



Empirical evaluation of a decision support model for adopting software product line engineering



Eray Tüzün^{a,*}, Bedir Tekinerdogan^b, Mert Emin Kalender^c, Semih Bilgen^d

^a Middle East Technical University, Informatics Institute, 06800 Ankara, Turkey

^b Wageningen University, Information Technology Group, 6706 KN, Wageningen, The Netherlands

^c Microsoft Corporation, One Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052, USA

^d Yeditepe University, Computer Engineering Department, 34755 Istanbul, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 2 September 2014

Received in revised form 4 December 2014

Accepted 30 December 2014

Available online 6 January 2015

Keywords:

Software product line engineering
Software product line transition strategies
Software product line engineering
feasibility analysis
Decision support system
Systematic literature review
Case study design

ABSTRACT

Context: The software product line engineering (SPLE) community has provided several different approaches for assessing the feasibility of SPLE adoption and selecting transition strategies. These approaches usually include many rules and guidelines which are very often implicit or scattered over different publications. Hence, for the practitioners it is not always easy to select and use these rules to support the decision making process. Even in case the rules are known, the lack of automated support for storing and executing the rules seriously impedes the decision making process.

Objective: We aim to evaluate the impact of a decision support system (DSS) on decision-making in SPLE adoption. In alignment with this goal, we provide a decision support model (DSM) and the corresponding DSS.

Method: First, we apply a systematic literature review (SLR) on the existing primary studies that discuss and present approaches for analyzing the feasibility of SPLE adoption and transition strategies. Second, based on the data extraction and synthesis activities of the SLR, the required questions and rules are derived and implemented in the DSS. Third, for validation of the approach we conduct multiple case studies.

Results: In the course of the SLR, 31 primary studies were identified from which we could construct 25 aspects, 39 questions and 312 rules. We have developed the DSS tool *Transit-PL* that embodies these elements.

Conclusions: The multiple case study validation showed that the adoption of the developed DSS tool is justified to support the decision making process in SPLE adoption.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

A software product line is a set of software-intensive systems sharing a common, managed set of features that satisfy the specific needs of a particular market segment or mission and that are developed from a common set of core assets in a prescribed way [1]. Software Product Line Engineering (SPLE) is a systematic and comprehensive process that aims to develop and maintain product lines. SPLE aims to provide pro-active, pre-planned reuse at a large granularity (domain and product level) to develop applications from a core asset base.

Currently an increasing number of companies aim to adopt an SPLE approach with the goals of enhancing the quality of products, reducing time-to-market and optimizing production costs. The benefits for adopting SPLE have been extensively documented (e.g. [1–4]) and discussed in experience reports (e.g. [5–7]). On the other hand it is commonly accepted that transition to SPLE is not easy. In general, it requires large upfront investments and as such forms a serious risk if the desired return-on-investment is not achieved. To illustrate this situation, consider, for example, the following typical realistic scenario of a company:

The engineering group manager of an organization that builds simulation systems is in a junction. The organization has delivered a number of successful simulation system projects in the last few years. Even though the simulation systems have a lot of common features, traditionally these systems were implemented using a single systems development approach. The company is aware that the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: e170994@metu.edu.tr (E. Tüzün), bedir.tekinerdogan@wur.nl (B. Tekinerdogan), mertk@microsoft.com (M.E. Kalender), semih.bilgen@yeditepe.edu.tr (S. Bilgen).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/549816>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/549816>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)