

Suggestions for Exam Problems Round 2

Group I

Team Participants: Jan Babor, jan@babor.nu
Addison Chung, int11ac4@student.lu.se
Carl Fagerlin, carl@otsu.se
Bernard Karaj, bernard.karaj.714@student.lu.se
Mikael Möller, moller86@gmail.com
Francisco Silva, franciscogmss@gmail.com

Supervisor: Dietmar Pfahl, dietmar.pfahl@cs.lth.se
Björn Regnell, bjorn.regnell@cs.lth.se
Lund University, Faculty of Engineering

Date of submission: 2011-11-30

Problem 1:

<i>Proposition:</i>	Platform is the combination of hardware and software on which the product shall run
<i>Reason:</i>	In the case, we already have a platform. "The product shall run" means that it must fulfill the other requirements when running on the stated platform
<i>Correct answer:</i>	B
<i>Motivation:</i>	Its a standard requirement and it's qualified with the reference to the case description.
<i>Reference:</i>	Lau:5
<i>Learning objective:</i>	1,3

Problem 2:

<i>Proposition:</i>	Don't specify maximum response times when writing performance requirements.
<i>Reason:</i>	Worst case response times are very rare so it doesn't make sense to worry about it.
<i>Correct answer:</i>	B
<i>Motivation:</i>	The reason partially covers the proposition but not all of it. Maximum response times do rarely happen and it can cost a lot to guarantee but the user should still specify the hardware speeds and system load so the supplier has an idea of what kind of request speeds to achieve.
<i>Reference:</i>	LAU 6.5 pg. 241-245
<i>Learning objective:</i>	3, 6

Problem 3:

<i>Proposition:</i>	Studies show that a heuristic approach to usability testing is preferable to other testing methods
<i>Reason:</i>	Usability experts often find problems a "normal" user wouldn't
<i>Correct answer:</i>	D

<i>Motivation:</i>	While it's true that usability experts often find more problems than ordinary users, it's often not the "right" kind of problems or problems that aren't interesting for the usability of the system. Trying to correct these "false" problems can cost a lot of time for the developer.
<i>Reference:</i>	Lau: 6.6.3, p. 254
<i>Learning objective:</i>	9, 13, 18, 20

Problem 4:

<i>Proposition:</i>	The usability of a software depends from the users that we expect will use the product
<i>Reason:</i>	Assessing the usability of an interface and recommending ways to improve it is the purview of the Usability Engineer
<i>Correct answer:</i>	C
<i>Motivation:</i>	The usability is subjective: it may be different for each. Designers of the software must understand the cognitive and emotional characteristics of users will use the system
<i>Reference:</i>	LAU: 6.6 (p.248)
<i>Learning objective:</i>	1, 20

Problem 5:

<i>Proposition:</i>	Requirements change during development and during maintenance
<i>Reason:</i>	Management of change should start from the beginning (early during elicitation) and last for all the life-cycle.
<i>Correct answer:</i>	B
<i>Motivation:</i>	The reason of the changes may be due to the following cases: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New demand, request to change the requirements or a misunderstanding• Real need behind the request• To the costs• Reject/accept, new or changed requirements• Next release or later, another way to deal with• Report the decision to the source and other relevant people• Revise the specification, negotiate with supplier
<i>Reference:</i>	LAU: 7.8 (pag. 322-325)
<i>Learning objective:</i>	7, 16

Problem 6:

<i>Proposition:</i>	A requirement that is risky to the customer is often low-risk to the developer and vice versa
<i>Reason:</i>	A typical risk is that they are not sure whether they can meet the requirements at a reasonable price
<i>Correct answer:</i>	B
<i>Motivation:</i>	The reason only explains what could be a risk for the developers and not how it could be a risk to the customer
<i>Reference:</i>	Lau:9
<i>Learning objective:</i>	1,6

Problem 7:

<i>Proposition:</i>	During the specification review, there may occur a similar problem to the heuristic evaluation of interfaces: experts predict a lot of problems, but not all of them are important
<i>Reason:</i>	The experts always find many potential problems, but many times these are not relevant to the costumer, which makes them unimportant
<i>Correct answer:</i>	A
<i>Motivation:</i>	During the specification review, the experts always find many potential problems, but many times these are not relevant to the costumer. In this aspect, this process is similar to the heuristic evaluation of interfaces: experts predict a lot of problems, but not all of them are important
<i>Reference:</i>	LAU: Chapter 9.3.1, p. 390
<i>Learning objective:</i>	1, 2

Problem 8:

<i>Proposition:</i>	The QUPER approach is based on the hypothesis that quality is continuous and non-linear
<i>Reason:</i>	The approach gives a graphical overview quality vs. benefit and costs
<i>Correct answer:</i>	B
<i>Motivation:</i>	The proposition is true, but it stands in contrast to the not-so-uncommon misconception that quality is measurable. The reason is also true, QUPER provides graphs based on input, but it does not explain the statement.
<i>Reference:</i>	QUPER, 2.1 fig. 2 & 3
<i>Learning objective:</i>	8, 13

Problem 9:

<i>Proposition:</i>	The release planning in a project requires human intuition.
<i>Reason:</i>	Release planning is a well-defined problem
<i>Correct answer:</i>	C
<i>Motivation:</i>	The release planning process requires human intuition because the problem of release planning is an ill-defined one.
<i>Reference:</i>	RP
<i>Learning objective:</i>	1, 9

Problem 10:

<i>Proposition:</i>	In agile projects, one of the iterative requirements engineering challenges lies on the fact that the non-functional requirements are often ignored.
<i>Reason:</i>	Since the project is always changing, it is hard to define non-functional requirements
<i>Correct answer:</i>	C
<i>Motivation:</i>	In agile projects, one of the iterative requirements engineering challenges lies on the fact that the non-functional requirements are often ignored. This happens because the customer tends to focus on core functionality instead of the NFRs (scalability, maintainability, portability, security, etc.).
<i>Reference:</i>	AGRE, p.5
<i>Learning objective:</i>	1