Foundations of Software Engineering

Motivation
Michael Hilton
Administrativa

• HW 5 due Tuesday, Nov 13th.
• No class Thanksgiving week, including Tuesday 20th
SE Minor – See me for questions!

• We are actively recruiting SE Minors

• Requirements
  – 17-313 Foundations of Software Engineering
  – 17-413 Software Engineering Practicum
  – 3 elective classes

• http://isri.cmu.edu/education/undergrad/se-minor/index.html
SHIP IT
SHIP IT GOOD
17-356/17-766
SOFTWARE ENGINEERING
FOR STARTUPS
Learning Goals

• Understand the differences among developers and implications for hiring and teamwork.
• Describe various models of motivation and their relationship to productive work environments.
• Design conditions that motivate developers.
• Understand team development and progression.
Interview

CIERA JASPAN
10X ENGINEERS
10X Engineers

- Aka “rock-star”, “ninja”
1966 study on online/offline programming performance

http://www.construx.com/10x_Software_Development/Origins_of_10X_%E2%80%93_How_Valid_is_the_Underlying_Research/
10x

• Reported as early as 1968 (Sackman, Erickson, and Grant)
  – Coding time 20:1
  – Debugging time 25:1
  – Program size 5:1
  – Execution speed 10:1
  – No correlation to amount of experience

• "order-of-magnitude differences among programmers" repeatedly reported

• Differences not explained by
  – programming language
  – years of experience
"During the time I was at Boeing in the mid 1980s, there was a project that had about 80 programmers working on it that was at risk of missing a critical deadline. The project was critical to Boeing, and so they moved most of the 80 people off that project and brought in one guy who finished all the coding and delivered the software on time."

– Steve McConnell
10x of Teams

- Lotus 123 version 3
  - 260 staff years
  - 400,000 lines of code.

- Microsoft Excel 3.0
  - 50 staff years
  - 649,000 lines of code
Great programmers according to Mantle and Lichty

• Intuitive sense for structure
• Discipline to design before code
• Write concise, clear, functional, high-quality code
• Produce the desired result

• Software as a craft
Challenge

• Find and hire great developers (Does balancing a red black tree on a white board correlate with being a better developers?)

• Mentor developers into becoming great developers

• Put processes in place to support developers
Interview Advice

Look for people who are:
1. Smart, and
2. Get things done.

DEVELOPER TURNOVER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Employer Name</th>
<th>Median Age of Employees</th>
<th>Median Employee Tenure</th>
<th>Median Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - tie</td>
<td>Amazon.com Inc</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$93,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - tie</td>
<td>American Family Life Assurance Company of Columbus (AFLAC)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - tie</td>
<td>Google, Inc.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - tie</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$69,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - tie</td>
<td>Chesapeake Energy Corporation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - tie</td>
<td>Group 1 Automotive, Inc.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - tie</td>
<td>Ross Stores, Inc</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - tie</td>
<td>Wellcare Health Plans, Inc.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$49,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - tie</td>
<td>Amerigroup Corporation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$54,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - tie</td>
<td>Brightpoint North America, Inc.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$42,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - tie</td>
<td>Devon Energy Corporation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$63,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - tie</td>
<td>Family Dollar Stores Inc</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - tie</td>
<td>Freeport-McMoRan Copper &amp; Gold Inc</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$62,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - tie</td>
<td>Paccar Corporation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$62,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - tie</td>
<td>Sandisk Corp</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - tie</td>
<td>Tenneco Inc</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$69,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.techrepublic.com/blog/career-management/tech-companies-have-highest-turnover-rate/; payscale.com data
Turnover

• > 20% turnover per year typical
  – average employment 15-36 month

• Costs?
• Reasons?
• Mitigations?
Unfolding Model of Employee Turnover

Organizational Science has studied employee turnover for over 100 years!

One Hundred Years of Employee Turnover Theory and Research

Peter W. Hom
Arizona State University

Thomas W. Lee
University of Washington

Jason D. Shaw
Hong Kong Polytechnic University

John P. Hausknecht
Cornell University

We review seminal publications on employee turnover during the 100-year existence of the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Along with classic articles from this journal, we expand our review to include other publications that yielded key theoretical and methodological contributions to the turnover literature. We first describe how the earliest papers examined practical methods for turnover reduction or control and then explain how theory development and testing began in the mid-20th century and dominated the academic literature until the turn of the century. We then track 21st century interest in the psychology of staying (rather than leaving) and attitudinal trajectories in predicting turnover. Finally, we discuss the rising scholarship on collective turnover given the centrality of human capital flight to practitioners and to the field of human resource management strategy.
High turnover is expensive

• Hiring overhead
  – Costs (1.5 month salary to agency)
  – Lost productivity (interviews)

• Getting new developers up to speed
  – Unproductive time (~6 month ramp up; 2 years in some estimates)
  – Training overhead

• Overhead for maintaining abandoned code

• Tendency to short-term viewpoints

• Premature promotions

• Young inexperienced staff

see also DeMarco and Lister. Peopleware. Chapter 19
Causes of, mitigations for turnover

• Causes (from literature, caveats for tech companies):
  – Just-passing-through mentality
  – Feeling of disposability
  – “Loyalty would be ludicrous”
  – High turnover encourages turnover

• Mitigations:
  – Environment and culture
    • striving to be "the best"
    • teams
  – Investment in personal growth, via retraining, no dead-end jobs

• Advice: enable appropriate processes to maintain productivity despite turnover.

see also DeMarco and Lister. Peopleware. Chapter 19
MOTIVATING PROGRAMMERS
Growth and Challenge
Theories

• Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs
• Herzberg’s Motivation and Hygiene Factors
• Daniel Pink, Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us.
Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943)
Herzberg’s Motivation and Hygiene Factors (1960s)

• (aka two-factor theory)

• Different factors for satisfaction and dissatisfaction
  – Addressing dissatisfaction does not lead to satisfaction

• Step 1: Eliminate dissatisfaction

• Step 2: Create condition for satisfaction
Achievement | Recognition | Work itself | Responsibility | Advancement | Salary | Possibility of growth | Status | Interpersonal relationships-subordinate | Interpersonal relationships-supervisor | Interpersonal relationships-peers | Supervision-technical | Company policies and administration | Working Conditions | Personal Life | Job Security
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Motivators | Hygiene factors

(Observation by Mantle and Lichty, not empirical data)
(Observation by Mantle and Lichty, not empirical data)
Addressing Causes of Dissatisfaction

• Respect for supervisor
• Having fun
• Learning and growing
• Good working conditions
• Sane company policies and administration
• Ethical management
• Fair compensation

• (often within control)
Addressing Causes of Dissatisfaction (selective)

- Respect as supervisor
  - gain technical credit
  - respect others
  - lead by example
  - help solve technical problems
  - manage and coach

- Having fun
  - out of office play
  - celebrations of accomplishments and occasions
Addressing Causes of Dissatisfaction (selective)

• Learning and growing
  – protect time for learning
  – explore new technologies; prototype
  – budget for attending conferences, seminars, inhouse training
  – invite guest speakers

• Good working conditions
  – plenty of whiteboards
  – room for discussions
  – Quiet space, Limit interruptions, avoid meeting culture
  – cubicles vs separate offices
  – fire “jerks”
  – free food
  – flexible hours, flexible dress, flexible space
Addressing Causes of Dissatisfaction (selective)

• Sane company policies and administration
  – communicate frequently (vision, intentions, requirements, schedules, ...)
  – protect staff from organizational distractions
  – protect staff from bad communication practices (establish culture)
Addressing Motivating Factors (selective)

• Making a difference
  – worthy goals, longterm vision
  – Steve Jobs when recruiting John Scully from Pepsi: “Do you want to sell sugar water or change to world”

• Toys and technology
  – modern hardware, large screens, phones, ...
Addressing Motivating Factors (selective)

- Recognition and praise
  - praise loudly and specifically, blame softly/privately
  - celebrate success

If anything goes bad, I did it. If anything goes semi-good, we did it. If anything goes real good, then you did it. That's all it takes to get people to win football games for you.

— Bear Bryant —
Why do engineers choose TO JOIN particular teams?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons grouped by clustering analysis</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liked new team and/or technology (exciting, manager)</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker asked me to join (new team, old team)</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined for better opportunities (location, domain, lack of other options)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed my manager (former or current)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why do engineers want to leave their teams?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons grouped by clustering analysis</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change is coming (technology, charter, re-org, turnover)</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking new challenges or location (role, location, challenges)</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with manager (priorities, goals, person, actions)</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grass is always greener on the other side (novelty, escape)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a good fit (bored, no need for my skills)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor team dynamics (dysfunctional, no career growth)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can extinguish intrinsic motivation
Can diminish performance
Can crush creativity
Can crowd out good behavior
Can encourage cheating, shortcuts, and unethical behavior
Can become addictive
Can foster short-term thinking

Rewards turn play into work and drain motivation

Autonomy
Mastery
Purpose
Rewards (aka grinding)
Tuckman, 1965: Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing

• Forming: team meets and learns about challenges, agrees on goals, begins to work.
  – Team members: (1) Behave independently. (2) May be motivated, but relatively uninformed about goals, (3) usually on their best behavior (albeit self-involved)

• Storming: participants form opinions about one another, possibly leading to conflict.
  – May voice opinions or question leader, especially if someone shirking responsibility or attempting to dominate.
  – Disagreements and conflicts must be resolved before team can progress; may regress if new challenges arise.
  – Stage can be destructive, but can lead to a better team in the long run if effective resolution tactics established.

• Norming: Resolved conflicts leads to a spirit of co-operation.
  – Team shares a common goal for which everyone takes responsibility.
  – Tolerate one another, move on from individual challenges.
  – Danger: too much avoidance of conflict can lead to avoidance of controversial ideas.

• Performing: group members focus on achieving common goals.
  – Everyone is now competent and can make decisions without supervision. Dissent is allowed if it’s through acceptable channels.
  – Supervisors are almost always participating.

• Upshot: Preserve existing teams, resist project mobility.
  – Tradeoffs? Compared to practices you’ve seen in companies?
Further Reading

• Mantle and Lichty. Managing the Unmanageable. Addison-Wesley, 2013
  – Very accessible and practical tips at recruiting and management
  – Anecdotes, stories, and tips on facilitating teams, projects, and environments
  – Detailed discussion of motivating factors for creative people
• Sommerville. Software Engineering. 8th Edition. Chapter 25