

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Lecture 9: Eliciting Requirements

→ Basics of elicitation

- ↳ Why info collection is hard
- ↳ Dealing with Bias

→ A large collection of elicitation techniques:

- ↳ Background Reading
- ↳ Hard data collection
- ↳ Interviews
- ↳ Questionnaires
- ↳ Group Techniques
- ↳ Participant Observation
- ↳ Ethnomethodology
- ↳ Knowledge Elicitation Techniques

© Easterbrook 2004 2

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Difficulties of Elicitation

→ Thin spread of domain knowledge

- ↳ The knowledge might be distributed across many sources
 - It is rarely available in an explicit form (I.e. not written down)
- ↳ There will be conflicts between knowledge from different sources
 - Remember the principle of complementarity!

→ Tacit knowledge (The "say-do" problem)

- ↳ People find it hard to describe knowledge they regularly use

→ Limited Observability

- ↳ The problem owners might be too busy coping with the current system
- ↳ Presence of an observer may change the problem
 - E.g. Probe Effect: Hawthorne Effect

→ Bias

- ↳ People may not be free to tell you what you need to know
- ↳ People may not want to tell you what you need to know
 - The outcome will affect them, so they may try to influence you (hidden agendas)

© Easterbrook 2004 3

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Example

→ Loan approval department in a large bank

- ↳ The analyst is trying to elicit the rules and procedures for approving a loan

→ Why this might be difficult:

- ↳ Implicit knowledge:
 - There is no document in which the rules for approving loans are written down
- ↳ Conflicting information:
 - Different bank staff have different ideas about what the rules are
- ↳ Say-do problem:
 - The loan approval process described to you by the loan approval officers is quite different from your observations of what they actually do
- ↳ Probe effect:
 - The loan approval process used by the officers while you are observing is different from the one they normally use
- ↳ Bias:
 - The loan approval officers fear that your job is to computerize their jobs out of existence, so they are deliberately emphasizing the need for case-by-case discretion (to convince you it has to be done by a human!)

© Easterbrook 2004 4

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Bias

→ What is bias?

- ↳ Bias only exists in relation to some reference point
 - can there ever be "no bias"?
- ↳ All views of reality are filtered
- ↳ All decision making is based partly on personal values.

→ Types of bias:

- ↳ Motivational bias
 - expert makes accommodations to please the interviewer or some other audience
- ↳ Observational bias
 - Limitations on our ability to accurately observe the world
- ↳ Cognitive bias
 - Mistakes in use of statistics, estimation, memory, etc.
- ↳ Notational bias
 - Terms used to describe a problem may affect our understanding of it

Examples of Bias

- ↳ Social pressure
 - response to verbal and non-verbal cues from interviewer
- ↳ Group think
 - response to reactions of other experts
- ↳ Impression management
 - response to imagined reactions of managers, clients, ...
- ↳ Wishful thinking
 - response to hopes or possible gains.
- ↳ Appropriation
 - Selective interpretation to support current beliefs.
- ↳ Misrepresentation
 - expert cannot accurately fit a response into the requested response mode
- ↳ Anchoring
 - contradictory data ignored once initial solution is available
- ↳ Inconsistency
 - assumptions made earlier are forgotten
- ↳ Availability
 - some data are easier to recall than others
- ↳ Underestimation of uncertainty
 - tendency to underestimate by a factor of 2 or 3.

© Easterbrook 2004 5

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Elicitation Techniques

- **Traditional techniques**
 - ↳ Introspection
 - ↳ Reading existing documents
 - ↳ Analyzing hard data
 - ↳ Interviews
 - Open-ended
 - Structured
 - ↳ Surveys / Questionnaires
 - ↳ Meetings
- **Contextual (social) approaches**
 - ↳ Ethnographic techniques
 - Participant Observation
 - Ethnomethodology
 - ↳ Discourse Analysis
 - Conversation Analysis
 - Speech Act Analysis
 - ↳ Sociotechnical Methods
 - Soft Systems Analysis
- **Collaborative techniques**
 - ↳ Focus Groups
 - Brainstorming
 - JAD/RAD workshops
 - ↳ Prototyping
 - ↳ Participatory Design
- **Cognitive techniques**
 - ↳ Task analysis
 - ↳ Protocol analysis
 - ↳ Knowledge Acquisition Techniques
 - Card Sorting
 - Laddering
 - Repertory Grids
 - Proximity Scaling Techniques

© Easterbrook 2004 6

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Background Reading

- **Sources of information:**
 - ↳ company reports, organization charts, policy manuals, job descriptions, reports, documentation of existing systems, etc.
- **Advantages:**
 - ↳ Helps the analyst to get an understanding of the organization before meeting the people who work there.
 - ↳ Helps to prepare for other types of fact finding
 - e.g. by being aware of the business objectives of the organization.
 - ↳ may provide detailed requirements for the current system.
- **Disadvantages:**
 - ↳ written documents often do not match up to reality.
 - ↳ Can be long-winded with much irrelevant detail
- **Appropriate for**
 - ↳ Whenever you not familiar with the organization being investigated.

© Easterbrook 2004 7

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

"Hard Data" and Sampling

- **Hard data includes facts and figures...**
 - Forms, Invoices, financial information,...
 - Reports used for decision making,...
 - Survey results, marketing data,...
- **Sampling**
 - ↳ Sampling used to select representative set from a population
 - Purposive Sampling - choose the parts you think are relevant without worrying about statistical issues
 - Simple Random Sampling - choose every kth element
 - Stratified Random Sampling - identify strata and sample each
 - Clustered Random Sampling - choose a representative subpopulation and sample it
 - ↳ **Sample Size is important**
 - balance between cost of data collection/analysis and required significance
 - ↳ **Process:**
 - Decide what data should be collected - e.g. banking transactions
 - Determine the population - e.g. all transactions at 5 branches over one week
 - Choose type of sample - e.g. simple random sampling
 - Choose sample size - e.g. every 20th transaction

© Easterbrook 2004 8

University of Toronto

Example of hard data

- **Questions:**
 - ↳ What does this data tell you?
 - ↳ What would you do with this data?

Agate
Campaign Summary

Date: 23rd February 1999
Client: Yellow Partridge
 Park Road Workshops
 Park Road
 Jewellery Quarter
 Birmingham B2 3DT
 U.K.
Campaign: Spring Collection 1999
Billing Currency: GB £

Item	Curr	Amount	Rate	Billing amount
Advert preparation: photography, artwork, layout etc.	GB £	15,000.00	1	15,000.00
Placement French Vogue	FFR.	47 000.00	11.35	4,140.97
Placement UK Vogue	GB £	5,000.00	1	5,000.00
Placement US Vogue	US \$	15,000.00	2.47	6,072.87
Total				30,213.84

This is not a VAT Invoice. A detailed VAT Invoice will be provided separately.

210-212 Carstairs Street, Birmingham B1 5TB
 Tel: 0121 411 2204 Fax: 0121 411 2245
 Email: agate@agatelltd.co.uk

© Easterbrook 2004

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Interviews

→ **Types:**

- ↳ Structured - agenda of fairly open questions
- ↳ Open-ended - no pre-set agenda

→ **Advantages**

- ↳ Rich collection of information
- ↳ Good for uncovering opinions, feelings, goals, as well as hard facts
- ↳ Can probe in depth, & adapt followup questions to what the person tells you

→ **Disadvantages**

- ↳ Large amount of qualitative data can be hard to analyze
- ↳ Hard to compare different respondents
- ↳ Interviewing is a difficult skill to master

→ **Watch for**

- ↳ Unanswerable questions ("how do you tie your shoelaces?")
- ↳ Tacit knowledge (and post-hoc rationalization)
- ↳ Removal from context
- ↳ Interviewer's attitude may cause bias (e.g. variable attentiveness)

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Goguen and Linde, 1993, p154. 10

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Interviewing Tips

→ **Starting off...**

- ↳ Begin the interview with an innocuous topic to set people at ease
 - e.g. the weather, the score in last night's hockey game
 - e.g. comment on an object on the person's desk: "My,... what a beautiful photograph! Did you take that?"

→ **Ask if you can record the interview**

- ↳ Make sure the tape recorder is visible
- ↳ Say that they can turn it off at any time.

→ **Ask easy questions first**

- ↳ perhaps personal information
 - e.g. "How long have you worked in your present position?"

→ **Follow up interesting leads**

- ↳ E.g. if you hear something that indicates your plan of action may be wrong,
 - e.g., "Could we pursue what you just said a little further?"

→ **Ask open-ended questions towards the end**

- ↳ e.g. "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

© Easterbrook 2004 11

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Questionnaires

→ **Advantages**

- ↳ Can quickly collect info from large numbers of people
- ↳ Can be administered remotely
- ↳ Can collect attitudes, beliefs, characteristics

→ **Disadvantages**

- ↳ Simplistic (presupposed) categories provide very little context
 - No room for users to convey their real needs

→ **Watch for:**

- ↳ Bias in sample selection
- ↳ Bias in self-selecting respondents
- ↳ Small sample size (lack of statistical significance)
- ↳ Open ended questions (very hard to analyze!)
- ↳ Leading questions ("have you stopped beating your wife?")
- ↳ Appropriation ("What is this a picture of?")
- ↳ Ambiguous questions (I.e. not everyone is answering the same question)

Note: Questionnaires MUST be prototyped and tested!

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Goguen and Linde, 1993, p154. 12

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Meetings

→ **Used for summarization and feedback**

- ↳ E.g. meet with stakeholders towards the end of each stage:
 - to discuss the results of the information gathering stage
 - to conclude on a set of requirements
 - to agree on a design etc.
- ↳ Use the meeting to confirm what has been learned, talk about findings

→ **Meetings are an important managerial tool**

- ↳ Used to move a project forward.
- ↳ Every meeting should have a clear objective:
 - E.g. presentation, problem solving, conflict resolution, progress analysis, gathering and merging of facts, training, planning,...
- ↳ Plan the meeting carefully:
 - Schedule the meeting and arrange for facilities
 - Prepare an agenda and distribute it well in advance
 - Keep track of time and agenda during the meeting
 - Follow up with a written summary to be distributed to meeting participants
 - Special rules apply for formal presentations, walkthroughs, brainstorming, etc.

© Easterbrook 2004 13

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Group Elicitation Techniques

→ **Types:**

- ↳ Focus Groups
- ↳ Brainstorming

→ **Advantages**

- ↳ More natural interaction between people than formal interview
- ↳ Can gauge reaction to stimulus materials (e.g. mock-ups, storyboards, etc)

→ **Disadvantages**

- ↳ May create unnatural groups (uncomfortable for participants)
- ↳ Danger of Groupthink
- ↳ May only provide superficial responses to technical questions
- ↳ Requires a highly trained facilitator

→ **Watch for**

- ↳ sample bias
- ↳ dominance and submission

© Easterbrook 2004 14

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Joint/Rapid Application Development

→ **JAD & RAD Principles:**

- ↳ Group Dynamics - use workshops instead of interviews
- ↳ Visual Aids
 - Lots of visualization media, e.g. wall charts, large monitors, graphical interfaces
- ↳ Organized, Rational Process
 - Techniques such as brainstorming and top-down analysis
- ↳ WYSIWYG Documentation Approach
 - each JAD session results in a document which is easy to understand and is created and agreed upon during the session

→ **Notes:**

- ↳ Choose workshop participants carefully
 - they should be the best people possible representing various stakeholder groups
- ↳ Workshop should last 3-5 days.
 - Must turn a group of participants into a team - this takes 1-2 days.
 - Session leader makes sure each step has been completed thoroughly.
 - Session leader steps in when there are differences of opinion - "open issues".
 - Meeting room should be well-equipped for presentations, recording etc.

© Easterbrook 2004 15

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Participant Observation

→ **Approach**

- ↳ Observer spends time with the subjects
 - Joining in long enough to become a member of the group
 - Hence appropriate for longitudinal studies

→ **Advantages**

- ↳ Contextualized;
- ↳ Reveals details that other methods cannot

→ **Disadvantages**

- ↳ Extremely time consuming!
- ↳ Resulting 'rich picture' is hard to analyze
- ↳ Cannot say much about the results of proposed changes

→ **Watch for**

- ↳ going native!

© Easterbrook 2004 16

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Ethnomethodology

→ **Basis**

- ↳ Social world is ordered
 - The social order may not be obvious, nor describable from common sense
- ↳ The social order cannot be assumed to have an a priori structure
 - Social order is established on a moment-to-moment basis through participants' collective actions (no pre-existing structures)
 - i.e. social order only observable when an observer immerses herself in it.
- ↳ Observation should be done in a natural setting
- ↳ Need to consider how meanings develop and evolve within context

→ **"Use the members' own Categories"**

- ↳ Most conventional approaches assume preexisting categories
 - This may mislead the observer (e.g. appropriation)
- ↳ Ethnography attempts to use the subjects' own categories
 - What categories (concepts) do they use themselves to order the social world?
- ↳ What methods do people use to make sense of the world around them?
 - Use the same methods members use during observation
 - E.g. by developing a legitimate role within the community under observation.

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Goguen and Linde, 1993, p158. 17

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Ethnomethodological approach

- Ethnomethodology is a subarea of Anthropology
 - ↳ Looks for behaviours that are culture-specific
 - E.g. Frenchmen brag about sexual conquests to gain status;
 - E.g. Americans brag about money to gain status.
 - Each of these topics is taboo in the other culture
- Uses a very tightly controlled set of methods:
 - ↳ Conversational analysis
 - ↳ Measurement of body system functions - e.g. heartbeat
 - ↳ Non-verbal behaviour studies
 - ↳ Detailed video analysis
 - ↳ These techniques are useful in capturing information about a social setting.
- Other observation techniques can be applied:
 - ↳ Time-motion study
 - who is where, when?
 - ↳ Communication audit
 - who talks to whom about what?
 - ↳ Use of tools - status symbols plus sharing rules

© Easterbrook 2004 18

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Knowledge Elicitation Techniques

→ Protocol Analysis

- ↳ based on vocalising behaviour
 - Think aloud vs. retrospective protocols
- ↳ Advantages
 - Direct verbalisation of cognitive activities
 - Embedded in the work context
 - Good at revealing interaction problems with existing systems
- ↳ Disadvantages
 - Essentially based on introspection, hence unreliable
 - No social dimension

→ Proximity Scaling Techniques

- ↳ Given some domain objects, derive a set of dimensions for classifying them:
 - step 1: pairwise proximity assessment among domain elements
 - step 2: automated analysis to build multi-dimensional space to classify the objects
- ↳ Advantages
 - help to elicit mental models, where complex multivariate data is concerned
 - good for eliciting tacit knowledge
- ↳ Disadvantages
 - Requires an agreed on set of objects
 - Only models classification knowledge (no performance knowledge)

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Hudlicka, 1996. 19

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

more KE techniques

→ Card Sorting

- ↳ For a given set of domain objects, written on cards:
 - Expert sorts the cards into groups...
 - ...then says what the criterion was for sorting, and what the groups were.
- ↳ Advantages
 - simple, amenable to automation
 - elicits classification knowledge
- ↳ Problems
 - suitable entities need to be identified with suitable semantic spread across domain.
 - No performance knowledge

→ Laddering

- ↳ Uses a set of probes to acquire stakeholders' knowledge.
 - Interview the expert.
 - Use questions to move up and down a conceptual hierarchy
 - E.g. developing goal hierarchies
- ↳ Advantages
 - deals with hierarchical knowledge, including poly-hierarchies (e.g., goal trees, "is-a" taxonomies).
 - knowledge is represented in standardised format
 - can elicit structural knowledge
 - suitable for automation.
- ↳ Disadvantages
 - assumes hierarchically arranged knowledge.

© Easterbrook 2004 20