126 [8]. Time taken is an objective measure of the effort required to perform the experimental task, and is one of the most commonly used measures of effort in performing cognitive tasks [27].

3.8. Summary of theoretical model

Figure 2 summarizes the theoretical model tested by this experiment.

- Circles indicate latent variables (theoretical constructs) while rectangles indicate observed or measured variables (empirical indicators).
- The solid lines indicate *causal relationships* hypothesized between latent variables. The direction of the arrows indicates direction of causation.
- The dotted lines indicate *measurement relationships* between latent variables and their empirical indicators. The direction of the arrows indicates whether they are reflective or formative. The \ominus symbol indicates an inverse indicator (where the measure is inversely related to the underlying construct).

As shown in Figure 2, we hypothesize a causal relationship between complexity of UML class diagrams and maintenance effort. The metrics defined in Section 2 are all *formative* measures of

Figure 2. The *a priori* theoretical model.

complexity, while maintenance time is a reflective measure of effort. The purpose of this research is to analyze the effects of different aspects or dimensions of complexity (represented by the different metrics) on maintenance effort.

3.9. Hypotheses

We want to investigate whether the complexity metrics proposed can be used as predictors of maintenance effort, so we formulate the following null and alternative hypotheses.

- H_0 : There will be no relationship between the complexity metrics (M1–M11) and maintenance time.
- H_1 : There will be positive relationships between (M1–M7, M10, M11) and maintenance time and negative relationships between (M8, M9) and maintenance time.



For simplicity, we express these as single hypothesis, but in reality they incorporate 11 distinct null and alternative hypotheses as shown in Figure 2.

4. RESULTS

This section begins with the data collection and continues with the analysis the empirical data and the interpretation of the analysis results.

4.1. Data collection

Data were collected by calculating the value of the metrics for each experimental data model and entering start and finish times for each experimental task. Metrics were calculated automatically using a tool, while maintenance time was calculated from start and finish times using a spreadsheet. The experiment resulted in a total of 270 data points (30 participants \times 9 experimental tasks) for the dependent variable, which formed the basis for the data analysis.

4.2. Statistical significance versus practical meaningfulness

In interpreting empirical results, it is important to distinguish between statistical significance and practical meaningfulness of results [74,75]. *Statistical significance* measures whether the observed relationship between variables is likely to be a ‘real’ relationship or if it is likely to be the result of random variation. Statistical significance is measured by alpha (α), which represents the probability that the result could have occurred by chance.

Effect size has been suggested by a number of researchers as an index of practical meaningfulness [74,76–78]. In studies involving relationships between variables, effect size is most commonly measured by the standardized regression coefficient (β). In terms of deciding whether an effect is ‘meaningful’ or not, the most frequently used guidelines are those proposed by Cohen [74]:

- $|\beta| < 0.1$, not meaningful;
- $|\beta| \geq 0.1$, small;
- $|\beta| \geq 0.3$, medium;
- $|\beta| \geq 0.5$, large.

4.3. Construct validity

The metrics defined in Section 2.2 are proposed as measures of a single underlying construct: UML class diagram complexity. Construct validity is one of the most important constructs in measurement and refers to the level of confidence that empirical indicators reflect the construct they purport to measure [75]. Factor analysis is the preferred technique among researchers for evaluating construct validity. However in this case, the sample size was too small, so *inter-item correlation analysis* was used instead. Out of 55 inter-item correlations between all metrics, 49 were significant at the 0.01 level, two more were significant at the 0.05 level and four were non-significant. Convergent validity (measured as the average correlation of each metric with the other metrics) for nine of the 11 metrics



was large ($r > 0.5$) and medium for the remaining two ($r > 0.3$). This provides strong evidence that they are all measuring the same underlying construct: each of the metrics measures a different dimension of the construct.

The construct validity of the metrics used for the independent variable is guaranteed by the DISTANCE framework [79] which was used for their theoretical validation [40].

4.4. Regression analysis

Multivariate regression analysis is a technique for analyzing causal relationships between continuous variables. All of the independent and dependent variables in this experiment are continuous variables so regression analysis is an appropriate technique for analyzing the relationships between them. The result of regression analysis is a prediction model relating the independent and dependent variables.

Stepwise regression analysis was used to evaluate the relative influence of the metrics in determining maintenance effort. This is a statistical technique used in exploratory research to discover the relationship between variables when a range of different causal factors have been hypothesized [75]. This is an appropriate technique to use here as the research is exploratory. Stepwise regression analysis may be carried out in the following two ways [80].

- Top down: start by including the most highly correlated variable in the regression equation and then adding the variable with the highest partial correlation until there is no significant change in r^2 .
- Bottom up: start by including all variables in the regression equation and then removing the least influential variable in each stage.

In this paper, we use top down analysis, but both methods lead to the same results.

4.4.1. Regression analysis stage 1

Bivariate correlation analysis was first carried out between all observed independent variables (the complexity metrics) and the dependent variable (maintenance time). All correlations were found to be statistically significant except for number of dependencies (M6). The number of methods (M2) metric emerged as the most influential variable, with a correlation coefficient of 0.499. Regression analysis was therefore carried out using M2 as the sole independent variable and maintenance time as the dependent variable. The results of the analysis were:

- $r^2 = 0.249$;
- $p = 0.000$;
- $\beta = 0.499$.

The r^2 statistic shows that M2 explains almost 25% of the variation in maintenance time. The standardized regression coefficient is 0.499, which represents a medium effect [74]. The regression equation which results is

$$\text{Maintenance Time} = 2.07 + (0.05 \times \text{Number of Methods}) \quad (1)$$



Table II. Separate effects of metrics on maintenance time.

Metric	Significance (p)	Effect size (β)
Number of methods (M2)	0.000	0.388
Number of associations (M4)	0.002	0.217

4.4.2. Regression analysis stage 2

In the second stage of the analysis, the metric with the highest partial correlation (while controlling for M2) was entered into the regression model. Partial correlation analysis revealed that number of associations (M4) was the only metric which had a significant partial correlation with Maintenance Time. Most of the remaining metrics were negatively correlated with the dependent variable after controlling for M2. M4 was therefore entered into the regression model. The results of the analysis were:

- $r^2 = 0.277$;
- $p = 0.000$;
- $\beta = 0.533$.

This shows that number of methods (M2) and number of associations (M4) together explain around 28% of the variation in maintenance effort, which is a significant increase in the predictive power of the model. The standardized regression coefficient is 0.533, which represents a large effect [74]. The regression equation which results is

$$\text{Maintenance Time} = 1.94 + (0.04 \times \text{Number of Methods}) + (0.09 \times \text{Number of Associations}) \quad (2)$$

The coefficients in the regression equation measure the 'raw' effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The regression coefficient for M2 is 0.04, which means that each additional method increases maintenance time by 2.4 seconds or 1%. The regression coefficient for M4 is 0.09, which means that each additional association increases maintenance time by 5.4 seconds or 2.27%.

The separate effects of each independent variable on Maintenance Time are shown in Table II. Both metrics were found to be significant predictors of maintenance time ($\alpha < 0.01$), with M2 having a medium effect and M4 having a small effect.

While each association has a larger incremental effect on maintenance time than each method (as measured by the regression coefficient), the much larger number of methods (on average, there were about six times as many methods as associations in the experimental models) means that they have a much greater effect on maintenance time overall (as measured by the effect size). While the regression coefficient for M2 is less than half the size of that for M4, the standardized regression coefficient (β) is almost twice the size.

4.4.3. Regression analysis stage 3

In the third stage of analysis, partial correlation analysis was carried out on the remaining metrics to see if there was a significant correlation with maintenance time after controlling for M2 and M4.



None of the remaining metrics had significant effects on maintenance time, nor were they even close (p values were all greater than 0.6). This provides strong evidence that the stepwise regression analysis is complete, and that the regression model defined in (2) is fully specified.

4.5. Validity analysis

In this section we analyze the internal, external and statistical validity of the experiment.

4.5.1. Internal validity

The following variables were controlled as part of the experiment.

- Participant characteristics: use of a within-subjects design minimizes threats to internal validity by equalizing participant characteristics between groups.
- Task complexity: the experimental tasks for all experimental models were equivalent in complexity.
- Instrumentation: the same measurement techniques were used for independent and dependent variables for all participants. The risk of measurement error was reduced by calculating metric values automatically.
- Training: all participants were given the same amount of prior training.
- Learning effects: experimental models were given to subjects in random order to minimize learning and sequence effects.

However, we identified two possible threats to the internal validity of the study.

- Control of environment: one threat to the validity of the experiment is that it was not conducted under controlled conditions. Participants were allowed to do the experimental tasks in their own time, which means that environmental factors (e.g., time of day, location) were not explicitly controlled. This was done because of the number of separate tasks involved: it would be quite onerous for subjects to complete all nine experimental tasks in a single laboratory session, and may have led to fatigue, which could have adversely affected the results. We argue that because of the within-subjects design, these effects would be randomly distributed across levels of the independent variable, and therefore do not represent a serious threat to the conclusions of the study.
- Measurement error: another threat to internal validity is the fact that subjects were responsible for recording the time it took to perform the experimental tasks. This increases risk of measurement error for the dependent variable, as subjects may have recorded the time inaccurately. However, again, the within-subjects design means that the error should be randomly distributed across levels of the independent variable, so does not represent a serious threat to the findings. If anything, this would reduce the significance of the regression results by introducing random error, so the results most likely underestimate the strength of the relationship between complexity and maintenance effort.



4.5.2. External validity

In this study, external validity is a much greater issue than internal validity. We identify three possible threats to the external validity of this study.

- **Sample population:** a clear threat to the generalizability of the findings was the choice of experimental subjects. In general, the population from which one selects subjects for the experiment should be representative of the population to which the researcher wishes to generalize results [81]. In this study, we used a sample population of students and academics, but wish to generalize the results to practice. Most previous experimental studies of conceptual modeling have used Computer Science or Information Systems students as proxies for practitioners, so this study has no greater external validity problems than most (e.g., [64,82–90]). According to the literature, causal relationships are more generalizable across populations than values of variables [75,81]. We can therefore be reasonably confident that the causal relationships found between the complexity metrics and maintenance effort will also hold in the target population, although the level of performance (i.e., time taken to perform the tasks) is likely to be significantly different.
- **Experimental models:** all of the class diagrams used in this experiment were created by the researchers specifically for the purpose of the experiment. As a result, they may not be representative of models found in practice in terms of distribution of metric values. In particular, the experimental models were much less complex than models that would be found in practice, where models frequently consist of 100 or more classes. This raises questions about the *scalability* of the results.
- **Experimental task:** a final weakness of this experiment was the artificiality of the experimental task. Participants were required to make two rather simple changes to each experimental model—in practice, maintenance changes would be much more complex. It is difficult to realistically simulate the task of maintaining UML models in a laboratory environment and this would be better tested in a real-world maintenance environment.

4.5.3. Statistical validity

There are a number of assumptions underlying the linear regression model that need to be satisfied for the results of regression analysis to be statistically valid. However, in many if not most reports where linear regression analysis is used, these assumptions are not even addressed [75].

- **Linearity.** Inspection of the scatterplots of both independent variables in the final regression model (M2 and M4) against Maintenance Time showed no evidence of curvilinearity.
- **Random error.** Correlation coefficients were calculated between independent variables and unstandardized residuals in each stage of the regression analysis and found to be 0.000.
- **Residual normality.** Shapiro–Wilk tests of normality were carried out on unstandardized residuals in each stage of the regression analysis, and they were found to be normally distributed.
- **Homoscedasticity.** Heteroscedasticity exists when the variance of residuals increases or decreases with values of the independent variable. Inspection of scatterplots showed that the variance of residuals was randomly distributed in all cases.



- *Multicollinearity.* Tolerance was found to be 0.741 in the final regression model, indicating that multicollinearity was not present.

Having satisfied these diagnostic tests, we conclude that the results of the regression analysis are valid.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Summary of results

This paper has conducted an empirical analysis of metrics for measuring complexity of UML class diagrams and their ability to predict maintenance effort. A total of 11 metrics were originally proposed, based on an ontological analysis of the UML class diagramming notation and a review of the OO metrics literature. Only two of the metrics emerged as significant predictors of maintenance effort: the number of methods (M2) and the number of associations (M4). This was contrary to our *a priori* predictions, as we expected all metrics to be significant determinants of maintenance effort, but to have different levels of influence (with inverse effects predicted for two of the metrics).

M2 and M4 together explain almost 30% of the variation in maintenance effort. The regression model has a high level of statistical significance ($\alpha < 0.01$) and a large effect size ($r > 0.5$), which means that the relationship between complexity and maintenance effort is practically meaningful as well as statistically significant. Analysis of the separate effects of each metric (Table II) showed that each had a highly significant effect ($\alpha < 0.01$), with M2 having a medium effect and M4 having a small effect. The ratio of effect sizes (β) for the metrics may be used to estimate their *relative predictive power*—their relative influence in determining maintenance effort. From Table II, the β values for M2 and M4 were 0.388 and 0.217 respectively. Given that the overall r^2 was 0.277, this means that M2 accounts for around 18% of the variation in maintenance effort while M4 accounts for around 10%.

5.2. Contributions of the research

This is one of the first experimental studies on maintenance of UML class diagrams. Maintainability of UML models is likely to become an important issue in practice as UML-based systems development approaches become more widespread. The results add to our theoretical understanding of how to measure complexity of UML class diagrams, and also about how different dimensions of complexity affect maintenance effort. More generally, the research contributes to our understanding of how complexity (an internal quality attribute) affects maintainability (an external quality attribute).

Contrary to our theoretical predictions, a measure of internal complexity (M2) emerged as the most influential factor in determining maintenance effort. Based on systems theory [21,31], theories of human information processing [23–25] and cognitive load theory [7,63], we expected that the number of classes (M1) would be the most influential metric as this corresponds to the number of system elements or primary concepts. However this was not found to be a significant determinant of maintenance effort. This is contrary to theories of human cognition, where complexity is considered to be determined by the number of ‘chunks’ rather than the composition of individual chunks [24,27].



This finding has important implications for software estimation models [59–61], which are primarily based on class metrics.

5.3. Further research

This experiment has produced some interesting and surprising findings about the determinants of maintenance effort in UML class diagrams. However, we have identified a number of weaknesses in the study, particularly with respect to external validity. The results of this experiment should therefore be interpreted as preliminary only, which need replication and corroboration. Also, because of the nature of the experimental task, in which participants made a number of predefined changes to UML class diagrams, this experiment was limited to two aspects of maintainability: analyzability and changeability.

We propose to conduct further research in two directions.

- Experimental research: we plan to replicate this study using different participants (practitioners), experimental models (class diagrams taken from practice) and experimental tasks (maintenance changes taken from practice). This will address most of the external validity issues identified with the present study.
- Field studies: we also plan to conduct a number of field studies on the effect of complexity on maintenance of UML class diagrams in practice. This will involve observations of maintenance practices in OO development environments. Data collected will include:
 - complexity of models, using the full range of metrics defined;
 - frequency and type of maintenance changes required; this will enable evaluation of the stability of models;
 - effort required to implement changes; this will enable evaluation of analyzability and changeability of models.

APPENDIX A. EXAMPLE OF EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS

Here we show one of the experimental class diagrams and maintenance tasks.

Task instructions

Write down your starting time (hour, minutes, seconds): _____

(Note: you must do this before looking at the class diagram or task description)

Modify the class diagram below to satisfy the following requirements:

1. Allow the administrator to modify the prerequisites and other course information.
2. Information on professors giving the courses is required. A professor may give various courses but each course is given by only one professor. For each professor store the first name, last name and SSN.

Write down your finish time (hour, minutes, seconds): _____




Figure 3. One of the experimental class diagrams used (CD5).

Class diagram

The class diagram below (see Figure 3) defines a system for providing information about courses to students. The system is managed by an administrator who is allowed to modify the course information in the catalogue. (Note: this corresponds to experimental model CD5).



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. This research is part of the MESSENGER project (PCC-03-003-1) financed by 'Consejería de Ciencia y Tecnología de la Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha (Spain)' and the CALIPO project supported by 'Dirección General de Investigación del Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología (Spain)' (TIC2003-07804-C05-03).

REFERENCES

1. Simon H. *Sciences of the Artificial*. MIT Press: Cambridge MA, 1996; 215.
2. Weber R. *Ontological Foundations of Information Systems (Coopers and Lybrand Accounting Research Methodology Monograph, No. 4)*. Coopers and Lybrand: Melbourne, 212.
3. Pigoski TM. *Practical Software Maintenance: Best Practices for Managing Your Software Investment*. Wiley: New York NY, 1996; 384.
4. Singer J. Practices of software maintenance. *Proceedings International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM'98)*. IEEE Computer Society Press: Los Alamitos CA, 1998; 139–145.
5. Van Genuchten M, Brethouwer G, Van Den Boomen T, Heemstra F. Empirical study of software maintenance. *Information and Software Technology* 1992; **34**(8):22–35.
6. Standish Group. *The CHAOS Report*. The Standish Group International: West Yarmouth MA, 1994. Available at: http://www.standishgroup.com/sample_research/chaos_1994_1.php [30 November 2004].
7. Standish Group. *Unfinished Voyages*. The Standish Group International: West Yarmouth MA, 1995. Available at: http://www.standishgroup.com/sample_research/unfinished_voyages_1.php [30 November 2004].
8. ISO/IEC. *Software Quality Characteristics and Metrics (ISO/IEC Standard 9126)*. International Standards Organisation: Geneva, Switzerland, 2001; 282.
9. Fenton N, Pfleeger S. *Software Metrics: A Rigorous Approach*. Chapman and Hall: London, 1997; 320.
10. Evans J, Lindsay Y. *The Management and Control of Quality*. South-Western College Publishing (Thomson Learning): Mason OH, 2004; 848.
11. Moody DL. Using quality function deployment to improve the quality of database designs. *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Quality Function Deployment (QFD'02)*. QFD Institut Deutschland: München, 2002; 112–122.
12. Boehm B. *Software Engineering Economics*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs NJ, 1981; 767.
13. Briand L, Wüst J. Modeling development effort in object-oriented systems using design properties. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 2001; **27**(11):963–986.
14. Brito e Abreu F, Melo W. Evaluating the impact of object-oriented design on software quality. *Proceedings 3rd International Symposium on Software Metrics (METRICS 1996)*. IEEE Computer Society Press: Los Alamitos CA, 1996; 90–98.
15. Dekleva S. The influence of the information systems development approach on maintenance. *MIS Quarterly* 1992; **16**(3):355–372.
16. Fioravanti F, Nesi P. Estimation and prediction metrics for adaptive maintenance effort of object-oriented systems. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 2001; **27**(12):1062–1083.
17. Li W, Henry S. Object-oriented metrics that predict maintainability. *Journal of Systems and Software* 1993; **23**(2): 111–122.
18. Munson J. *Software Engineering Measurement*. Auerbach: Boca Raton FL, 2003; 443.
19. Van Vliet H. *Software Engineering: Principles and Practice* (2nd edn). Wiley: Chichester U.K., 2000; 748.
20. Weinberg G. *The Psychology of Programming*. Van Nostrand Reinhold: New York NY, 1971; 292.
21. Flood R, Carson E. *Dealing With Complexity: An Introduction to the Theory and Application of Systems Science*. Plenum: New York NY, 1993; 280.
22. Davis G, Olson M. *Management Information Systems: Conceptual Foundations, Structure, and Development*. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1985; 693.
23. Baddeley A. The magical number seven: Still magic after all these years? *Psychological Review* 1994; **101**(2):353–356.
24. Miller G. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *The Psychological Review* 1956; **63**:81–97.
25. Newell A, Simon H. *Human Problem Solving*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1972; 920.
26. Driver M, Mock T. Human information processing decision style theory and accounting information systems. *The Accounting Review* 1975; **50**:490–508.



27. Eysenck M, Keane M. *Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah NJ, 2000; 540.
28. Jacoby J, Speller D, Kohn C. Brand choice as a function of information load. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 1978; **63**:83–91.
29. Lipowski Z. Sensory and information inputs overload: Behavioural effects. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 1975; **16**(3):105–124.
30. Heales J. Factors affecting information system volatility. *Proceedings 21st International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS'2000)*, Ang S, Krcmar H, Orlikowski WJ, Weill P, DeGross JI (eds.). Association for Information Systems: Atlanta GA, 2000; 1–3.
31. Klir G, Elias D. *Architecture of Systems Problem Solving*. Plenum: New York NY, 2003; 349.
32. Arthur LJ. *Measuring Programmer Productivity and Software Quality*. Wiley: New York NY, 1985; 292.
33. Brooks FP. *The Mythical Man-Month: Essays on Software Engineering*. Addison-Wesley: Reading MA, 1975; 195.
34. Meyer B. *Object Oriented Software Construction*. Prentice-Hall: Nyack NY, 1997; 1296.
35. Alexander C. *Notes on the Synthesis of Form*. Harvard University Press: Boston MA, 1968; 224.
36. Oman P, Hagemester J. Metrics for assessing a software system's maintainability. *Proceedings Conference on Software Maintenance*. IEEE Computer Society Press: Los Alamitos CA, 1992; 337–344.
37. Welker KD, Oman PW. Software maintainability metrics models in practice. *Crosstalk* 1995; **8**(11):19–23, 32.
38. Welker KD, Oman PW, Atkinson G. Development and application of an automated source code maintainability index. *Journal of Software Maintenance* 1997; **9**(3):127–159.
39. OMG. *Unified Modeling Language (UML) Specification, Version 1.5*. Object Management Group: Needham MA, 2001; 736.
40. Genero M. Defining and validating metrics for conceptual models. *Doctoral Dissertation*, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain, 2002; 437.
41. Genero M, Piattini M, Calero C. Early measures for UML class diagrams. *L'Objet* 2000; **6**(4):489–515.
42. Genero M, Olivas J, Piattini M, Romero F. Using metrics to predict OO information systems maintainability. *CAISE 2001 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2068)*. Springer: Berlin, 2001; 388–401.
43. Marchesi M. OOA metrics for the Unified Modeling Language. *Proceedings 2nd Euromicro Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering*. IEEE Computer Society Press: Los Alamitos CA, 1998; 67–73.
44. Bansiya J, Davis C. A hierarchical model for object-oriented design quality assessment. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 2002; **28**(1):4–17.
45. Henderson-Sellers B. *Object-Oriented Metrics—Measures of Complexity*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs NJ, 1996; 252.
46. Chidamber S, Kemerer C. A metrics suite for object oriented design. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 1994; **20**(6):476–493.
47. Lorenz M, Kidd J. *Object-Oriented Software Metrics: A Practical Guide*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs NJ, 1994; 146.
48. Harrison R, Counsell S, Nithi R. Coupling metrics for object-oriented design. *Proceedings 5th International Symposium on Software Metrics*. IEEE Computer Society Press: Los Alamitos CA, 1998; 150–157.
49. Zuse H. *A Framework of Software Measurement*. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 1997; 775.
50. Etzkorn LH, Bansiya J, Davis C. Design and code complexity metrics for OO classes. *The Journal of Object-Oriented Programming* 1999; **12**(1):335–340.
51. Briand L, Daly J, Wüst J. A unified framework for coupling measurement in object-oriented systems. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 1999; **25**(1):91–121.
52. Brito e Abreu F, Carapuça R. Object-oriented software engineering: Measuring and controlling the development process. *Proceedings 4th International Conference on Software Quality*. American Society for Quality (ASQ): Milwaukee WI, 1994; 212–224.
53. Siau K, Cao Q. Unified Modeling Language—a complexity analysis. *Journal of Database Management* 2001; **12**(1):26–34.
54. Siau K, Erickson J, Lee L. Complexity of UML: Theoretical versus practical complexity. *Proceedings 12th Workshop on Information Technology and Systems (WITS'02)*. Association of Information Systems: Barcelona, 2002; 13–18.
55. Siau K, Tian Y. The complexity of Unified Modeling Language: A GOMS analysis. *Proceedings 14th International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS'01)*. Association for Information Systems (AIS): Atlanta GA, 2001; 443–448.
56. Fenton N, Neil M. Software metrics: A roadmap. *Future of Software Engineering*, Finkelstein A (ed.). ACM Press: New York NY, 2000; 359–370.
57. Moody D. Complexity effects on end user understanding of data models: An experimental comparison of large data model representation methods. *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS'2002)*. University of Gdańsk: Gdańsk, Poland, 2002; 53–58.
58. Shanks CG, Moody DL, Nuredini J, Tobin D, Weber RA. Representing things and properties in conceptual modelling: An empirical evaluation. *Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS 2003)*. Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli: Naples, 2003; 112–124.



59. COSMIC. *Measurement Manual—COSMIC-FPP Version 2.0*. Common Software Measurement International Consortium, Montreal QB, 1999. Available at <http://www.cosmicon.com/> [30 November 2004].
60. IFPUG. *Function Point Counting Practices Manual Release 4.1*. International Function Points Users Group: Mequon WI, 1999; 266.
61. Symons C. Function point analysis: difficulties and improvements. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 1988; **14**(1):2–11.
62. Sweller J. Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty and instructional design. *Learning and Cognition* 1994; **4**:295–312.
63. Chandler P, Sweller J. Cognitive load while learning to use a computer program. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 1996; **10**:51–170.
64. Nordbotten J, Crosby M. The effect of graphic style on data model interpretation. *Information Systems Journal* 1999; **9**:139–156.
65. Moody DL. Dealing with complexity: A practical method for representing large entity relationship models. *Doctoral Dissertation*, Department of Information Systems, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia, 2001; 352.
66. Shanks G. The challenges of strategic data planning in practice: An interpretive case study. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 1997; **6**(1):69–90.
67. Basili V, Briand L, Melo W. A validation of object-oriented design metrics as quality indicators. *IEEE Transactions of Software Engineering* 1996; **22**(10):751–761.
68. Daly J, Brooks A, Miller J, Roper M, Wood M. An empirical study evaluating depth of inheritance on maintainability of object-oriented software. *Empirical Software Engineering* 1996; **1**(2):109–132.
69. Cartwright M. An empirical view of inheritance. *Information and Software Technology* 1998; **40**(4):795–799.
70. Unger B, Prechelt L. The impact of inheritance depth on maintenance tasks: Detailed description and evaluation of two experimental replications. *Technical Report 18/1998*, Karlsruhe University, Karlsruhe, Germany, 1998; 36.
71. Harrison R, Counsell S, Nithi R. Experimental assessment of the effect of inheritance on the maintainability of object-oriented systems. *The Journal of Systems and Software* 2000; **52**:173–179.
72. Poels G, Dedene G. Evaluating the effect of inheritance on the modifiability of object-oriented business domain models. *Proceedings 5th European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering (CSMR 2001)*. IEEE Computer Society Press: Los Alamitos CA, 2001; 20–29.
73. Chapin N, Hale JE, Khan KM, Ramil JF, Tan W-G. Types of software evolution and software maintenance. *Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice* 2001; **13**(1):3–30.
74. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates: Mahwah NJ, 1988; 567.
75. Pedhazur E, Schmelkin L. *Measurement, Design and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah NJ, 1991; 819.
76. Harris M, Rosenthal R. Mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects: 31 meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin* 1985; **97**:363–386.
77. Rosenthal R. Assessing the statistical and social importance of the effects of psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1983; **51**:4–13.
78. Rosenthal R, Rubin D. A note on percent variance explained as a measure of importance of effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 1979; **74**:395–396.
79. Poels G, Dedene G. Distance-based software measurement: Necessary and sufficient properties for software measures. *Information and Software Technology* 2000; **42**(1):35–46.
80. Cohen J, Cohen P. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlational Analysis Techniques for the Behavioral Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates: Mahwah NJ, 1983; 795.
81. Babbie E. *The Practice of Social Research*. Wadsworth: Belmont, CA, 1998; 592.
82. Batra D, Hoffer J, Bostrom R. Comparing representations with relational and EER models. *Communications of the ACM* 1990; **33**(2):126–139.
83. Bock D, Ryan T. Accuracy in modeling with extended entity relationship and object-oriented data model. *Journal of Database Management* 1993; **4**(4):30–39.
84. Bodart F, Patel A, Sim M, Weber R. Should the optional property construct be used in conceptual modeling: A theory and three empirical tests. *Information Systems Research* 2001; **12**(4):384–405.
85. Hardgrave B, Dalal N. Comparing object-oriented and extended entity relationship models. *Journal of Database Management* 1995; **6**(3):15–21.
86. Lee H, Choi B. Comparative study of conceptual data modeling techniques. *Journal of Database Management* 1998; **9**(2):26–35.
87. Moody DL. Comparative evaluation of large data model representation methods: The Analyst's Perspective. *Proceedings 21st International Conference on Conceptual Modeling (ER'2002)*, Spaccapietra S, March ST, Kambayashi Y (eds.). Springer: Heidelberg, 2002; 121–132.



88. Shoval P, Even-Chaime M. Database schema design: An experimental comparison between normalization and information analysis. *Database* 1987; **18**(3):30–39.
89. Shoval P, Shiran S. Entity-relationship and object-oriented data modeling: An experimental comparison of design quality. *Data and Knowledge Engineering* 1997; **21**(3):297–315.
90. Weber R. Are attributes entities? A study of database designers' memory structures. *Information Systems Research* 1996; **7**(2):137–162.

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES



Marcela Genero Bocco is an assistant professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain. Her research interests are advanced database design, software metrics, conceptual data models quality and database quality. She has published many papers in conferences and journals. She is co-editor of the 2002 book *Information and Database Quality*. Marcela received her MSc degree in Computer Science from the Department of Computer Science of the University of South Argentine in 1989 and her PhD at the University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain in 2002.



Daniel Moody is a visiting professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland. He has previously held academic positions at the Czech Technical University, Charles University (Prague), University of Valencia, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Monash University and the University of Melbourne. He has held senior IT positions in the private sector and has consulted to a wide range of organizations around the world, including Australia, Europe, the U.S.A. and South-East Asia. Daniel's research interests include data modeling, data warehousing, information economics, information architecture, medical informatics and IT education. He has a PhD in Information Systems from the University of Melbourne.



Mario Piattini is a professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain. His research interests are in advanced database design, database quality, software metrics, software maintenance and security in information systems. He leads the ALARCOS research group of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Castilla-La Mancha. He is the author of several books and papers on databases, software engineering and information systems, and has co-edited several books including *Auditing Information Systems* in 2000. Mario earned his MSc and PhD in Computer Science from the Politechnical University of Madrid, and is a Certified Information System Auditor Manager by ISACA (Information System Audit and Control Association).