

*Software Engineering: A Practitioner's Approach, 6/e*

# **Chapter 15**

## **Product Metrics for Software**

# McCall's Triangle of Quality, 1977(!)

Maintainability

Flexibility

Testability

**PRODUCT REVISION**

Portability

Reusability

Interoperability

**PRODUCT TRANSITION**

**PRODUCT OPERATION**

Correctness

Usability

Efficiency

Reliability

Integrity

# Measures, Metrics and Indicators

- A *measure* provides a **quantitative** indication of the extent, amount, dimension, capacity, or size of some attribute of a product or process
- The IEEE glossary defines a *metric* as “a quantitative **measure of the degree** to which a system, component, or process possesses a given attribute.”
- An *indicator* is a metric or **combination of metrics** that provide insight into the software process, a software project, or the product itself

# Measurement Principles

- The **objectives** of measurement should be established before data collection begins
- Each technical metric should be defined in an **unambiguous** manner
- Metrics should be derived **based** on a **theory** that is **valid** for the **domain** of **application**
  - metrics for design should draw upon basic design concepts and principles and attempt to provide an indication of the presence of an attribute that is deemed desirable
- Metrics should be **tailored** to best accommodate specific products and processes

# Measurement Process

## *Formulation.*

- The derivation of software measures and metrics appropriate for the representation of the software that is being considered

## *Collection.*

- The mechanism used to accumulate data required to derive the formulated metrics

## *Analysis.*

- The computation of metrics and the application of mathematical tools

## *Interpretation.*

- The evaluation of metrics results in an effort to gain insight into the quality of the representation

## *Feedback.*

- Recommendations derived from the interpretation of product metrics transmitted to the software team

# Goal-Oriented Software Measurement

- The Goal/Question/Metric Paradigm
  - (1) establish an explicit measurement *goal* that is specific to the process activity or product characteristic that is to be assessed
  - (2) define a set of *questions* that must be answered in order to achieve the goal, and
  - (3) identify well-formulated *metrics* that help to answer these questions.
- Goal definition template
  - *Analyze* {the name of activity or attribute to be measured}
  - *for the purpose of* {the overall objective of the analysis}
  - *with respect to* {the aspect of the activity or attribute that is considered}
  - *from the viewpoint of* {the people who have an interest in the measurement}
  - *in the context of* {the environment in which the measurement takes place}.

# Metrics Attributes

*simple and computable.*

- It should be relatively easy to learn how to derive the metric, and its computation should not demand inordinate effort or time

*empirically and intuitively persuasive.*

- The metric should satisfy the engineer's intuitive notions about the product attribute under consideration

*consistent and objective.*

- The metric should always yield results that are unambiguous.

*consistent in its use of units and dimensions.*

- The mathematical computation of the metric should use measures that do not lead to bizarre combinations of unit.

*programming language independent.*

- Metrics should be based on the analysis model, the design model, or the structure of the program itself.

*an effective mechanism for quality feedback.*

- That is, the metric should provide a software engineer with information that can lead to a higher quality end product

# Collection and Analysis Principles

- Whenever possible, data collection and analysis should be **automated**;
- Valid **statistical techniques** should be applied to establish relationship between internal product attributes and external quality characteristics
- **Interpretative guidelines** and **recommendations** should be established for each metric

# Analysis Metrics

- **Specification metrics:** used as an indication of quality by measuring number of requirements by type
- **Function-based metrics:** use the function point as a normalizing factor or as a measure of the “size” of the specification

# Function-Based Metrics

- The *function point metric* (FP), first proposed by Albrecht, can be used effectively as a means for measuring the functionality delivered by a system.
- Function points are derived using an empirical relationship based on **countable (direct) measures** of software's **information domain** and assessments of **software complexity**
- Information domain values are defined in the following manner:
  - number of external inputs (EIs)
  - number of external outputs (EOs)
  - number of external inquiries (EQs)
  - number of internal logical files (ILFs)
  - number of external interface files (EIFs)

# Function Points

Information Domain Value	Count	Weighting factor			=	[ ]
		simple	average	complex		
External Inputs (EIs)	[ ]	3	3	4	6	[ ]
External Outputs (EOs)	[ ]	3	4	5	7	[ ]
External Inquiries (EQs)	[ ]	3	3	4	6	[ ]
Internal Logical Files (ILFs)	[ ]	3	7	10	15	[ ]
External Interface Files (EIFs)	[ ]	3	5	7	10	[ ]
Count total	—————→					[ ]

# Design Metrics

- **Architectural** design metrics
  - **Structural** complexity =  $g(\text{fan-out})$
  - **Data** complexity =  $f(\text{input \& output variables, fan-out})$
  - **System** complexity =  $h(\text{structural \& data complexity})$
- **Morphology** metrics: a function of the **number** of modules and the number of **interfaces** between **modules**

# Class-Oriented Metrics - 1

*CK-Metrics: Proposed by Chidamber and Kemerer:*

- weighted methods per class
- depth of the inheritance tree
- number of children
- coupling between object classes
- number of response methods for a class
- common attributes (lack of cohesion in methods)

# Class-Oriented Metrics - 2

*LK-Metrics: Proposed by Lorenz and Kidd [LOR94]:*

- class size
- number of operations overridden by a subclass
- number of operations added by a subclass
- specialization index

# Operation-Oriented Metrics

*Proposed by Lorenz and Kidd [LOR94]:*

- average operation size
- operation complexity
- average number of parameters per operation

# Class-Oriented Metrics - 3

## *The MOOD Metrics Suite*

- Method inheritance factor
- Coupling factor
- Polymorphism factor

# Component-Level Design Metrics

- **Cohesion metrics:** a function of data objects and the locus of their definition
- **Coupling metrics:** a function of input and output parameters, global variables, and modules called
- **Complexity metrics:** hundreds have been proposed (e.g., cyclomatic complexity)

# Interface Design Metrics

- Layout appropriateness: a function of layout entities, the geographic position and the “cost” of making transitions among entities

# Code Metrics

- Halstead's Software Science: a comprehensive collection of metrics all predicated on the number (count and occurrence) of operators and operands within a component or program
  - It should be noted that Halstead's "laws" have generated substantial controversy, and many believe that the underlying theory has flaws. However, experimental verification for selected programming languages has been performed (e.g. [FEL89]).

# Metrics for Testing

- Testing effort can also be estimated using metrics derived from Halstead measures
- Binder [BIN94] suggests a broad array of design metrics that have a direct influence on the “testability” of an OO system.
  - Lack of cohesion in methods (LCOM).
  - Percent public and protected (PAP).
  - Public access to data members (PAD).
  - Number of root classes (NOR).
  - Fan-in (FIN).
  - Number of children (NOC) and depth of the inheritance tree (DIT).