

# **Socio-Technical Congruence: A Framework for Assessing the Impact of Technical and Work Dependencies on Software Development**

**Marcelo Cataldo<sup>1</sup>, James D. Herbsleb<sup>2</sup>, Kathleen M. Carley<sup>2</sup>**

March 2008  
CMU-ISR-08-104

<sup>1</sup> Research and Technology Center, Robert Bosch LLC, Pittsburgh, PA, USA  
<sup>2</sup> Institute for Software Research, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Institute for Software Research  
School of Computer Science  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

## **Abstract**

The identification and management of work dependencies is a fundamental challenge in software development organizations. This paper argues that modularization, the traditional technique intended to reduce interdependencies among components of a system, is not a sufficient representation of work dependencies in the context of software development. We build on the idea of congruence proposed by Cataldo et al [10] to examine the relationship between the structure of technical and work dependencies and their impact on software development productivity. Our empirical evaluation of the congruence framework showed that when developers' coordination patterns are congruent with their coordination needs, the resolution time of modification requests was, on average, reduced by 32%. Those findings highlight the importance of identifying the "right" set of product dependencies that drive the coordination requirements among software developers.

**Keywords:** collaborative software development, coordination, software dependencies.

The research reported in this paper was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. IIS-0414698, Grant No. IIS-0534656 and Grant No. IGERT 9972762, by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory under Collaborative Technology Alliance Program, Cooperative Agreement DAAD19-01-2-0011, by the Office of Naval Research (ONR N00014-06-1-0921) and by the Air Force Research Lab with Charles River Analytics SC060701.

## 1. Introduction

A growing body of work on coordination in software development suggests that the identification and management of work dependencies is a fundamental challenge in software development organizations, particularly in those that are geographically distributed (some examples are: [11][16][25][28]). The modular product design literature has extensively examined issues associated with dependencies, for instance, the work on design structure matrices to find alternative structures that reduce dependencies among the various components of the system [19, 43]. Those research streams could inform the design of software development organizations so they are better able to identify and manage work dependencies. However, we first need to understand the assumptions of the different theoretical views and how those assumptions relate to the characteristics of software development tasks.

This study argues that modularization is a necessary but not a sufficient mechanism for handling the work dependencies that emerge in the process of developing software systems. We build on the concept of congruence introduced by Cataldo et al [10] to examine how different types of technical dependencies related to work dependencies among software developers and, ultimately, how those work dependencies impact development productivity. Our empirical evaluation of the congruence framework illustrated the importance of understanding the dynamic nature of software development. Identifying the “right” set of product<sup>1</sup> dependencies that determine the relevant work dependencies and coordinating accordingly has significant impact on reducing the resolution time of software modification requests. The analyses showed traditional software dependencies, such as syntactic relationships, tend to capture a relatively stable view of product dependencies that is not representative of the dynamism in product dependencies that emerges as software systems are implemented. On the other hand, logical dependencies provide a more accurate representation of the most relevant product dependencies affecting the development effort. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We first discuss the theoretical background related to the relationship between technical and work dependencies in software development projects. Next, we present the socio-technical congruence framework followed by a description of data, measures and models used in the empirical analysis. Finally, we discuss the results, their implications and future work.

## 2. The Nature of Software Development and Modular Design

The idea of dividing a complex task into smaller manageable units is consistent with the reductionist view [41, 44] which is well developed in the product development literature [19]. Projects, typically, have a general description of the system’s components and their relationships or a more detailed report such as architectural or high-level design document. Managers use the information in those documents to divide the development effort into work items that are assigned to specific development teams minimizing the interdependencies among those teams [13, 19, 43]. In the system design literature, it has long been speculated that the structure of a product inevitably resembles the structure of the organization that designs it [13]. In Conway’s original formulation, he reasoned that coordinating product design decisions requires communication among the engineers making those decisions. If everyone needs to talk to everyone, the communication overhead does not scale well for projects of any size. Therefore,

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms “technical dependency” and “product dependency” are used interchangeably through out this paper.

products must be split into components, with limited technical dependencies among them, and each component assigned to a single team. Conway [13] proposed that the component structure and organizational structure stand in a homomorphic relation, in that more than one component can be assigned to a team, but a component must be assigned to a single team.

A similar argument has been proposed in the strategic management literature. Baldwin and Clark [2] argued that modularization makes complexity manageable, enables parallel work and tolerates uncertainty. The design decisions are hidden within the modules which communicate through standard interfaces, then, modularization adds value by allowing independent experimentation of modules and substitution [2]. Moreover, Baldwin and Clark [2] argued that a modular design structure leads to an equivalent modular task structure. Then, their view aligns with Conway's idea that one or more modules can be assigned to one organizational unit and work can be conducted almost independently of others. In the context of software engineering, a similar approach was first articulated by Parnas [39] as modular software design. Parnas [39] argued that modules ought to be considered work items instead of just a collection of subprograms. Then, development work can continue independently and in parallel across different modules. Parnas' views also coincide with the theoretical arguments from product design and strategic management literatures.

All three theoretical views rely on two interrelated assumptions. The authors assumed a simple and obvious relationship between product modularization and task modularization. Hence, reducing the technical interdependencies among the modules of a system, the modularization theories argued, task interdependencies are reduced, which consequently, reduces the need for communication among work groups. Unfortunately, there are several problems with these assumptions when applied in the context of software development. First, existing software modularization approaches only use a subset of the technical dependencies, typically syntactic relationships, of a software system [23]. Then, potentially relevant work dependencies might be ignored. Secondly, recent empirical evidence indicates that the relationship between product structure and task structure is not as simple as previously assumed. Moreover, the theorized similarity between product and task structures diminishes over time [10].

Thirdly, promoting minimal communication between teams responsible for interdependent modules is problematic. Recent studies suggest that minimal communication between teams, collocated or distributed, is detrimental to the success of projects. The product development literature argues that information hiding, which leads to minimal communication between teams, is an inevitable antecedent of variability in the evolution of projects resulting, typically, in integration problems [46]. In context of software development, de Souza and colleagues [17] found that information hiding led development teams to be unaware of others teams' work resulting in coordination problems. Grinter and colleagues [25] reported similar findings for geographically distributed software development projects. The authors highlighted that the main consequence of reducing the teams' need to communicate was the increased costs because problems were discovered too late in the development process. Those findings do not suggest that modularization is not useful. They highlight the need to supplement it with coordination mechanisms to allow developers to deal correctly with the assumptions that are not captured in the specification of the dependencies.

Finally, another important problem associated with the assumptions of modular design is the role of change which can be characterized along three interrelated dimensions: the evolution of requirements, the stability of the interfaces between software modules and the dynamic nature of

technical dependencies that arise as design and implementation decisions are made. First, it is widely accepted among software engineering researchers and practitioners that the requirements of the system become known over time or those requirements change as time progresses [35]. In some cases, the changes in the requirements result in minor alterations of specific development tasks. In other instances, new features have to be added or features under development are eliminated. These events introduce a certain level of dynamism in software development that challenges the determinism and stability assumptions of the modularization approach.

The second dimension of change in software development is the nature and stability of the interfaces between software modules. The interfaces between software modules might differ in complexity and little is known about its impact on coordination among development teams. However, recent research has started to examine those issues. Cataldo et al [11] presented case studies where even simple interfaces between modules developed by remote teams create coordination breakdown and integration problems. The authors reported that semantic dependencies were even more problematic and they argued that the developers' ability to identify and manage dependencies was hindered by several inter-related factors such as development processes, organizational attributes (e.g. structure, management style) and uncertainty of the interfaces. In relation to the stability of interfaces, de Souza [16] encountered, in a field study of a large software project, that interfaces tended to change often and their design details tended to be incomplete, increasing the likelihood of future changes to them and leading to serious integration problems. This lack of stability represents a constant challenge for software development organizations in terms of coordination and, ultimately, productivity and quality.

Finally, the third dimension of change is the dynamic nature of finer-grain dependencies that arise as part of the development of a piece of code. The act of developing a software system consists of a collection of design decisions, either at the architectural level or at the implementation level. Those design decisions introduce constraints that might establish new dependencies among the various parts of the system, modify existing ones or even eliminate dependencies. The changes in dependencies can generate new coordination requirements that are quite difficult to identify a priori, particularly when they are not obvious, or as a project matures over time [27, 42]. Failure to discover the changes in coordination needs might have a profound impact on the quality of the product [15], on productivity [28] and even on the projects' overall design [4]. In addition, little is known about the specific impact of the various types of dependencies that arise among parts of a software system such as explicit versus implicit dependencies or syntactic versus logical dependencies.

The previous paragraphs highlight the limitations of the product modularization approach which does not necessarily yield an equivalent task modularization structure. The nature of software development such as the attributes and stability of interfaces among modules and the dynamics of technical dependencies, are a constant challenge for software development organizations, particularly, for those geographically distributed. Mechanisms to complement the modular design approach are required to maintain appropriate levels of coordination among development groups. This leads us to the following research questions:

*RQ1: How relevant task dependencies can be identified from technical dependencies?*

*RQ2: What is the impact of those task dependencies on development productivity?*

### 3. Socio-Technical Congruence

Product development endeavors involve two fundamental elements: a technical and a social component. The technical properties of the product to develop, the processes, the tasks, and the technology employed in the development effort constitute the technical component. The second element is composed by the organization and the individuals involved in the development process, their attitudes and behaviors. In other words, a product development project can be thought of a socio-technical system where the two components, the technical and the social elements, need to be aligned in order to have a successful project. Then, a key issue is to understand how we can examine the relationship between those two, the technical and the social, dimensions. Two lines of work are particularly relevant in this context. First, the idea of “fit” from the organizational theory literature provides the conceptual framework. Fit is defined as the match between a particular organizational design and the organization’s ability to carry out a task [6]. This line of research has, traditionally, focused on two factors: the temporal dependencies among tasks that are assigned to organizational groups and the formal organizational structure as a means of communication and coordination [9, 36]. The second relevant line of work is the research on dynamic analysis of social networks which provides an innovative approach, called the meta-matrix, to examine the dynamic co-evolution of relationships among multiple types of entities such as resources, tasks, and individuals [8, 33]. Building on those two streams of research, we define socio-technical congruence as the match between the coordination requirements established by the dependencies among tasks and the actual coordination activities carried out by the engineers. In other words, the concept of congruence has two components. First, the coordination needs determined by the technical dimension of the socio-technical system and, secondly, the coordination activities carried out by the organization representing the social dimension. The following paragraphs discuss in detail the mathematical framework to measure the two components of congruence originally introduced by Cataldo and colleagues [10].

#### 3.1 Identification of Coordination Requirements

In order to identify which set of individuals should be coordinating their activities, we need to represent two sets of relationships. One set is given by which individuals are working on which tasks. The relationships or dependencies among tasks represent the second element. In the framework proposed in this section, assignments of individuals to particular work items is represented by a people by task matrix where a one in cell  $ij$  indicates that worker  $i$  is assigned to task  $j$ . We will refer to this matrix as *Task Assignments* ( $T_A$ ). Following the same approach, the set of dependencies among tasks can be represented as a square matrix where a cell  $ij$  (or cell  $ji$ ) indicates that task  $i$  and task  $j$  are interdependent. We will refer to this matrix as *Task Dependencies* ( $T_D$ ). Now, if the *Task Assignment* and *Task Dependencies* matrices are multiplied, a people by task matrix is obtained that represents the set of tasks a particular worker should be aware of, given the work items the person is responsible for and the dependencies of those work items with other tasks. Finally, a representation of the coordination requirements among the different workers is obtained by multiplying the product of the *Task Assignment* and *Task Dependencies* matrices by the transpose of the *Task Assignment* matrix. This product results in a people by people matrix where a cell  $ij$  (or cell  $ji$ ) indicates the extent to which person  $i$  works on tasks that share dependencies with the tasks worked on by person  $j$ . In other words, the resulting matrix represents the *Coordination Requirements* or the extent to which each pair of

people needs to coordinate their work. Formally, the *Coordination Requirements* matrix is determined by the following product:

$$C_R = T_A * T_D * T_A^T \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

where,  $T_A$  is the Task Assignments matrix,  $T_D$  is the Task Dependencies matrix and  $T_A^T$  is the transpose of the Task Assignments matrix. This framework provides alternatives ways of thinking about coordination requirements among workers depending on what type of data is used to populate the Task Dependencies matrix. Past work had focused on temporal relationships between tasks, for instance, task A needs to be done before task B (e.g. [36]). In the context of software development, such way of thinking about task dependencies is quite common. Alternative views could be based on high level roles in the development organizations (e.g. integration and testing depends on development) or task dependencies based on product dependencies in the actual software code (e.g. function calls between modules). The focus on this paper is on the work dependencies structure-product dependency structure relationship because, as discussed earlier, the difficulty of identifying and managing certain types of product dependencies is a critical factor in coordination success and ultimately in productivity and quality.

### 3.2 Computing Congruence

Given a particular *Coordination Requirements* matrix constructed from relating product dependencies to work dependencies, we can compare it to an *Actual Coordination* ( $C_A$ ) matrix that represents the interactions workers engaged in through different means of coordination. Then, given a particular set of dependencies among tasks, congruence is the proportion of coordination activities that actually occurred (given by the *Actual Coordination* matrix) relative to the total number of coordination activities that should have taken place (given by the *Coordination Requirements* matrix). For example, if the *Coordination Requirements* matrix shows that 10 pairs should coordinate, and of these, 5 show *Actual Coordination* interactions, then the congruence is 0.5. Formally, we define congruence as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Diff(C_R, C_A) &= \text{card} \{ \text{diff}_{ij} \mid cr_{ij} > 0 \ \& \ ca_{ij} > 0 \} \\ |C_R| &= \text{card} \{ cr_{ij} > 0 \} \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have:

$$\text{Congruence}(C_R, C_A) = \text{Diff}(C_R, C_A) / |C_R| \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

In sum, the value of congruence belongs to the [0,1] interval that represents the proportion of coordination requirements that were satisfied through some type of coordination activity or mechanism. The measure of socio-technical congruence proposed here provides a new way of thinking about coordination, particularly, by providing a fine-grain level of analysis of different types of product dependencies and allowing us to examine how coordination needs are impacted by them.

### 3.3 Two Approaches to Identify Technical Dependencies in Software Systems

The measure of congruence presented in the previous section relies on a representation of dependency that drives the engineers' coordination needs. In this section, we discuss two approaches to identify technical dependencies from a software system.

The traditional view of software dependency has its origins in compiler optimizations and they focus on control and dataflow relationships [30]. This approach extracts relational information between specific units of analysis such as statements, functions or methods, as well as modules, typically, from the source code of a system or from an intermediate representation of the software code such as bytecodes or abstract syntax trees. These relationships can represent either a data-related dependency (e.g. a particular data structure modified by a function and used in another function) or a functional dependency (e.g. method A calls method B). This type of dependency analysis techniques has been widely used in a research context to examine the relationship between coupling and quality of a software system (see for instance [31, 40]). Syntactic dependency analyses are also used by software developers to improve their understanding of programs and the linkages among the various parts of those programs [37].

One characteristic of these relational structures such as a call-graph, and for that matter other graphs such as inheritance and data dependencies graphs, is that they provide a particular view of the system-wide structure. Moreover, the accuracy of the information represented in these graphs depends on the ability of the tool used to identify all the appropriate types of syntactic relationships allowed by the underlying programming language [37].

An alternative mechanism of identifying dependencies consists of examining the set of source code files that are modified together as part of a modification request. This approach is equivalent to the approach proposed by Gall and colleagues [22] in the software evolution literature to identify logical dependencies between modules. A source code file can be viewed as representing a “bundle” of technical decisions. If a modification request can be implemented by changing only one file, it provides no evidence of any dependencies among files. However, when a modification request requires changes to more than one file, it can be assumed that decisions about the change to one file in a modification request depend in some way on the decisions made about changes to the other files involved in implementing the modification request. Dependencies could range from syntactic, for instance a function call between files, to more complex semantic dependencies where the computations done in one files affects the behavior of another files. This approach would represent a better estimate for semantic dependencies relative to call graphs or data graphs because it does not rely on language constructs to establish the dependency relationship between source code files. The remainder of this paper refers to this approach to identify dependencies as the “Files Changed Together” (FCT) method. We will refer to the method to identify dependencies based on syntactic functional and data relationships described earlier as the CGRAPH method.

## **4. Method**

### **4.1 Description of the Data**

We collected data from a software development project of a large distributed system produced by a company that operates in the data storage industry. The data covered a period of 39 months of development activity and the first four releases of the product. The company had one hundred and fourteen developers grouped into eight development teams distributed across three development locations. All the developers worked full time on the project during the time period covered by the data. Software developers communicated and coordinated using various means. Opportunities for interaction existed when the developers worked in the same formal team or when they were located in the same development site. Developers also used tools such as

Internet Relay Chat (IRC) and a modification request (MR) tracking system to interact and coordinate their work. For instance, the MR tracking system kept track of the progress of the task, comments and observations made by developers as well as additional material used in the development process. We collected communication and coordination information from those two systems. Finally, we also collected demographic data about the developers such as their programming and domain experience and level of formal education.

The unit of analysis is the modification request which corresponds to a development work item associated with a defect or a new feature. A total of 2375 multi-team modification requests were identified. Those modification requests belonged to the first four releases of the product and involved more than one software development team. The decision to focus on such modification requests is based on a growing body of research which shows that difficulties in communication and coordination breakdowns are recurring problems in software development [15, 28, 34], particularly when the work items are geographically distributed [28] and the task involves more than one organizational team [15, 20, 34].

#### 4.2 Descriptions of Measures

The literature has identified a number of factors that affect development time and, consequently, the resolution of modification requests. Some of those factors are related to characteristics of the task such as the amount of code to be written and the priority of the task, whereas other factors capture relevant attributes of the individual developers and the teams that participate in the development task. In the following paragraphs, we first describe our dependent variable, resolution time of modification requests. Secondly, the procedures used to construct the measures of congruence are described. Finally, we describe a number of control measures that were also included in the statistical models.

**Productivity Measure:** Our measure of productivity is *Resolution Time* which captures the time it took to resolve a particular modification request, and it accounts for all the time that the MR was assigned to developers. The modification requests reports contain records of when the MR was opened and resolved as well as every time the MR was assigned to a particular developer. Given this information, we can compute the amount of time that developers were actually working on the task.

**Congruence Measures:** The data for building the *Coordination Requirements* matrix (equation 1) was extracted from several data sources such as the modification request reports, the version control system as well as the software code itself. A modification request provides the “developer  $i$  modified file  $j$ ” relationship that constitutes our *Task Assignment* matrix. Since, two different methods for identifying dependencies were used, FCT and CGRAPH, we constructed two different *Task Dependency* matrices. In the case of the FCT method, the cell  $c_{ij}$  of the *Task Dependency* matrix represents the number of times a particular pair of source code files changed together as part of the work associated with a modification request. A moving window of 19 months was used to capture a representative set of logical dependencies among the software modules. The resolution date of the modification request was paired with the end of the time window used to collect the task dependency information. In the case of the CGRAPH method, the cell  $c_{ij}$  of the *Task Dependency* matrix represents the number of data/function/method references from file  $i$  into file  $j$ . The syntactic relationships were extracted from the system’s source code using the C-REX tool [26]. We constructed quarterly call-graphs of the entire system. The data from the quarter associated with the resolution date of the modification request was used to collect the task dependency information. Given the *Task Assignments* and *Task*

*Dependencies* matrices just described, we computed as described in equation 1, two *Coordination Requirement* matrices, one based on the FCT and a second based on the CGRAPH method.

In order to compute a measure of congruence, we also need to build the *Actual Coordination* matrix which represents the coordination activities that took place during the work associated with a modification request. These activities could take numerous forms and the communication and information exchanges could occur over different means. Hence, four coordination paths were used to construct the *Actual Coordination* matrices. First, *Structural Congruence* captures the potential paths of communication and coordination that members of a formal team have through various mechanisms such as team meetings and other work-related activities. We built the actual coordination matrix where a coordination activity between engineers  $i$  and  $j$  exists if they belong to the same formal team. *Geographical congruence*, similarly to the case of organization structure, is built around the idea of potential paths of communication and coordination that exist when individuals work in the same physical location [1, 38]. Then, in terms of the matrix of coordination activities, engineers  $i$  and  $j$  have a linkage if they work in the same location. Higher levels of congruence would mean that the geographic location of people matches their coordination needs so that relatively little coordination is required across sites. *MR communication congruence* considers an exchange of technical information between engineers  $i$  and  $j$  only when both  $i$  and  $j$  explicitly commented in the modification request report. Multiple modification requests might refer to the same problem and later be marked as duplicates of a particular modification request. All duplicates of the focal MR were also used to capture the interactions among developers. Finally, *IRC communication congruence* was computed based on interaction between developers from the IRC logs. Three raters, blind to the research questions, examined the IRC logs corresponding to the period of time associated with each MR and established an interaction between engineers  $i$  and  $j$  if they made reference to the bug ID or to the task or problem represented by the MR in their conversations. In order to assess the reliability of the raters' work, 10% of the MRs were coded by all raters. Comparisons of the obtained networks showed that 98.2% of the networks had the same set of nodes and edges. All four *Actual Coordination* matrices were symmetric.

**Control Measures:** Past research has proposed several additional factors that impact development time [20, 28, 34]. We collected a number of control variables that capture attributes of the task, the individuals and the teams associated with the development work. Several task-specific factors such as the temporal dependency among MRs, task priority and task re-assignments could have an important effect on development time. *Temporal Dependency* was measured as the number of modification requests that the focal MR depends on in order for the task to be performed. Management prioritized the activities of the developer by using a scale from 1 to 5 in the modification request report where level 5 as the highest priority and level 1 as the lowest priority. This rating constituted our measure of *priority* of the MR. *Task re-assignment* was measured as the number of times an MR was re-assigned to a different engineer or team. Re-assignment impacts resolution time because each new developer needs to build up contextual information about the task. In addition, MRs opened by customers could represent work items with higher importance consequently affecting the resolution time. A dummy variable was used to indicate if the MR is associated with the service request from a customer. *Multiple Locations* is a binary variable that indicates whether all the developers that worked on a particular MR were in the same geographical location (a value of 0) or were distributed across the development labs (a value of 1). Finally, the *release* variable identifies the release of

the product that the modification request is associated with. This variable could also be considered as a proxy for time to control for efficiencies that might develop over time and, consequently, affect the resolution time of the modification requests.

The amount of code written or changed is a proxy for the actual amount of development work done. The *change size* was computed as the number of files that were modified as part of the change for the focal MR. Prior research [20] has used lines of code changed as a measure of the size of the modification; however, a comparative analysis of both measures showed equivalent results in the statistical model used in this study. Therefore, the results presented in this chapter are based on the measure computed from the number of files modified. The change size measure was highly skewed so a log transformation was applied to satisfy the normality requirements of the regression model used in our analysis.

An experienced software engineer familiar with tools and programming languages can be substantially more productive than an inexperienced developer [5, 14, 15]. Furthermore, experience with the domain area and the technical characteristics of the application being developed help accelerate development time [15]. We used archival information as well as data from the software repositories to compute several individual level measures of experience. First, *programming experience* was computed as the average number of years of programming experience prior to joining the company of all the engineers involved in the modification request. *Tenure* was measured as the average number of months in the company of all the engineers that worked in the modification request at the time the work associated with the MR was completed. *Component experience* was computed as the average number of times that the engineers responsible for the modification request have worked on the same files affected by the focal modification request. This measure was also log-transformed to satisfy normality requirements. Finally, *Team load* is a measure of the average work load of the teams responsible for the components associated with the modification request. This control variable was computed as the ratio of the average number of modification requests in *open* or *assigned* state over the total number of engineers in the groups involved in the focal modification request during the period of time the MR was in *assigned* state.

### 4.3 Description of the Model

Past research has found that linear [20, 29] and hierarchical linear [20, 34] models are appropriate techniques for examining the effects of different factors on development productivity. In this study, we examined the effect of congruence on resolution time using the following linear regression model:

$$\text{ResolutionTime} = \sum_i \beta_i * \text{CongruenceMeasure}_i + \sum_j \delta_j * \text{ControlVariable}_j + \varepsilon$$

An examination of descriptive statistics and Q-Q plot indicated that several of the variables (*Resolution Time*, *Chang Size* and *Component Experience*) were highly skewed to the left. The log transformation provided the best approximation to a normal distribution. Table 1a summarizes the descriptive statistics of the dependent and control variables included in our model. Table 1b summarizes the descriptive statistics of the congruence measures computed using the FCT method. Table 1c presents the descriptive statistics for the congruence measures computed using the CGRAPH method. The analysis of the pair-wise correlations amongst the

variables in the model (Table 2) suggested no relevant collinearity problems. Only a small set of correlations were statistically significant but their levels did not exceed +/- 0.343.

The measures of structural and geographical congruence could be affected by personnel turnover and mobility across teams. We examined archival data collected from the company and we determined a yearly turnover rate of only 3% and an inter-group mobility rate of less than 1%. The modification requests that involved individuals that left the company or changed group membership were eliminated from the analysis. However, an analysis including those modification requests showed results consistent with those reported in section 5.

**Table 1a: Descriptive Statistics for Dependent and Control Variables**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Skew</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
<i>Resolution Time (log)</i>	3.260	1.236	0	6.490	-0.809	3.127
<i>Temporal Dependency</i>	0.834	1.721	0	7	2.144	6.759
<i>Priority</i>	3.388	1.111	1	5	0.115	1.694
<i>Re-assignment</i>	1.457	1.599	0	6	0.481	1.605
<i>Customer MR</i>	0.483	0.499	0	1	0.067	1.004
<i>Release</i>	2.323	1.093	1	4	0.269	1.769
<i>Change Size (log)</i>	1.163	1.781	0	4.741	0.302	4.005
<i>Team Load</i>	9.104	2.938	1.016	58.800	-0.361	2.342
<i>Multiple Locations</i>	0.779	0.414	0	1	-1.346	2.814
<i>Programming Exp.</i>	4.429	3.654	2	22	1.074	4.462
<i>Tenure</i>	23.921	17.107	0	76	0.175	1.685
<i>Component Exp. (log)</i>	3.051	0.958	0	5.601	-0.015	2.145

**Table 1b: Descriptive Statistics for Congruence Measures (FCT method)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Skew</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
<i>Structural Cong.</i>	0.663	0.217	0.156	0.995	-0.931	3.754
<i>Geographical Cong.</i>	0.684	0.237	0.142	0.993	-0.863	3.201
<i>MR Cong.</i>	0.567	0.283	0.070	0.982	-0.319	1.965
<i>IRC Cong.</i>	0.599	0.274	0.079	0.982	-0.506	2.233

**Table 1c: Descriptive Statistics for Congruence Measures (CGRAPH method)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Skew</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
<i>Structural Cong.</i>	0.544	0.273	0.111	0.614	-0.322	1.849
<i>Geographical Cong.</i>	0.571	0.266	0.193	0.967	-0.062	2.048
<i>MR Cong.</i>	0.093	0.086	0.002	0.348	1.434	4.114
<i>IRC Cong.</i>	0.133	0.142	0.001	0.313	1.324	3.448

**Table 2: Pair-wise Correlations (N=2375, bold values are significant at  $p < 0.05$ ).**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 <i>Temporal Dependency</i>	-					
2 <i>Priority</i>	<b>0.341</b>	-				
3 <i>Re-assignment</i>	-0.013	0.029	-			
4 <i>Customer MR</i>	0.012	-0.031	<b>-0.224</b>	-		
5 <i>Release</i>	0.004	0.001	0.025	-0.019	-	
6 <i>Change Size</i>	0.113	<b>0.332</b>	0.031	-0.046	0.003	-
7 <i>Team Load</i>	-0.001	-0.029	<b>-0.329</b>	0.103	-0.008	-0.044
8 <i>Programming Exp.</i>	<b>0.314</b>	<b>0.343</b>	0.033	-0.021	-0.015	<b>0.218</b>
9 <i>Tenure</i>	<b>0.243</b>	0.023	0.009	0.001	-0.026	<b>-0.216</b>
10 <i>Component Exp.</i>	-0.043	-0.013	0.016	-0.001	-0.002	<b>-0.122</b>
11 <i>Multiple Locations</i>	<b>-0.160</b>	-0.013	-0.006	0.002	0.037	0.014
12 <i>Struct. Cong. (FCT)</i>	-0.030	0.022	-0.031	0.032	-0.015	0.049
13 <i>Geo. Cong. (FCT)</i>	-0.097	-0.035	0.008	-0.013	0.024	-0.008
14 <i>MR Cong. (FCT)</i>	0.007	-0.014	-0.003	-0.032	-0.013	-0.001
15 <i>IRC Cong. (FCT)</i>	-0.019	-0.006	0.079	-0.129	-0.016	-0.021
16 <i>Struct. Cong. (CGR)</i>	-0.024	-0.001	0.124	<b>-0.196</b>	0.035	0.055
17 <i>Geo. Cong. (CGR)</i>	0.004	-0.034	0.094	-0.064	0.002	-0.045
18 <i>MR Cong. (CGR)</i>	0.007	-0.014	-0.003	-0.032	-0.012	-0.001
19 <i>IRC Cong. (CGR)</i>	-0.063	0.010	0.058	-0.051	0.039	0.013
	7	8	9	10	11	12
7 <i>Team Load</i>	-					
8 <i>Programming Exp.</i>	-0.012	-				
9 <i>Tenure</i>	0.011	<b>0.266</b>	-			
10 <i>Component Exp.</i>	0.018	<b>0.161</b>	<b>0.245</b>	-		
11 <i>One Location</i>	0.010	0.012	-0.022	0.041	-	
12 <i>Struct. Cong. (FCT)</i>	0.031	-0.021	-0.052	-0.038	0.049	-
13 <i>Geo. Cong. (FCT)</i>	-0.009	-0.005	0.003	-0.003	0.087	<b>0.127</b>
14 <i>MR Cong. (FCT)</i>	-0.062	-0.004	-0.009	0.007	-0.040	0.033
15 <i>IRC Cong. (FCT)</i>	-0.044	-0.003	-0.022	-0.011	-0.003	0.028
16 <i>Struct. Cong.(CGR)</i>	-0.062	-0.021	-0.053	-0.003	0.059	0.041
17 <i>Geo. Cong. (CGR)</i>	-0.085	-0.004	-0.016	-0.010	0.072	0.015
18 <i>MR Cong.(CGR)</i>	-0.051	-0.014	-0.093	-0.039	-0.021	0.032
19 <i>IRC Cong.(CGR)</i>	-0.029	-0.008	0.002	0.001	-0.008	0.021
	13	14	15	16	17	18
13 <i>Geo. Cong. (FCT)</i>	-					
14 <i>MR Cong. (FCT)</i>	0.017	-				
15 <i>IRC Cong. (FCT)</i>	0.005	0.009	-			
16 <i>Struct. Cong.(CGR)</i>	0.009	0.009	0.027	-		
17 <i>Geo. Cong. (CGR)</i>	0.035	0.004	0.041	<b>0.188</b>	-	
18 <i>MR Cong.(CGR)</i>	0.032	0.039	0.001	0.021	0.044	-
19 <i>IRC Cong.(CGR)</i>	0.003	0.002	0.014	0.064	0.073	0.019

## 5. Results

We performed several linear regression analyses to assess the effect of the congruence

measures on the resolution time of modification requests. As discussed in section 4, two different methods, FCT and CGRAPH, were used to identifying technical dependencies which resulted in two sets of congruence measures. We first discuss the results of the analyses done using the congruence measures based on the FCT method. Table 3 shows the results from the OLS regressions. Model I is a baseline regression model which only considers the control factors. Consistent with previous empirical work in software engineering, factors such as the size of the modification to the code, familiarity with the software components, and general programming experience are significant elements that affect resolution time of MRs [20, 28]. Task-specific characteristics such as temporal dependencies with other modification requests and the priority of the task are associated with an increase in development time. As it has been reported in previous research [20, 28], the results also show that when developers are geographically distributed, the amount of time required to resolve modification requests is likely to increase. The coefficients from model I also suggest that time, captured by the variable *Release*, had no statistically significant effect. Since the *Release* measure is in fact a categorical variable, we also examined its impact using two dichotomous variables to represent the four possible values. The results were identical to defining *Release* as an integer from 1 to 4 to represent the four releases of the product.

**Table 3: Effects on Resolution Time (FCT method)**

	Model I	Model II	Model III
<i>(Intercept)</i>	4.81**	4.63**	4.48**
<i>Temporal Dependency</i>	0.59**	0.59**	0.59**
<i>Priority</i>	-0.40**	-0.41**	-0.40**
<i>Re-assignment</i>	0.01	0.01	0.01
<i>Customer MR</i>	0.09	0.10	0.09
<i>Release</i>	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03
<i>Change Size (log)</i>	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**
<i>Team Load</i>	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
<i>Multiple Locations</i>	0.13**	0.13**	0.13**
<i>Programming Experience</i>	-0.17**	-0.17**	-0.17**
<i>Tenure</i>	-0.01+	-0.01+	-0.01+
<i>Component Experience (log)</i>	-0.07**	-0.07**	-0.07**
<i>Structural Congruence</i>		-0.18*	-0.14*
<i>Geographical Congruence</i>		-0.02*	-0.04*
<i>MR Congruence</i>		-0.06*	-0.05*
<i>IRC Congruence</i>		-0.21*	-0.21*
<i>Multiple Locations X MR Congruence</i>			0.13
<i>Multiple Locations X IRC Congruence</i>			-0.27*
N	2375	2375	2375
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.718	0.819	0.831

(+ p < 0.10, \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01)

Model II introduces the measures of congruence in the analysis. The results show statistically significant effects on all the congruence measures computed using the FCT method. The estimated coefficients of the congruence measures have negative values which are associated

with a reduction in resolution time. The results highlight the important role of congruence on task performance as well as the complementary nature of all communication paths. Structural congruence is associated with shorter development times suggesting that when coordination requirements are contained within a formal team and appropriate communication paths exists, task performance increases. Geographical congruence had a positive effect on resolution time, consistent with past research that argued distance has detrimental effects on communication (see [28] and [38] for reviews). Communication congruence based on the interactions amongst engineers through the MR reports as well as IRC were also statistically significant suggesting the usefulness of these tools in facilitating coordination among individuals that belong to different teams and could potentially be geographically distributed.

Finally, model III includes several interaction factors to assess whether the role of congruence changes when the groups involved in a particular MR are geographically distributed. The results show a statistically significance impact only for the Multiple Locations X IRC term. The negative coefficient suggests that when developers are geographically distributed the impact of IRC congruence on resolution time is higher above and beyond the direct effect.

**Table 4: Effects on Resolution Time (CGRAPH method)**

	Model I	Model IV	Model V
<i>(Intercept)</i>	4.81**	4.88**	4.81**
<i>Temporal Dependency</i>	0.59**	0.59**	0.59**
<i>Priority</i>	-0.40**	-0.40**	-0.40**
<i>Re-assignment</i>	0.01	0.03	0.01
<i>Customer MR</i>	0.09	0.19	0.09
<i>Release</i>	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02
<i>Change Size (log)</i>	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**
<i>Team Load</i>	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
<i>Multiple Locations</i>	0.13**	0.12**	0.13**
<i>Programming Experience</i>	-0.17**	-0.17**	-0.17**
<i>Tenure</i>	-0.01+	-0.01+	-0.01+
<i>Component Experience (log)</i>	-0.07**	-0.07**	-0.07**
<i>Structural Congruence</i>		-0.21+	-0.23+
<i>Geographical Congruence</i>		-0.11*	-0.03*
<i>MR Congruence</i>		0.41	0.48
<i>IRC Congruence</i>		-0.01	-0.02
<i>Multiple Locations X MR Congruence</i>			0.05
<i>Multiple Locations X IRC Congruence</i>			-0.41
N	2375	2375	2375
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.718	0.731	0.722

(<sup>+</sup> p < 0.10, \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01)

Table 4 shows the results of our analysis obtained when the congruence measures are computed using the CGRAPH method for identifying technical dependencies. Model I is the same model reported in table 3. We observe in model IV that only geographical congruence is statistically significant and its coefficient is negative indicating a reduction in the resolution time as

congruence increases. Structural congruence was marginally significant. Finally, Model V shows that interaction terms were not statistically significant. In sum, these results suggest that the two dependency identification methods, FCT and CGRAPH, are capturing different sets of technical dependencies that impact the development tasks differently.

## 6. Discussion

This study has significant contributions to the software engineering and management of product development organizations literatures. First, the empirical evaluation of the congruence framework showed the importance of understanding the dynamic nature of software development. Identifying the “right” set of product dependencies that determine the relevant work dependencies and coordinating accordingly has significant impact on reducing the resolution time of modification requests. The analyses showed traditional software dependencies, such as syntactic relationships, tend to capture a relatively stable view of product dependencies that is not representative of the dynamism in product dependencies that emerges as software systems are implemented. On the other hand, logical dependencies provide a more accurate representation of the most relevant product dependencies in software development projects. The statistical analyses showed that when developers’ coordination patterns are congruent with their coordination needs, the resolution time of modification requests was, on average, reduced by 32% when considering the collective effect of all four measures of congruence. Generalizing, the empirical examination of the congruence framework and coordination patterns showed the tight relationship between team design, coordination and performance providing an important contribution to the organizational literature.

The view of coordination presented in this paper extends traditional conceptualizations of coordination by taking a fine-grain level of analysis to better examine the mismatches between dependencies and coordination activities. Those gaps could have major implications for the productivity and the quality of the output of product development organizations [15, 20, 28, 42] and for non-routine intellectual work more generally. Our empirical results suggest that our measure of socio-technical congruence represents a useful framework to examine how coordination needs that are not satisfied impact software development productivity. When the developers coordinate their task with the relevant set of workers, productivity increases. Individuals have difficulties identifying task interdependencies that are not obvious or explicit [42] and the developers’ ability to recognize dependencies diminish as coordination requirements change over time [27]. For these reasons, volatility in the coordination requirements represents an important obstacle for product development organizations, particularly, when work groups are geographically distributed. Collaborative tools and managerial techniques that utilize the congruence framework could play an important role in reducing the gap between recognized and actual interdependencies.

It is also important to highlight some of the limitations of the work reported in this paper. First, the measures proposed as part of the congruence framework are contingent on assumptions about the software development processes used in the development organization as well as usage patterns of tools that assist the development effort such as defect tracking and version control systems. One key assumption is the possibility to identify (1) the set of source code files that were changed as part of a modification request and (2) the developers that made those changes. For instance, a policy of source code file ownership by particular developers could potentially

bias the congruence measures. Developers that own a particular source code might appear as participants in the development effort associated with a modification request, however, that might not be the case. In other cases, such as open source projects, the nature of the work in certain project is such that the information about which files changed together as part of a modification request is not easily reconstructible in a reliable way. The alternative approach of computing coordination requirements based on syntactic relationships also has its limitations. The method relies on tools that can reliably extract the dependency information among software modules for a specific programming language. More importantly, projects that use multiple programming languages will represent a challenge, particularly, in terms of determining syntactic dependencies that involve modules written in different programming languages.

Another limitation of the work presented in this paper is a potential concern for external validity. Our analysis examined only one system with particular technical properties that might be conducive to support the results found by the analysis. However, the processes and tools used by the development organization are commonplace in the software industry. Moreover, the general technical characteristics of the system are similar to other types of distributed systems developed into products in the software industry. Hence, we think the results are generalizable, particularly, in the context of development organizations responsible for delivering complex software systems.

## **6.1 Future Work**

### **6.1.1 Enhancing coordination needs awareness**

Collaboration, coordination, and task awareness tools are a natural application for the coordination requirements measure presented in this paper. Part of the research effort of the CSCW community has been on improving traditional tools, such as email and instant messaging, which have become an integral part of work in the vast majority of organizations [3, 45]. For instance, the coordination requirements measure could provide a way of identifying the email exchanges that are more relevant given the task interdependencies among individuals. This information would enable tools to present an enhanced task management experience by, for instance, prioritizing to-do-lists and generating reminders to respond to task-specific emails based on the coordination requirements. This email sorting approach could be thought as a task-specific alternative to other social-based sorting techniques such as the one proposed by Fisher and colleagues [21]. A more recent set of tools, such as sidebars [7] and productivity assistants [24], would also benefit from the congruence framework. These types of tools focus on activity-centric collaboration and, as argued by Geyer and colleagues [24], the majority of the tools assume user intervention in terms of deciding what type of information to make part of the sidebar. The congruence framework would provide an automatic mechanism to identify people of interest giving a particular set of task dependencies among the workers.

In the context of large software development projects, identifying the appropriate person to interact with and coordinate interdependent activities is not a straightforward task. In fact, it is well established that software developers have serious difficulties identifying the right set of individuals to coordinate with [17, 25]. The coordination requirement measure provides a mechanism to augment awareness tools that provide real-time information regarding the likely set of workers that a particular individual might need to communicate with. For instance, integrated development environments, such as Eclipse [18] or Jazz [32], could use the coordination requirement information to recommend a dynamic “coordination buddy list” every time particular parts of the software are modified. In this way, the developer becomes aware of

the set of engineers that modified parts of the system that are interdependent with the one the developer is working on. The concept of the “buddy list” in communication and collaboration tools is not a new idea. However, the novel contribution is to construct the “buddy list” from accurate estimates of the set of individuals more likely to be relevant to a particular developer in relations to the work dependencies, information which is captured by the coordination requirements measure.

#### 6.1.2 Identification of coordination requirements in early stages of software projects

The empirical examination of the congruence framework showed the relevance of matching coordination activity with the fine-grained coordination needs that emerge in the development of software systems. However, the measure of congruence, as computed in the study, relies on archival data to capture the information about product dependencies, task assignments as well as coordination activity carried out by the development organization. Our promising results highlight the importance of identifying potential coordination needs as early as possible in the development process in order to provide the development organization with the appropriate communication and coordination mechanisms. Certainly such a task is a challenging one.

In early stages of a project, only architectural or high level design specifications of a system are available. Those documents by definition abstract a significant portion of the technical details of software systems in order to understand the overall attributes and relationships among the main components of a system. A higher level of abstraction could potentially hinder the identification of relevant technical dependencies and consequently, important coordination requirements. However, the use of standardized design and modeling languages, such as UML, might represent a way of overcoming these challenges. Researchers have proposed standard graphical representations of software architectures that capture different technical aspects of a software system [12]. Examples of those graphical representations are the *module* view and the *components-and-connectors* view. Then, one approach would be to construct a *coordination* view of the architectures that combines the product’s technical dependencies with relationships among the organizational units responsible for carrying out the development work. In order to generate such representations, methods of identifying relevant dependencies from the technically focused views of the architecture are to be devised. One potentially promising approach is to synthesize the dependencies represented in the various types of UML diagrams (e.g. class diagrams, sequence diagrams, collaboration diagrams, etc) into a single set of technical relationships among modules. Such a method could be able to identify logical relationships among parts of the systems which, as shown in this paper, are an important factor driving the work dependencies in software development organizations.

## 7. References

- [1] Allen, T.J. (1977). *Managing the Flow of Technology*. MIT Press.
- [2] Baldwin, C.Y. and Clark, K.B. (2000). *Design Rules: The Power of Modularity*. MIT Press.
- [3] Bellotti, V., Ducheneaut, N., Howard, M., Smith, I. (2003). Taking email to task: the design and evaluation of a task management centered email tool. In *Proceedings International Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI’03)*, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.
- [4] Bass, M., Bass, L., Herbsleb, J.D. and Cataldo, M (2006). Architectural Misalignment: an Experience Report. To appear in the *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Software Architectures (WICSA ’07)*.

- [5] Brooks, F. (1995). *The Mythical Man-Month: Essays on Software Engineering (Anniversary Edition)*. Addison Wesley.
- [6] Burton, R.M. and Obel, B. *Strategic Organizational Diagnosis and Design*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Norwell, MA, 1998.
- [7] Cadiz, J.J., Venolia, G.D., Jancke, G., Gupta, A. (2002). Designing and deploying an information awareness interface. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW'02)*, New York, NY.
- [8] Carley, K.M. (2002). Smart Agents and Organizations of the Future. In *Handbook of New Media*. Edited by Lievrouw, L. and Livingstone, S., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [9] Carley, K.M and Ren, Y. Tradeoffs between Performance and Adaptability for C<sup>3</sup>I Architectures. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium*, Annapolis, Maryland, 2001.
- [10] Cataldo, M., Wagstrom, P, Herbsleb, J.D. and Carley, K.M (2006). Identification of Coordination Requirements: Implications for the Design of Collaboration and Awareness Tools. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW'06)*, Banff, Alberta, Canada.
- [11] Cataldo, M., Bass, M, Herbsleb, J.D. and Bass, L (2007). On Coordination Mechanism in Global Software Development. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Global Software Engineering*, Munich, Germany.
- [12] Clements, P., Bachman, F., Bass, L., Garlan, D., Ivers, J., Little, R., Nord, R. and Stafford, J. (2002). *Documenting Software Architectures: Views and Beyond*. Addison-Wesley, New York, NY.
- [13] Conway, M.E. (1968). How do committees invent? *Datamation*, Vol. 14, No. 5, 28-31.
- [14] Curtis, B. (1981). *Human Factors in Software Development*. Ed. by Curtis, B., IEEE Computer Society.
- [15] Curtis, B., Kransner, H. and Iscoe, N. (1988). A field study of software design process for large systems. *Communications of ACM*, Vol. 31, No. 11, pp. 1268-1287.
- [16] de Souza, C.R.B. (2005). *On the Relationship between Software Dependencies and Coordination: Field Studies and Tool Support*. Ph.D. dissertation, Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences, University of California, Irvine.
- [17] de Souza, C.R.B., Redmiles, D., Cheng, L., Millen, D. and Patterson, J. (2004). How a Good Software Practice Thwarts Collaboration – The multiple roles of APIs in Software Development. In *Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> Conference on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE '04)*, Newport Beach, CA, 221-230.
- [18] Eclipse Project (2008). <http://www.eclipse.org>. URL accessed on February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008.
- [19] Eppinger, S.D., Whitney, D.E., Smith, R.P. and Gebala, D.A. (1994). A Model-Based Method for Organizing Tasks in Product Development. *Research in Engineering Design*, Vol. 6, pp. 1-13.
- [20] Espinosa, J.A. (2002). *Shared Mental Models and Coordination in Large-Scale, Distributed Software Development*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie Mellon University.

- [21] Fisher, D., Brush, A.J., Gleave, E. and Smith M.A. (2006). Revisiting Whittaker and Sidner's "Email Overload": Ten Years Later. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW'06)*, Banff, Alberta, Canada.
- [22] Gall, H. Hajek, K. and Jazayeri, M. (1998). Detection of Logical Coupling Based on Product Release History. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM '98)*, Bethesda, Maryland.
- [23] Garcia, A., et al. (2007). Assessment of Contemporary Modularization Techniques, ACOM'07 Workshop Report. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, Vol. 35, No. 5, pp. 31-37.
- [24] Geyer, W., Brownholtz, B., Muller, M., Dugan, C., Wilcox, E. and Millen, D.R. (2007). Malibu Personal Productivity Assistant. In *Proceedings International Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI'07) – Work in Progress Section*, San Jose, CA.
- [25] Grinter, R.E., Herbsleb, J.D. and Perry, D.E. (1999). The Geography of Coordination Dealing with Distance in R&D Work. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Supporting Group Work (GROUP'99)*, Phoenix, Arizona.
- [26] Hassan, A.E. and Holt, R.C. (2004). C-REX: An Evolutionary Code Extractor for C. *CSER Meeting*. Canada, 2004
- [27] Henderson, R.M. and Clarck, K.B. (1990). Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, pp. 9-30.
- [28] Herbsleb, J.D. and Mockus, A. (2003). An Empirical Study of Speed and Communication in Globally Distributed Software Development. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp.
- [29] Herbsleb, J.D., Mockus, A. and Roberts, J.A. 2006. Collaboration in Software Engineering Projects: A Theory of Coordination. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems (Milwaukee, Wisconsin)*. ICIS'06.
- [30] Horwitz, S., Reps, T., and Binkley, D. (1990). Interprocedural slicing using dependence graphs. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 26-60.
- [31] Hutchens, D.H. and Basili, V.R. (1985). System Structure Analysis: Clustering with Data Bindings. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, Vol. 11, No. 8, pp. 749-757.
- [32] Jazz Project (2008). <http://jazz.net/pub/index.jsp>. URL accessed on February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008.
- [33] Krackhardt, D. and Carley, K.M. (1998). A PCANS Model of Structure in Organization. In *Proceedings of the 1998 International Symposium on Command and Control Research and Technology*, pp.113-119.
- [34] Kraut, R.E. and Streeter, L.A. (1995). Coordination in Software Development. *Communications of ACM*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 69-81.
- [35] Leffingwell, D. and Widrig, D. (2003). *Managing Software Requirements: A Use Case Approach, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Addison-Wesley.
- [36] Levchuk, G.M. et al. (2004). Normative Design of Project-Based Organizations – Part III: Modeling Congruent, Robust and Adaptive Organizations. *IEEE Trans. on Systems, Man & Cybernetics*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 337-350.

- [37]Murphy, G.C., Notkin, D., Griswold, W.G. and Lan, E.S. (1998). An empirical study of call graph extractors. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering Methodology*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 158-191.
- [38]Olson, G.M. and Olson, J.S. (2000). Distance Matters. *Human-Computer Interaction*, Vol. 15, No. 2 & 3, pp. 139-178,
- [39]Parnas, D.L. (1972). On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Communications of ACM*, Vol. 15, No. 12, 1053-1058.
- [40]Selby, R.W. and Basili, V.R. (1991). Analyzing Error-Prone System Structure. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 141-152.
- [41]Simon, H.A. (1962). The Architecture of Complexity. *In Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 106, No. 6, pp. 467-482.
- [42]Sosa, M.E., Eppinger, S.D., and Rowles, C.M. (2004). The Misalignment of Product Architecture and Organizational Structure in Complex Product Development. *Management Science*, Vol. 50, No. 12, pp. 1674-1689
- [43]Sullivan, K.J., Griswold, W.G., Cai, Y, and Hallen, B. (2001). The Structure and Value of Modularity in Software Design. *In Proceedings of the International Conference on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE '01)*, Vienna, Austria, 99-108
- [44]von Hippel, E. (1990). Task Partitioning: An Innovation Process Variable. *Research Policy*, Vol. 19, pp. 407-418.
- [45]Wattenberg, M., Rohall, S., Gruen, D. and Kerr, B. (2005). E-Mail Research: Targeting the Enterprise. *Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, Vol. 20, pp. 139-162.
- [46]Yassine, A., Joglekar, N., Braha, D., Eppinger, S. And Whitney, D. (2003). Information Hiding in Product Development: The Design Churn Effect. *Research in Engineering Design*, Vol. 14, pp. 145-161