

Who Needs Software Engineering?

Steve McConnell

The traditional distinction between software and hardware was that software was easily changeable and therefore “soft,” whereas hardware was captured on a physical medium like a chip, was hard to change, and was therefore “hard.” This traditional distinction is breaking down today. Software delivered via the Internet is clearly “soft” in the traditional sense, but software delivered via CD or DVD is hardly “soft” in the sense of being “easy to change.”



We now commonly see software being delivered on EPROMs; the electronic control module that controls my car’s fuel injection is an example. I can take my car to my dealer to have the chip reprogrammed, so in some sense the program on the chip is soft, but is it software? Should the chip developers

be using software engineering?

Computer chip designers are now doing much of their chip development using software-engineering-like tools. Only at the last minute is the code committed to silicon. Do we really think that committing code to a CD-ROM makes it software but committing it to a silicon wafer makes it hardware? Have we arrived at a point where even computer hardware is really software?

If software and hardware are totally different, then electrical engineers designing computer chips don’t need to know about software engineering. But if modern chip design involves a significant amount of programming, then perhaps electrical engineers should know something about software en-

gineering. Should computer hardware be designed using software engineering?

Throw a few other disciplines into the mix such as Web programming and games development, and I think a fundamental question lurks here: What is software? This question is important because it leads to a second question: What is software engineering today, and who needs it? I recently posed these questions to several *IEEE Software* board members.

Blurred distinctions

Wolfgang Strigel: No doubt, the distinction between software and hardware has blurred. When the term *software* was coined, there was a clearer distinction, or nobody cared because it sounded good and made intuitive sense. Moreover, it is not important that software is modifiable (or “soft” once it is completed). Software does not change its nature by being turned into something “hard” or unmodifiable. After all, we have accepted the concept of selling software on CDs. And RAM can also be write-protected. What matters is whether there is a “program” that can be executed by a device.

The project plan for building a high-rise is a set of complex instructions, decision points, and so on that could be interpreted as a software program. But it is not executed by a device. But how about multimedia, say an animated movie? It has instructions for movement, rendering, and so on, and is executed by a device. It can also be modified. How about a set of MIDI instructions that produce music if delivered to an electronic

DEPARTMENT EDITORS

Bookshelf: Warren Keuffel,
wkeuffel@computer.org

Country Report: Deependra Moitra,
d.moitra@computer.org

Design: Martin Fowler, ThoughtWorks,
fowler@acm.org

Loyal Opposition: Robert Glass, Computing Trends,
rglass@indiana.edu

Manager: Don Reifer, Reifer Consultants,
dreifer@sprintmail.com

Quality Time: Jeffrey Voas, Cigital,
voas@cigital.com

STAFF

Group Managing Editor
Dick Price

Senior Lead Editor
Dale C. Strok
dstrok@computer.org

Associate Lead Editors
**Crystal Chweh, Jenny Ferrero, and
Dennis Taylor**

Staff Lead Editor
Shani Murray

Magazine Assistants
Dawn Craig and Angela Williams
software@computer.org

Art Director
Toni Van Buskirk

Cover Illustration
Dirk Hagner

Technical Illustrator
Alex Torres

Production Artists
Carmen Flores-Garvey and Larry Bauer

Acting Executive Director
Anne Marie Kelly

Publisher
Angela Burgess

Membership/Circulation
Marketing Manager
Georgann Carter

Advertising Assistant
Debbie Sims

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Denise Hurst, Kirk Kroeker, Nancy Mead, Kalpana Mohan, Ware Myers, Paula Powers, Judy Shane, Gil Shif, Tanya Smekal, Margaret Weatherford

Editorial: All submissions are subject to editing for clarity, style, and space. Unless otherwise stated, bylined articles and departments, as well as product and service descriptions, reflect the author's or firm's opinion. Inclusion in *IEEE Software* does not necessarily constitute endorsement by the IEEE or the IEEE Computer Society.

To Submit: Send 2 electronic versions (1 word-processed and 1 postscript or PDF) of articles to Magazine Assistant, *IEEE Software*, 10662 Los Vaqueros Circle, PO Box 3014, Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314; software@computer.org. Articles must be original and not exceed 5,400 words including figures and tables, which count for 200 words each.

instrument? This does not fundamentally differ from a ladder diagram that controls the execution of a programmable logic controller.

Larry Graham: I agree that the line between software and hardware is blurry. Patent law has a fairly rich tradition that equates the two—virtually every hardware device can be described in terms of a function it performs and vice versa.

Is software engineering invariant?

Annie Kuntzmann-Combelles: I think the basic practices needed to develop software properly are always the same: get clear and complete requirements from customers; manage changes to requirements; estimate, plan, and track the work to be done; select an adequate life cycle; define and perform QA activities; and maintain product integrity. The software architecture and coding might differ from one application to the other, but the process aspects are invariant.

Tomoo Matsubara: I don't think software development is always the same. My recommendation for improving software process is to apply domain-specific methodologies and tools and conduct problem-focused process improvement. The levels of importance and priorities are different between domains.

For example, one of the most critical processes for commercial software is fixing data flow. For scientific software, a key to success is choosing the right algorithm. For COTS, it's designing a good human-machine interface. For embedded systems, it's pushing instructions into the fewest memory chips. For maintenance, it's rigorous testing with regression tests. Software development practices should vary accordingly.

Grant Rule: Think about the games industry, where the "software" is delivered on CD-ROM or game cartridges. Game development can take vast amounts of schedule. Teams can be quite large—25 to 30 people from a variety of disciplines including analysts, designers, coders, testers, QA staff, and project man-

agement—and lots of nontraditional software personnel such as writers, artists, and so on. Schedules must be managed carefully to meet holiday sales seasons. If a game misses its marketing window, it might be a commercial failure; there's no second chance. Reliability is important: the game is mass-produced on CD-ROM, and from that point forward there is no real chance to correct it—it is infeasible to recall hundreds of thousands of copies to fix a defect.

The result seems to be that, in some cases at least, game developers take a more rigorous approach to "engineering" their software than do some developers of commercial data-processing applications. All this seems to be "software engineering" to me.

What's unique about software?

Robert Cochran: I use the following definition to describe what is unique or special about software:

1. Software is intangible (which I think is true even if it gets embedded).
2. It has high intellectual content (many other intangibles have low intellectual content).
3. It is generally not recognized as an asset by accountants and so is off the balance sheet.
4. Its development process is labor intensive, team based, and project based. We forget sometimes how little of the rest of the world regards projects as the normal way to work.
5. Software doesn't exhibit any real separation between R&D and production.
6. Software is potentially infinitely changeable. Once you make a physical widget, there are severe limits on how you can change it. In principle, we can keep changing software forever.

Is there any real distinction between printing out a source code listing, creating a binary, or burning software onto a chip or CD-ROM? In all these cases, we are just "fixing" a copy of the software in some form that cannot

directly or easily be modified. That does not have any relevance to the nature of the software as such.

Grant: That makes software just like any written work, art book, or design drawing. The medium (technology) might differ—wax tablets, canvas, paper—but anything that can have multiple copies made in a mutable medium sounds like it could be this thing called “software.”

Martin Fowler: Robert’s Number 5 seems to be the key point. Until you deploy you can build, modify, and evolve the software, regardless of whether you eventually deploy to PROMs or CD. That ability to evolve while building is a key aspect of software that has no equivalent in disciplines where you must separate design from construction.

This question of how “soft” is software is quite an important point and one that gels particularly with me. One of the reasons that I’m so much in favor of light methods is that they try to make software softer while many methodologies try to make it harder. In the information systems world, softness is an important and valuable asset.

Making software softer

Steve McConnell: That does seem to be the age-old challenge: How do you keep software from becoming brittle? How do you keep it soft? Whether you’re creating software, or a computer chip, or even a building, it seems as though it would be advantageous to keep the thing you’re building “soft” as far as possible into the project.

Terry Bollinger: This overall question helps to deal with trying to understand the baffling diversity of production styles in the software marketplace. “Hard” software such as that found in processor chips is catastrophically expensive to fix after fielding, and so drives the entire software design process to be very conservative and validation intensive. “Fluid” software that can be changed automatically over the Internet drives the opposite behavior. I think that understanding these kinds of issues is quite fundamental to software management.

I do think we need to have a better overall definition of software. The very fact that I had to mangle together a phrase as awful as “hard” software to describe algorithms encoded into silicon shows that the industry has become more complex than it was in the days when you had vacuum tubes and bits on punched cards, and not much in between.

I think the distinction needs to focus on the idea of “information machines”—what we have traditionally called software—versus the particular method of distribution and update of such machines. Those are two separate dimensions, not one. A bunch of gears is not an information machine, because it relies primarily on physical materials for its properties, even if it happens to do a little information processing at the same time (for example, odometers in cars). A structured algorithm masked into an addressable array that is an integral part of a processor chip most emphatically is an information machine, because its complete set of properties can be represented as structured binary information only, without any reference to the chip’s physical properties.

Don Bagert: In defining what’s really software, my thought is to look at what the object code does (rather than where it resides), as well as the source code. I would define it as follows: “Software is a set of instructions that are interpreted or executed by a computer.” The source code is definitely “soft” not in the sense of the deployment medium but in that it is a non-physical entity. It consists of a series of instructions, by definition nonphysical, that can be translated into object code or interpreted by a computer processor. My colleague Dan Cooke has an interesting view: a Universal Turing machine corresponds to computer hardware, while an individual Turing machine defined to solve a particular problem corresponds to software.

What is software without programming?

Steve: My original focus on the medium on which the software hap-

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:
Steve McConnell
 10662 Los Vaqueros Circle
 Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314
 software@construx.com

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF EMERITUS:
 Alan M. Davis, Omni-Vista

ASSOCIATE EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Design: Maarten Boasson, Quaerendo Invenietis
 boasson@science.uva.nl

Construction: Terry Bollinger, Mitre Corp.
 terry@mitre.org

Requirements: Christof Ebert, Alcatel Telecom
 christof.ebert@alcatel.be

Management: Ann Miller, University of Missouri, Rolla
 millera@ece.umar.edu

Quality: Jeffrey M. Voas, Cigital
 voas@cigital.com

EDITORIAL BOARD

Don Bagert, Texas Tech University
 Andy Bytheway, Univ. of the Western Cape
 Ray Duncan, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
 Richard Fairley, Oregon Graduate Institute
 Martin Fowler, ThoughtWorks
 Robert Glass, Computing Trends
 Natalia Juristo, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
 Warren Keuffel, independent consultant
 Brian Lawrence, Coyote Valley Software
 Karen Mackey, Cisco Systems
 Stephen Mellor, Project Technology
 Deependra Moitra, Lucent Technologies, India
 Don Reifer, Reifer Consultants
 Wolfgang Strigel, Software Productivity Centre
 Karl Wieggers, Process Impact

INDUSTRY ADVISORY BOARD

Robert Cochran, Catalyst Software, chair
 Annie Kuntzmann-Combelles, Q-Labs
 Enrique Draier, PSINet
 Eric Horvitz, Microsoft Research
 David Hsiao, Cisco Systems
 Takaya Ishida, Mitsubishi Electric Corp.
 Dehua Ju, ASTI Shanghai
 Donna Kasperson, Science Applications International
 Pavle Knafllic, Hermes SoftLab
 Günter Koch, Austrian Research Centers
 Wojtek Kozaczynski, Rational Software Corp.
 Tomoo Matsubara, Matsubara Consulting
 Masao Matsumoto, Univ. of Tsukuba
 Dorothy McKinney, Lockheed Martin Space Systems
 Susan Mickel, AtomicTangerine
 Dave Moore, Vulcan Northwest
 Melissa Murphy, Sandia National Laboratories
 Kiyoh Nakamura, Fujitsu
 Grant Rule, Software Measurement Services
 Girish Seshagiri, Advanced Information Services
 Chandra Shekaran, Microsoft
 Martyn Thomas, Praxis
 Rob Thomsett, The Thomsett Company
 John Vu, The Boeing Company
 Simon Wright, Integrated Chipware
 Tsuneo Yamaura, Hitachi Software Engineering

MAGAZINE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Sorel Reisman (chair), James H. Aylor, Jean Bacon,
 Thomas J. Bergin, Wushow Chou, George V. Cybenko,
 William I. Grosky, Steve McConnell, Daniel E. O’Leary,
 Ken Sakamura, Munindar P. Singh,
 James J. Thomas, Yervant Zorian

PUBLICATIONS BOARD

Rangachar Kasturi (chair), Angela Burgess (publisher),
 Jake Aggarwal, Laxmi Bhuran, Lori Clarke,
 Mike T. Liu, Sorel Reisman, Gabriella Sannitti diBaja,
 Sallie Sheppard, Mike Williams, Zhiwei Xu

pens to be deployed seems to have been a red herring. I think software engineering applies broadly to creating complex “instructions,” regardless of the target media. Years ago, people argued that the need for software engineering had passed because Fortran had been invented. People didn’t have to write programs anymore; they could just write down formulas! Thirty years later, we now think of Fortran programming as comparatively low-level software engineering—“writing down formulas” is harder than it looks.

As the years go by, we see the same argument repeated time and time again. The early claims about creating programs using Visual Basic were reminiscent of the early press on Fortran—“No more writing code! Just

drag-and-drop buttons and dialogs!” And today more new programs are being written in Visual Basic than any other language. Ten years from now, we’ll probably see programming environments that are much higher-level than Visual Basic; people working in those environments will benefit from software engineering.

Martin: This is an important point. Often people talk about things “without programming” (one of my alarm-bell phrases). You find this in phrases like, “Buy our ERP system and you can customize it for your business without programming.” So you end up with people who are experts in customizing XYZ’s ERP system. Are they doing software engineering? I would say yes, even though their language is putting con-

figuration information into tables. They still need to know about debugging and testing.

Indeed, whenever we talk about writing tools so that “users can configure the software without programming,” we run into the same problems. If you can enter programs through wizards, you still have to be able to debug and test the results.

Wolfgang: At the risk of being simplistic, I would define software as follows: “Software is a set of instructions that are interpreted (or executed) by a computer.” I did not say “electronic computer” because it could well be a chemical computer or one that operates with light. That delegates the problem to defining the term “computer”—and that’s a hardware problem! ☺

CHI 2001
anyone. anywhere.

Seattle, Washington
31 March - 5 April 2001

www.acm.org/chi2001
(Early registration discount available until 15 February 2001)

Technology! It is impacting everyone, everywhere and should be accessible to *anyone, anywhere*. CHI 2001 will explore the innovations and challenges of the future. You will gain insights on accessibility, portability and internationalization, and emerging research and technology initiatives. A dynamic program of tutorials, workshops and presentations will address the full range of human-computer interaction topics and issues.

CHI 2001: The world's premier conference on Computer-Human Interaction.
Sponsored by ACM's Special Interest Group on Computer-Human Interaction (ACM SIGCHI)

CHI 2001
KEYNOTE SPEAKER
Bill Gates
Chairman, Microsoft Corporation