

# Creative Software Development: An Empirical Modelling Framework

by

#### Paul Edward Ness

#### Thesis

Submitted to the The University of Warwick in partial fulfilment of the requirements for admission to the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** 

Department of Computer Science
University of Warwick

October 1997

### Contents

List of	Exam	ples	viii
List of	Table	s	хi
List of	Figur	es	xii
Ackno	wledgi	nents	xiii
Declar	ations		xiv
Abstra	act		xv
Chapte	er 1 I	ntroduction	1
1.1	Prelin	ninaries	1
1.2	$\operatorname{Aims}$	and motivations	2
1.3	Metho	odological challenges	4
1.4	Source	es of illustrative material	5
1.5	Thesis	outline	7
1.6	Abbre	viations	9
Chapte	er 2 H	Background to EM, PD and SD	11
2.1	Empir	ical Modelling	11
	2.1.1	General concepts and principles	12
	2.1.2	Agentless systems	17
	2.1.3	Single-agent systems and modelling	19
	2.1.4	Computer as artefact	21

	2.1.5 Multi-agent systems and modelling	23
	2.1.6 Agent concept	. 25
	2.1.7 Conceptualization	. 26
	2.1.8 Situating EM	. 28
2.2	Product design	. 29
2.3	Software development	. 32
Chapte	er 3 Characterization of EM, PD and SD	38
3.1	Background	. 38
3.2	Artefacts	. 39
3.3	Subjects	. 45
3.4	Actions	. 47
3.5	Constraints	. 53
3.6	Environments	. 56
3.7	Knowledge	. 59
3.8	Summary and conclusion	
Chapte	ter 4 Artefacts of EM. PD and SD	65
_	ter 4 Artefacts of EM, PD and SD	<b>65</b> . 65
4.1	Definition	. 65
4.1	Definition	. 65 . 67
4.1	Definition	. 65 . 67
4.1	Definition	. 65 . 67 . 68
4.1	Definition	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71
4.1	Definition	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72
4.1	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73
4.1	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness  4.3.5 Incongruity and congruity	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73 . 74
4.1 4.2 4.3	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness  4.3.5 Incongruity and congruity  4.3.6 Divergence and convergence	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73 . 74 . 75
4.1	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness  4.3.5 Incongruity and congruity  4.3.6 Divergence and convergence  Further characterizations of artefacts	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73 . 74 . 75 . 76
4.1 4.2 4.3	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness  4.3.5 Incongruity and congruity  4.3.6 Divergence and convergence  Further characterizations of artefacts  4.4.1 Construals	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73 . 74 . 75 . 76 . 77
4.1 4.2 4.3	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness  4.3.5 Incongruity and congruity  4.3.6 Divergence and convergence  Further characterizations of artefacts  4.4.1 Construals  4.4.2 Design drawings	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73 . 74 . 75 . 76 . 77
4.1 4.2 4.3	Definition  Need for artefacts and how they help cognition  Characterization of artefacts  4.3.1 Novelty and familiarity  4.3.2 Ambiguity and unambiguity  4.3.3 Implicit meaningfulness and explicit meaning  4.3.4 Emergence and completeness  4.3.5 Incongruity and congruity  4.3.6 Divergence and convergence  Further characterizations of artefacts  4.4.1 Construals  4.4.2 Design drawings	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 71 . 72 . 73 . 74 . 75 . 76 . 77 . 79

Chapte	er 5 A	ctions of EM, PD and SD	97
5.1	Definit	ion	97
5.2	Genera	ative actions	99
	5.2.1	Retrieval	100
	5.2.2	Association	101
	5.2.3	Synthesis	102
	5.2.4	Transformation	103
	5.2.5	Analogical transfer	103
	5.2.6	Categorical reduction	104
5.3	Explor	atory actions	105
	5.3.1	Creative exploration and SD $\dots$	106
	5.3.2	Attribute finding	107
	5.3.3	Conceptual interpretation	108
	5.3.4	Functional inference	108
	5.3.5	Contextual shifting	109
	5.3.6	Hypothesis testing	110
	5.3.7	Searching for limitations	111
5.4	Furthe	r characterizations of actions	112
	5.4.1	Observation and experimentation	112
	5.4.2	Methods and methodology $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	114
5.5	Summa	ary	115
	Appen	dix: Illustrative examples for Sections 5.2 and 5.3	117
Chapte	er 6 S	D as Systems Development	137
6.1	Genera	alizing computers, programs and programming	137
	6.1.1	Computer as artefact	138
	6.1.2	Program as configuration	141
	6.1.3	Programming as configuring	145
6.2	Addres	ssing the essential difficulties of software	149
	6.2.1	Complexity	149
	6.2.2	Conformity	151
	6.2.3	Changeability	152

	6.2.4	Invisibility	154
6.3	Attack	s on the essential difficulties of software	155
	6.3.1	Buy versus build	155
	6.3.2	Requirements refinement and rapid prototyping	156
	6.3.3	Incremental development - grow don't build software	158
	6.3.4	Great designers	159
6.4	Softwa	are and SD in the future	160
	6.4.1	Networked computing and concurrency	161
	6.4.2	Software agents	162
	6.4.3	Object standards and technology	162
	6.4.4	Product-oriented development	164
6.5	Requi	rements engineering in the future	165
	6.5.1	Emerging importance of context	165
	6.5.2	End of requirements as contract $\dots \dots \dots \dots$	168
	6.5.3	Supporting market-driven inventors	169
	6.5.4	Coping with incompleteness	170
	6.5.5	Integrating design artefacts	171
	6.5.6	Making requirements methods and tools more accessible	171
6.6	Concl	usion	172
6.7	Limit	ations of EM for developing software	175
	6.7.1	Quality	176
	6.7.2	Management	177
	6.7.3	Methodology	179
	6.7.4	Scale	. 180
Chapt	er 7	Conclusions and further work	182
7.1	Conc	lusions	. 182
7.2	Furtl	ner work	. 184
	7.2.1	Software engineering	. 184
	7.2.2	EM in context	. 188
	7.2.3	Distribution of EM tools	. 189

Bibliog	raphy	191
Appen	dix A Empirical Modelling of a Sailboat	206
A.1	Common-sense knowledge	206
A.2	Agent-oriented modelling	207
A.3	Observation-oriented modelling	207
A.4	Definitive representation of the sailboat	209
<b>A.</b> 5	Exploring the sailboat simulation	213
A.6	Extending the sailboat model	214
Appen	dix B Experiences Using the Shlaer-Mellor Method	217
B.1	Overview of the Shlaer-Mellor method	218
B.2	Domain analysis	219
B.3	Using the Teamwork tool in analysis and design	219
B.4	Automatic code generation	220
B.5	Testing	221
B.6	Conclusion	222
Appen	dix C SUL, MUL and Hydrolift Artefacts	223
C.1	SUL artefacts	223
	C.1.1 SUL LSD specification	223
	C.1.2 SUL visualization/animation	224
	C.1.3 SUL DoNaLD script	224
	C.1.4 SUL ADM script	227
	C.1.5 SUL sketch	228
	C.1.6 SUL statement of requirements	228
C.2	MUL artefacts	229
	C.2.1 MUL LSD specification	229
	C.2.2 MUL visualization/animation	230
	C.2.3 MUL DoNaLD redefinitions	230
	C.2.4 MUL ADM redefinitions	230
	C.2.5 MUL sketch	231
	C.2.6 MUL statement of requirements and models	231

C.3	Hydro	lift artefacts	232
	C.3.1	Hydrolift LSD specification	232
	C.3.2	Hydrolift visualization/animation	233
	C.3.3	$ \label{eq:hydrolift} \textbf{Hydrolift DoNaLD redefinitions} \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ $	233
	C.3.4	Hydrolift ADM redefinitions	235
	C.3.5	Hydrolift sketch	236
	C.3.6	Statement of requirements and models	236
Appen	dix D	Reviews	238
	Creati	ve Cognition: Theory, Research, and Applications	238
	Total 1	Design: Integrated Methods for Successful Product Engineering	242
	Creati	ng Innovative Products Using Total Design: The Living Legacy	
	of Stua	art Pugh	244

## List of Examples

2.1	Observation and agent-oriented analysis in OXO	14
2.2	Definitive representation of state in OXO	16
2.3	0-agent view in OXO	19
2.4	1-agent view in OXO	20
2.5	Computer as artefact in OXO	22
2.6	n-agent view in OXO	24
2.7	Classification of agents in OXO	26
2.8	Conceptualization in OXO	27
2.9	Structure models in SD	35
2.10	Behaviour models in SD	35
2.11	Process models in SD	36
3.1	LSD specifications in EM	41
3.2	Visualizations in EM	41
3.3	Animations in EM	42
3.4	Sketches in PD	43
3.5	Structure, behaviour and process models in SD	44
3.6	Generative and exploratory actions in EM	49
3.7	Generative and exploratory actions in PD	50
3.8	Transformational actions in SD	52
3.9	Statement of requirements as constraint in SD	55
3.10	LSD specification as constraint in EM	56
3.11	Traditional environments in design	59

4.1	Familiarity in stating requirements	83
4.2	Familiarity in EM	84
4.3	Novelty in EM	85
4.4	Ambiguity in stating requirements	86
4.5	Unambiguity in SD	87
4.6	Unambiguity in EM	88
4.7	Ambiguity in EM	89
4.8	Explicit meaning in SD	90
4.9	Implicit meaningfulness in EM	91
4.10	Emergence and completeness in EM	92
4.11	Completeness in SD	93
4.12	Incongruity and congruity in PD	94
4.13	Incongruity and congruity in EM	95
4.14	Divergence and convergence in EM	96
5.1	Retrieval in EM	117
5.2		117
5.3	Retrieval in PD	118
5.4	Retrieval in SD	119
5.5	Association in EM	120
5.6	Association in PD	121
	Association in SD	122
5.7	Synthesis in EM	
5.8	Synthesis in SD	
5.9	Transformation in SD	125
	Transformation in EM	126
	Transfer in EM	127
	Transfer in PD	128
	Transfer in SD	128
	Reduction in EM	129
	Reduction in SD	130
	Lack of incentive for exploration in SD	131
5.17	Attribute finding in EM	132

5.18	Conceptual interpretation in EM	133
5.19	Interpretation in PD	134
5.20	Functional inference in EM	135
5.21	Contextual shifting in EM	136
7.1	Organization of observations in EM	187
7.2	Sequencing of observations in EM	188
A.1	Representing the modeller in the SBS	208
A.2	Representing the sail in the SBS	210
A.3	Representing the rig and hull in the SBS	211
A.4	Exploration in the SBS	214
A.5	Emergence in the SBS	215
A.6	Openness in the SBS	216

### List of Tables

3.1	Elements of the product design specification	54
4.1	Creative and analytical properties	69
5.1	Generative and exploratory actions	99
6.1	Contrasting complexity in software and systems	150
6.2	Contrasting conformity in software and systems	152
6.3	Contrasting changeability in software and systems	153
6.4	Contrasting invisibility in software and systems	154
6.5	EM themes associated with buy versus build	155
6.6	EM themes associated with requirements and prototyping	157
6.7	EM themes associated with incremental development	158
6.8	EM themes associated with great designers	160
6.9	Patterns of large software systems: failure and success	176

# List of Figures

2.1	Tools and notations in EM 1
2.2	tkeden being used to model OXO game
2.3	Activity model for total design
3.1	Baltimore and Ohio Railroad drafting room 1899
3.2	Comparison of EM, PD and SD
5.1	Geneplore Model
5.2	Lift system components
D.1	Geneplore Model
D.2	Activity model for total design

#### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my friend and supervisor, Meurig Beynon, for his support and guidance throughout the research and writing of this thesis and for his infectious enthusiasm for my ideas.

I would also like to thank my friends, both inside and outside the department, who made the good times great and the bad times bearable over the last few years, Anna Philippou especially.

Special thanks goes to my mother, father and brother for the help they have given me in so many different ways. I am indebted to my brother Steve who took on the unpleasant task of introducing me to computing.

Finally, thanks goes to the EPSRC and IBM who funded the research through a CASE award and to Hugh Darwen and Steve Russ for making it happen.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Further thanks goes to Mike Holcombe for his constructive comments during the viva and to Meurig Beynon and Steve Russ for guiding me through the revisions.

#### **Declarations**

This thesis is presented in accordance with the regulations for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It has been composed by myself and has not been submitted in any previous application for any degree. The work described in this thesis has been undertaken by myself except where otherwise stated.

The various aspects concerning the Empirical Modelling of the sailboat have been published in [NBY94]. The view of Empirical modelling expressed in this thesis has been represented in [BNR95]. The view of Empirical Modelling as a new paradigm for computing has been presented in [BN95].

#### Abstract

The commercial success of software development depends on innovation [Nar93a]. However, conventional approaches inhibit the development of innovative products that embody novel concepts. This thesis argues that this limitation of conventional software development is largely due to its use of analytical artefacts, and that other activities, notably Empirical Modelling and product design, avoid the same limitation by using creative artefacts. Analytical artefacts promote the methodical representation of familiar subjects whereas creative artefacts promote the exploratory representation of novel subjects. The subjects, constraints, environments and knowledge associated with a design activity are determined by the nature of its artefacts.

The importance of artefacts was discovered by examining the representation of different kinds of lift system in respect of Empirical Modelling, product design and software development. The artefacts were examined by identifying creative properties, as characterized in the theory of creative cognition [FWS92], together with their analytical counterparts. The processes of construction were examined by identifying generative and exploratory actions. It was found that, in software development, the artefacts were analytical and the processes transformational, whereas, in Empirical Modelling and product design, the artefacts were both creative and analytical, and the processes exploratory.

A creative approach to software development using both creative and analytical artefacts is proposed for the development of innovative products. This new approach would require a radical departure from the established ideas and principles of software development. The existing paradigm would be replaced by a framework based on Empirical Modelling. Empirical Modelling can be thought of as a situated approach to modelling that uses the computer in exploratory ways to construct artefacts. The likelihood of the new paradigm being adopted is assessed by considering how it addresses the topical issues in software development.