

# Developers Want Requirements, but Their Project Manager Doesn't; and A Possibly Transcendent Hawthorne Effect

**Daniel Isaacs and Daniel M. Berry**  
**University of Waterloo**

**2011**

# Initial Conditions, Cont'd

- **The project manager at O communicated PX's requirements as a one-sentence requirements specification: ...**

**“Mimic this Webpage.” while pointing to the Webpage implemented by PY.**

# **An X Acquisition**

**X acquired another Canadian company, Y.**

**Y's main product is PY.**

**X acquired Y mainly to incorporate PY's functionality into its own products.**

# **O Project to Build PX**

**O began a project to build PX in March 2008.**

**From now on, this project is called “the project”.**

**Project scheduled for 18 months; required 24.**

**Client was representative of first X customer that agreed to beta test new PX.**

# Staffing for the Project

**Project started with team of 16.**

**But, 8 quit in first 9 months from job dissatisfaction, ...**

**leaving 8, including the FA, at the time of the CS.**

**These 8 included 7 developers, including the FA, and 1 quality assurer.**

# The Non-Royal “We”

**The FA was a member of the project that was studied.**

**Therefore, each of “we”, “us”, and “our” includes the FA, ...**

**and does not include the second author.**

# Challenges in the Project

**One significant challenge we faced when we started the project was our lack of knowledge of PY's domain.**

**PY's developers and other stakeholders, such as end users, were geographically separated from the PX project team.**

**When Y became part of X, all PY developers, who had domain knowledge about PY, quit rather than become X employees.**

# Initial Conditions

- **X's senior management communicated to PX developers in O that their job was to replicate the functionality of PY.**

**No more, no less functionality than PY had.**

- **PY's functionality had to be migrated to a different technology, in order to incorporate the functionality into O's suite of SW.**



# Initial Conditions, Cont'd

- **The project manager at O communicated PX's requirements as a one-sentence requirements specification: ...**

**“Mimic this Webpage.” while pointing to the Webpage implemented by PY.**

# Initial Conditions, Cont'd

- **PY's functionality was not defined or documented anywhere.**

**Information sufficient for a smooth development was not provided.**

**Thus, the developers did not fully understand what was required to build PY.**

# Initial Conditions, Cont'd

- **The implementation of PX relied heavily on each developer's own interpretation, ...**

**a serious problem since each developer's interpretation was different from those of the others.**

# The Project's Manager and RE

**Based on the FA's experiences at O and informal discussions with his fellow O employees, the FA concluded that ...**

**The project's manager did *not* like requirements!**

**The FA drew this conclusion from the manager's behavior.**

# Manager's Behavior

**Manager seemed to resist any suggestion of the development team's figuring out requirements collectively.**

**Instead, he asked each *individual* to build a prototype of a different feature, interacting with only the client, and reporting back to only him with completed prototype.**

# Phony Agility

**Agility in sense of continuous interaction with client, ...**

**but not in sense of communication with entire team.**

# **Manager's Behavior, Cont'd**

**The FA believes that the manager associated knowledge with power and job stability.**

**If the manager is the only one that knows something, he is indispensable.**

**A requirements specification gives this knowledge to everyone in the project team.**

**Thus, a requirements specification is very low priority to the manager.**

# Manager's Behavior, Cont'd

**Ironically, the lack of a systematic, coordinated attempt to determine all requirements up front →**

**the manager probably knew no more about requirements than did the team collectively.**



# Lack of RE and Productivity

**In the absence of well defined requirements, productivity was hampered.**

**The resulting rewriting wastes time.**

# Quality Assurance, Cont'd

**By the end of June 2010, the QA team has logged 681 tickets.**

**Large number, even for O.**

# Origin of Tickets

**For this CS, the FA tried to determine the origins of the 681 tickets.**

**After reviewing only the first 100 tickets, he gave up, confident of a representative sample.**

**37 of the 100 were from missing requirements, and ... Since they knew the scope, the built PX exactly, these missing are D requirements!!**  
**the remaining 63 were bugs introduced during programming of known requirements.**