

**A Framework for Assisting the Design of Effective  
Implementation Strategies for Software Process Improvement**

Mahmood Khan Niazi (B.Sc., M.Sc., MPhil)

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF  
**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**University of Technology Sydney  
Faculty of Information Technology**

**2004**

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated and referenced in the thesis.

**Signature of Candidate**

Production Note:  
Signature removed prior to publication.

---

## **Acknowledgements**

All thanks and praise is due to Almighty Allah for granting me the opportunity of writing this thesis.

This thesis was completed with the support of a range of people and organizations. I must appreciate the help and support of my supervisors Associate Professor David Wilson, Associate Professor Didar Zowghi and Dr. Bernard Wong, who devoted an enormous amount of their busy time to me during the entire course of the study. Specifically, I would like to thank David and Didar for their help, guidance and support during this period. I am thankful to them for showing me the big picture first and then pulling me towards very good research topic. Especially, their time at the final stages is something exceptional. Without their help, encouragement and support, this work would have never reached this stage.

The help and support of my friends Mr. Ismail Sabir, Mr Samiaji Sarosa, Ms Norazlin Yusop, Ms Nurmuliani, Mr Chad Coulin, Mr Dalil Khan, Dr. Zaki, Mrs Alia Shahid, Mr Shahid Javaid, Mr. Misbah rehman, Mr. Hakim Jan, Mr. Inamullah Khan and Mr Tariq Khan for their willingness to share my research ideas. Special thanks to Mr. Asif Amin for his great help to complete this thesis. I am thankful to companies and SPI experts who participated in this research. I am also thankful to Dr. Tray Hall, Dr. Sarah Beecham and Dr. Nathan Baddoo for their help.

Finally, I would like to thank my wonderful wife Maryam and kids Azam and Sarah for their patience and support during the lengthy process of this study. I am also grateful to

my parents, brothers (Dr. Salahuddin Khan, Professor Javed Khan, Khushnood Khan, Ziauddin Khan and Jamshed Khan) uncle Abdullah Khan and other family members for their best wishes, prayers and support.

<b>A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSISTING THE DESIGN OF EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES FOR SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>XIII</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>XIV</b>
<b>LIST OF ACRONYM.....</b>	<b>XV</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....</b>	<b>XVI</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>XVII</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 THE PROBLEM STATEMENT AND MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND AIMS OF RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.4 RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.5 THESIS ROADMAP .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2 SOFTWARE QUALITY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3 SOFTWARE PROCESS .....</b>	<b>13</b>

<b>2.4 SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.5 APPROACHES TO SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
2.5.1 CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL (CMM) .....	16
2.5.2 CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL INTEGRATION (CMMI) .....	19
2.5.3 SPICE (ISO/IEC 15504).....	22
2.5.4 ISO 9000.....	24
2.5.5 TRILLIUM.....	25
2.5.6 BOOTSTRAP.....	25
<b>2.6 LIMITATIONS OF SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>2.7 EMPIRICAL STUDIES OF SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>2.8 LIMITATIONS WITH EMPIRICAL STUDIES .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>2.9 KEY EXPERIENCE REPORTS OF SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>31</b>
2.9.1 HUGHES.....	32
2.9.2 MOTOROLA .....	32
2.9.3 OKLAHOMA CITY AIR LOGISTICS CENTRE .....	33
2.9.4 SCHLUMBERGER.....	34
2.9.5 SPACE SHUTTLE SOFTWARE PROJECT .....	35
2.9.6 TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES .....	35
<b>2.10 LIMITATIONS WITH KEY EXPERIENCE REPORTS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>2.11 SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>39</b>

<b>3.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>3.2 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>3.3 QUALITATIVE VERSUS QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS.....</b>	<b>42</b>
3.3.1 QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS .....	42
3.3.2 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS.....	43
<b>3.4 CHOOSING A RESEARCH METHOD .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>3.5 RESEARCH DESIGN .....</b>	<b>46</b>
3.5.1 SAMPLE PROFILE .....	46
3.5.2 DATA COLLECTION METHODS .....	48
3.5.2.1 <i>Literature Review</i> .....	48
3.5.2.2 <i>Application of literature review in this research</i> .....	48
3.5.2.3 <i>CSFs interviews</i> .....	51
3.5.2.4 <i>Application of CSF interviews in this research</i> .....	52
3.5.3 DATA ANALYSIS METHODS .....	55
3.5.3.1 <i>Frequency analysis</i> .....	56
3.5.3.2 <i>Application of frequency analysis in this research</i> .....	56
3.5.3.3 <i>Content analysis</i> .....	57
3.5.3.4 <i>Application of content analysis in this research</i> .....	60
<b>3.6 LIMITATION OF RESEARCH DESIGN .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>3.7 UTS ETHICS REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>3.8 SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>63</b>

<b>CHAPTER FOUR: EMPIRICAL STUDY OF CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS AND CRITICAL BARRIERS FOR SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT IMPLEMENTATION.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>4.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>4.2 CHAPTER AIM.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>4.3 CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR (CSF) CONCEPT .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>4.4 CSFS IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>66</b>
4.4.1 HIGHER MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....	66
4.4.2 STAFF INVOLVEMENT .....	67
4.4.3 TRAINING AND MENTORING.....	69
4.4.4 STAFF TIME AND RESOURCES.....	70
4.4.5 CREATING PROCESS ACTION TEAMS/ CHANGE AGENTS AND OPINION LEADERS ...	71
<b>4.5 CRITICAL BARRIERS (CBS) IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE....</b>	<b>72</b>
4.5.1 LACK OF RESOURCES.....	72
4.5.2 TIME PRESSURE .....	73
4.5.3 INEXPERIENCED STAFF/LACK OF KNOWLEDGE.....	74
4.5.4 ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS .....	74
4.5.5 SPI GETS IN THE WAY OF REAL WORK.....	75
4.5.6 STAFF TURNOVER .....	75
<b>4.6 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS (CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS).....</b>	<b>76</b>
4.6.1 <i>Critical Success Factors identified through literature.....</i>	76
4.6.2 <i>Critical Success Factors identified through an empirical study.....</i>	77
4.6.3 <i>Comparison of two data sets.....</i>	78

<b>4.7 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS (CRITICAL BARRIERS)</b> .....	<b>83</b>
4.7.1 <i>Critical Barriers identified through literature</i> .....	84
4.7.2 <i>Critical Barriers identified through an empirical study</i> .....	84
4.7.3 <i>Comparison of two data sets</i> .....	85
<b>4.8 CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>87</b>
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSISTING THE DESIGN OF EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES FOR SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT</b> .....	<b>91</b>
<b>5.1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>91</b>
<b>5.2 FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT PROCESS</b> .....	<b>92</b>
<b>5.3 SPI IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK</b> .....	<b>95</b>
<b>5.4 AN ASSESSMENT COMPONENT</b> .....	<b>98</b>
5.4.1 MATURITY STAGE DIMENSION .....	100
5.4.2 CSFs AND CBS DIMENSION .....	103
5.4.3 ASSESSMENT DIMENSION.....	107
<b>5.5 AN IMPLEMENTATION COMPONENT</b> .....	<b>109</b>
5.5.1 SPI IMPLEMENTATION PHASE DIMENSION.....	111
5.5.1.1 <i>Awareness.</i> .....	111
5.5.1.2 <i>Learning.</i> .....	112
5.5.1.3 <i>Pilot implementation.</i> .....	112
5.5.1.4 <i>SPI implementation action plan.</i> .....	113
5.5.1.5 <i>Implementation across the organization.</i> .....	114
5.5.1.6 <i>Maintenance.</i> .....	115

5.5.2 SPI IMPLEMENTATION CSFs AND CBS DIMENSION .....	115
<b>5.6 SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>CHAPTER SIX EVALUATION OF SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>6.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>6.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA.....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>6.3 LIMITATIONS OF EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>6.4 EVALUATION THROUGH CASE STUDIES .....</b>	<b>121</b>
6.4.1 CASE STUDY AT COMPANY A .....	123
6.4.1.1 <i>Assessment results at Company A</i> .....	124
6.4.1.2 <i>Feedback at Company A</i> .....	126
6.4.2 CASE STUDY AT COMPANY B .....	129
6.4.2.1 <i>Assessment results at Company B</i> .....	130
6.4.2.2 <i>Feedback at Company B</i> .....	131
6.4.3 CASE STUDY AT COMPANY C .....	132
6.4.3.1 <i>Assessment results at Company C</i> .....	133
6.4.3.2 <i>Feedback at Company C</i> .....	134
6.4.4 DISCUSSION.....	135
6.4.5 CASE STUDIES LESSONS LEARNED .....	138
<b>6.5 EVALUATION THROUGH EXPERT PANEL REVIEW PROCESS.....</b>	<b>140</b>
6.5.1 EASE OF LEARNING.....	142
6.5.2 USER SATISFACTION .....	143
6.5.3 STRUCTURE OF IMM .....	144

<b>6.6 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>7.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>7.2 SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL RESULTS.....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>7.3 SUMMARY OF DELIVERABLES.....</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>7.4 CRITIQUE OF METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>155</b>
7.4.1 THE USE OF PERCEPTION DATA ONLY.....	156
7.4.2 SAMPLE CATEGORISATION.....	157
7.4.3 USING CLOSE-ENDED QUESTIONS INSTEAD OF OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS.....	158
7.4.4 GROUP INTERVIEWS AS OPPOSED TO ONE-TO-ONE INTERVIEWS.....	159
7.4.5 EVALUATION USING THREE CASE STUDIES.....	159
7.4.6 THE EXPERT PANEL REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE.....	160
<b>7.5 FURTHER WORK.....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>7.6 REFLECTION ON RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>7.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS.....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANT COMPANY INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: LETTER OF REQUEST FOR CSF INTERVIEWS.....</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: EXPERIENCE REPORTS, CASE STUDIES AND PAPERS.....</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: LIST OF CSF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF CSFS AND CBS IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>183</b>

<b>APPENDIX F: CSFS IN DIFFERENT PERIODS OF TIME.....</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>APPENDIX G: CSFS AND CBS IDENTIFIED BY DIFFERENT GROUP OF PRACTITIONERS .....</b>	<b>192</b>
<b>APPENDIX H: ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (SOURCE (DASKALANTONAKIS, 1994)).....</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>APPENDIX I: LIST OF PRACTICES FOR CSFS AND CBS.....</b>	<b>199</b>
<b>APPENDIX J: EXPERT PANEL QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>203</b>
<b>APPENDIX K: ASSESSMENT DONE AT COMPANY A .....</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>APPENDIX L: ASSESSMENT DONE AT COMPANY B.....</b>	<b>214</b>
<b>APPENDIX M: ASSESSMENT DONE AT COMPANY C.....</b>	<b>218</b>
<b>APPENDIX N: THE LIST OF PUBLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>222</b>

## List of Tables

TABLE 2.1 MAJOR VIEWS OF QUALITY .....	11
TABLE 2.2 SPICE CAPABILITY LEVELS AND PROCESS ATTRIBUTES .....	23
TABLE 4.1 CSFs IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE.....	76
TABLE 4.2 CSFs IDENTIFIED THROUGH AN EMPIRICAL STUDY .....	78
TABLE 4.3 CSFs IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE AND CSF INTERVIEWS .....	81
TABLE 4.4 CRITICAL BARRIERS IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE.....	84
TABLE 4.5 CRITICAL BARRIERS IDENTIFIED THROUGH AN EMPIRICAL STUDY .....	85
TABLE 4.6 CRITICAL BARRIERS IDENTIFIED THROUGH LITERATURE AND AN EMPIRICAL STUDY .....	87
TABLE 4.7 SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CSFs AND CBS) FROM LITERATURE AND INTERVIEWS .....	90
TABLE 5.1 CATEGORIES OF CSFs AND CBS .....	105
TABLE 5.2 CSFs AND CBS DIMENSION.....	106
TABLE 5.3 FACTOR EVALUATION SHEET.....	109
TABLE 5.4 SPI IMPLEMENTATION CSFs AND CBS DIMENSION.....	117
TABLE 6.1 IMPLEMENTATION SCORES FOR EACH CSF AND CB AT COMPANY A.....	126
TABLE 6.2 IMPLEMENTATION SCORES FOR EACH CSF AND CB AT COMPANY B.....	131
TABLE 6.3 IMPLEMENTATION SCORES FOR EACH CSF AND CB AT COMPANY C.....	133
TABLE 6.4 SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF COMPANIES A, B AND C .....	136
TABLE 6.5 SPI EXPERTS' PROFILE .....	141
TABLE C.1 CSFs ACROSS PRACTITIONER GROUPS.....	194
TABLE C.2 CRITICAL BARRIERS ACROSS PRACTITIONER GROUPS.....	196

## List of Figures

FIGURE 2.1 THE KEY PROCESS AREAS BY MATURITY LEVEL (PAULK ET AL, 1993) .....	18
FIGURE 2.2 CMMI MODEL WITH STAGED REPRESENTATION (SEI, 2002A).....	21
FIGURE 2.3 CMMI MODEL WITH CONTINUOUS REPRESENTATION (SEI, 2002A).....	21
FIGURE 3.1 RESEARCH STAGES AND ACTIVITIES.....	40
FIGURE 4.1 A SUMMARY OF CSFs STATED BY LITERATURE AND INTERVIEWS. THE CSFs ARE LISTED AS A BULLET POINT. THE AREA IN WHICH BOTH CATEGORIES OVERLAP REPRESENTS COMMON FACTORS .....	83
FIGURE 4.2 A SUMMARY OF CBs STATED BY LITERATURE AND INTERVIEWS. THE CBs ARE LISTED AS A BULLET POINT. THE AREA IN WHICH BOTH CATEGORIES OVERLAP REPRESENTS COMMON BARRIERS.....	86
FIGURE 5.1 ACTIVITIES INVOLVED IN BUILDING THE SPI-IF AS CONDUCTED IN THIS RESEARCH .....	93
FIGURE 5.2 SPI IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK .....	97
FIGURE 5.3 SPI IMPLEMENTATION MATURITY MODEL STRUCTURE (ADAPTED FROM (PAULK <i>ET AL</i> , 1993; SEI, 2002A)).....	99
FIGURE 5.4 MATURITY STAGE DIMENSION AS PROPOSED BY THIS RESEARCH .....	102
FIGURE 5.5 SPI IMPLEMENTATION MODEL .....	110
FIGURE 5.6 SPI IMPLEMENTATION PHASE DIMENSION .....	113
FIGURE 7.1 SPI-IF ASSISTING THE DESIGN OF SPI IMPLEMENTATION INITIATIVES .....	153

## List of Acronym

CBs	Critical Barrier
CMM	Capability Maturity Model
CMMI	Capability Maturity Model Integration
CSFs	Critical Success Factors
IMM	Implementation Maturity Model
ISO	International Standard Organization
IT	Information Technology
KPA	Key Process Area
PA	Process Area
SCE	Software Contractor Evaluation
SEI	Software Engineering Institute
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPA	Software Process Assessment
SPI	Software Process Improvement
SPI-IF	SPI Implementation Framework
SPI-IM	SPI Implementation Model

## **Dedication**

To my uncle Abdul Saboor Khan and my parents, Ghulam Rasool Niazi and Zakia Khanum, for making this possible...

## **Abstract**

This research addresses issues relating to the implementation of software process improvement (SPI) initiatives. A number of advances have been made in the development of software process improvement (SPI) standards and models, e.g. Capability Maturity Model (CMM), more recently CMMI, and ISO's SPICE. However, these advances have not been matched by equal advances in the adoption of these standards and models in software development which has resulted in limited success for many SPI efforts. The current problem with SPI is not a lack of standards or models, but rather a lack of an effective strategy to successfully implement these standards or models.

Despite the importance of the SPI implementation process, little empirical research has been carried out on developing ways in which to effectively implement SPI initiatives. I have focused on SPI implementation issues and designed three individual components in order to assist SPI practitioners in the design of effective SPI implementation initiatives. I have combined individual components under one SPI implementation framework (SPI-IF) using a bottom-up approach. The framework is based on results drawn from the SPI literature and an empirical study I have carried out. In the design of SPI-IF, the concept of critical success factors (CSFs) is used and extended. Thirty-four CSF interviews were conducted with Australian practitioners. In addition, 50 research articles (published experience reports and case studies) were selected and analysed in order to identify factors that play positive or negative roles in SPI implementation. The SPI-IF has three components: SPI implementation factors component, assessment

component and implementation component. It provides a practical structure with which to assess and implement SPI implementation initiatives.

In order to evaluate the software process improvement implementation framework, two practical evaluations were undertaken: three case studies and an expert panel review process. The case study method was used because this method provides valuable insights for problem solving, evaluation and strategy in the real world environment. An “expert panel review” process was also conducted in order to seek the opinions of SPI experts about the structure and components of the SPI-IF.

In order to provide more confidence in this study, three separate case studies were conducted at different companies. The results of the case studies showed that the SPI-IF is not only significant in the theoretical sense but also significant in a real world environment. Successful completion of the three case studies demonstrates the use of the SPI-IF in the real world environment. All the participants who used the SPI-IF were fully satisfied with the assessment results and overall performance of the framework.

The results of the expert panel review process showed that the SPI experts’ general impression about ‘ease of learning’, ‘user satisfaction’ and ‘structure of the SPI-IF’ was positive. Overall, the experts were fully satisfied with the different components of SPI-IF. All the experts considered this piece of work as useful for the SPI practitioners. They have also confirmed the SPI-IF as a valuable framework that has the potential to assist SPI practitioners in the design of SPI implementation initiatives.