

An Innovative Requirements Solution: Combining Six Sigma KJ Language Data Analysis with Automated Content Analysis

Ira A. Monarch
Dennis R. Goldenson
Robert W. Stoddard

SEPGSM 2009 North America
Perform at a Higher Level

March 23-26
San Jose California



Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE MAR 2009		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2009 to 00-00-2009	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE An Innovative Requirements Solution: Combining Six Sigma KJ Language Data Analysis with Automated Content Analysis				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Carnegie Mellon University, Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Requirements Engineering Challenge: Applying Measurement & Analysis to Qualitative Problems

Users & customers often have **unrealistic performance expectations**.*

To meet this challenge in military acquisition, it is not enough that

- program managers begin to collect unbiased data to analyze project costs & projections.
- programs perform technology maturation activities, competitive prototyping or Preliminary Design Reviews (PDRs).

Most importantly,

- Mutual understanding of capabilities in context & what it takes to enable them need to be established **before** a project is initiated among those who
 - determine what capabilities are needed
 - write requirement specifications
 - acquire the systems that meet specifications,

so that appropriate measures of performance & other **quality attributes** of the capabilities & their enabling systems can be determined and aligned.

* OPINION : Reforms for the Department of Defense, by Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI), *Niles Star*, Michigan, 03/11/2009 re the Levin-McCain 2009 Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Bill



A Promising Solution

A key to understanding **quality attributes** is handling qualitative data, which in large part is language data, & making it quantitative.


Two complementary language data techniques are being used

- KJ Analysis
 - Structured methods for eliciting & clarifying/interpreting semantic meaning of textual information
 - That automated text analysis simply does not have
- Semi-automated content analysis based on automated text analysis
 - Enables more input from more stakeholders and identifies concepts in common that enables consistent applications of KJ across time & sites

Merging the two allows understanding of language data crucial for requirements & their measured validation.



Language Data: “The Other Data of Measurement & Analysis”* for Requirements Engineering




* Adopted from David Hollowell, Language Data: The ‘Other Data’ of Six Sigma: Part 1 of 2,
<http://software.isixsigma.com/library/content/c040303b.asp>





KJ – a Method for Collaborative Processing of Language Data

KJ (named after Jiro Kawakita) is a method for transmuting *tacit* knowledge into *explicit* and more & more objective statements ...



... and refining a collection of these statements into a 2-D patterned representation (KJ template) that conveys lots of information and related thought processes for those communicating asynchronously.



Adopted from David Hallowell, Language Data: The 'Other Data' of Six Sigma: Part s 1 & 2," <http://www.isixsigma.com/library/content/c040303b.asp>



Distilling Meaning in Language Data: Benefits of Combining KJ with Automated Content Analysis

Content analysis (CA) methods to analyze large bodies of textual documentation have existed for over seventy years, but until recently were predominantly manual.

- They were used during World War II to predict the bombing of London by analyzing Joseph Goebbels' speeches.
- However, humans cannot read & digest all the documents & recognize *all* the patterns that machines are getting increasingly better at doing.
- Yet humans must interpret the meaning, or lack thereof, of what machines can find.

Benefits of Combining CA & KJ

- *Automated text analysis can process a much richer body of information & provide common concepts for KJ participants to establish consistency from group to group.*
- *KJ analysis provides a framework for collaborative interpretation of concept maps produced by CA.*

Upshot: The combination is a hybrid that alters both CA & KJ but that generates insights that neither could produce alone.



Insuring Consistency & Completeness Across KJ Settings is a Problem

To date, KJ analysis has been applied in small, face-to-face one-day workshops where both customer and technologist points of view are represented.

One worry is that results might be quite different if different representatives were assembled on a different day.

An automated language or content analysis approach is being developed to supplement the KJ method so that


- a significantly larger group of individuals in geographically disparate locations can participate asynchronously.
- additional textual information is captured beyond that in KJ face-to-face sessions:
 - documentation in the form of requirement descriptions & specifications
 - problem and defect report databases
 - open text surveys
- there is more confidence that results are complete and repeatable.



Content Analysis & Concept Maps – a Language Data Computational Processing Method

CA uses automated text analysis tools to identify recurring concepts & clusters of concepts:

- Concepts are synonyms of strongly related **co-occurring** terms
 - constituted in automatically generated affinity lists
 - named by most representative term in affinity list
- Concept Clusters are collections concepts of similar co-occurrence patterns
 - more strongly related to each other than to concepts in other clusters
 - named by automatic selection of the concept most strongly related to other concepts in the cluster




Concept Clusters are represented graphically as Venn diagrams

- Concept names labeling dots are in concept clusters represented as circles
- dots can be linked by lines whose brightness represents frequency of co-occurrence
- dots can appear in the overlap of two (or more) circles
- circle size does not always indicate importance since circles can be sparsely populated



A CMMI-ACQ Example: Concept Map Clusters



Handling Language Data Numerically

Ranked Concept List

Concept	AbsoluteRelative	
	Count	Count
<u>process</u>	2068	100%
<u>project</u>	845	40.8%
<u>organization</u>	815	39.4%
<u>product</u>	812	39.2%
<u>supplier</u>	671	32.4%
<u>performance</u>	536	25.9%
<u>work</u>	510	24.6%
<u>management</u>	504	24.3%
<u>agreement</u>	493	23.8%
<u>information</u>	474	22.9%
<u>plan</u>	450	21.7%
<u>Requirements</u>	417	20.1%
<u>measures</u>	374	18%
<u>acquirer</u>	361	17.4%
<u>risk</u>	345	16.6%
<u>practices</u>	343	16.5%
<u>standard</u>	308	14.8%
<u>improvements</u>	295	14.2%
<u>activities</u>	291	14%
<u>level</u>	290	14%
<u>Quality</u>	259	12.5%
<u>results</u>	257	12.4%
<u>Data</u>	254	12.2%
<u>organizational</u>	253	12.2%
<u>defined</u>	248	11.9%
<u>stakeholders</u>	240	11.6%
<u>selected</u>	235	11.3%
<u>Criteria</u>	234	11.3%
<u>established</u>	224	10.8%
<u>support</u>	220	10.6%
<u>analysis</u>	214	10.3%
<u>changes</u>	209	10.1%
<u>models</u>	194	9.3%
<u>action</u>	194	9.3%
<u>service</u>	193	9.3%
<u>reviews</u>	189	9.1%

The most frequent CMMI-ACQ concepts are listed at the left.

The **absolute count** is the number of text blocks where a concept occurs – highest count set at 100%.

The **relative count** is the percentage of text blocks concepts occur in.

Not surprisingly for a process model, conceptual traces of **process** are found in the most CMMI-ACQ text blocks.

Project and **organization** are the *next most* significant thematic concepts.

These are followed by **product** and then **supplier all of which are important to the points made previously**

All are in the top 10% of concepts appearing in concept maps that follow.

Combining KJ and CA


An Example:

Starting with military capability areas & corresponding documentation

and documentation of systems that may enable essential capabilities,

formulate a Theme Question:

Are there essential planning capabilities not enabled by military systems?



Army BC
Functional
Concept (TP
525-3.3
2007)

Army C2
Doctrine
(FM 6-0
2003)

Planning Aviation
Missions (PAM)
Desired Functions
Description (DFD)
2007


Army Aviation
ISP for Mission
Planning

Operational
Capabilities

System
Functions



Army Battle Command – Continuous (Re)Planning (TP 525-3.3 BC Functional Concept)



At the operational and strategic levels, the commander **frames** the existing conditions by interrelating PMESSII-PT factors (Politics, Military, Economic, Social, Information, Infrastructure, Physical & Time).

At the tactical level, commanders consider **METT-TC** factors (Mission, Enemy, Terrain & weather, Troops & support, Time available, Civil considerations) wrt what they are learning from accumulating PMESII-PT information covering both friendly forces & enemy forces.


"No battle plan survives contact with the enemy." (Moltke in FM 6-0)

After initial planning, framing is referred to as reframing.



Elements of a KJ Template

Theme Question: If there are essential planning capability gaps not covered by the interoperation of Aviation mission planning and information sharing systems, what should be done?



Concepts Used in KJ Templates Derived from Concept Maps

Theme Question: If there are essential planning capability gaps not covered by the interoperation of Aviation mission planning and information sharing systems, what should be done?

Theme 1 (TP525-3.3 & FM 6-0): An essential planning capability is reframing or adjusting plans during mission execution requires agility dependent on interoperability

SubTheme 1.1 TP525-3.3:
Plan reframing during missions to leader agility that is dependent on interoperability

SubTheme 1.2 FM 6-0: Plan adjustment during missions to flexibility in leading dependent on interoperability

Planning reframing based on data, information & METT-TC during execution requires leader's agility



Interoperability applies to data, planning, information & agility

Agility & interoperability are mutually dependent quality attributes but not operationalized

No plan survives intact once conflict is made

Flexible leaders & staffs must understand & adjust to changing situations to alter plans

Mutual dependence of flexibility & interoperability not explicit & neither quality attribute is operationalized



Misalignment between TP 525-3.3/FM 6-0 & PAM DFD/ISP

Theme Question: *Given that there are essential planning capability gaps not covered by the interoperation of Aviation mission planning and information sharing systems, what should be done?*

Theme1 (TP525-3.3 & FM 6-0): An essential planning capability is reframing or adjusting plans during mission execution requires agility dependent on interoperability



Theme2: (DFD & ISP): Agility & flexibility are not specified & interoperability is not sufficiently specified nor operationalized; adjusting plans in-flight not really considered

SubTheme1.1 TP525-3.3: Plan reframing during missions takes leader agility that is dependent on interoperability

SubTheme1.2 FM 6-0: Plan adjustment during missions takes flexibility in leading dependent on interoperability

Planning reframing based on data, information & METT-TC during execution requires leaders agility

Interoperability applies to data, planning, information & agility

Agility & interoperability are mutually dependent quality attributes but not operationalized

No plan survives intact once contact is made

Flexible leaders & staffs must understand & adjust to changing situations to alter plans

Mutual dependence of flexibility & interoperability not explicit & neither quality attribute is operationalized

SubTheme2.1: The DFD does not explicitly address plan adjustment during execution nor specify agility & interoperability

SubTheme2.2: The ISP requires interoperability at a syntactic level, but does not define interoperability at different levels

The system is more geared to loading Data before flight & using it to execute a plan

Adjusting plans takes place before loading data into aircraft systems

Interoperability is included as an objective but only up to the syntactic level

Control of information is provided by interoperability functions that support transfer of data in various formats

Interoperability levels labeled 0, 1 or 2 are used but not defined, let alone operationalized with measures specified

The conditional of the theme question appears to be true, so what should be done?



Given the Misalignment, What Should be Done?

Theme Question: Given that there are essential planning capability gaps not covered by the interoperation of Aviation mission planning and information sharing systems, *what should be done?*

Theme3: Establish processes for evolution of Aviation planning capabilities & their quality attributes

SubTheme3.1: If providing a capability like adjusting plans in-flight is an objective, planning & analysis is needed across programs responsible for the multiple systems enabling the capability

Sensor, planning & information sharing systems are mutually responsible for enabling plan adjustment during flight

There are technical, tactical & human limitations on the extent to which planning & missions can be reframed both pre & during flight

Multiple systems have to interoperate throughout their evolution

SubTheme3.2: Establish a process for defining, operationalizing & aligning quality attributes like agility & interoperability across combat forces and systems

Agility & interoperability are quality attributes for both combat forces and systems that need to be operationalized & aligned

There are semantic & pragmatic levels of interoperability that need to be reached in addition to technical & syntactic levels

Planning & plan reframing provide context for specifying agility & interoperability measures

A preliminary answer is provided in Statements & SubThemes 3.1 & 3.2 formulated in discussion with a few representatives from PEO Aviation.

Elaboration, confirmation & buy-in has to be achieved with many more stakeholders.

More discussions with more Aviation groups is being planned using a mix of KJ and CA methods both synchronously and asynchronously.



Relationships of all Three Themes

Theme Question: Given that there are essential planning capability gaps not covered by the interoperation of Aviation mission planning and information sharing systems, what should be done?

Theme1 (TP525-3.3 & FM 6-0): An essential planning capability is reframing or adjusting plans during mission execution taking agility dependent on interoperability



Theme2: (DFD & ISP): Agility & flexibility are not specified & interoperability is not sufficiently specified nor operationalized; adjusting plans in-flight not really considered

SubTheme1.1 TP525-3.3: Plan reframing during missions takes leader agility that is dependent on interoperability

SubTheme1.2 FM 6-0: Plan adjustment during missions takes flexibility in leading dependent on interoperability

Planning reframing based on data, information & METT-TC during execution requires leaders agility

Interoperability applies to data, planning, information & agility

Agility & interoperability are mutually dependent quality attributes but not operationalized

No plan survives intact once contact is made

Flexible leaders & staffs must understand & adjust to changing situations to alter plans

Mutual dependence of flexibility & interoperability not explicit & neither quality attribute is operationalized

SubTheme2.1: The DFD does not explicitly address plan adjustment during execution nor specify agility & interoperability

SubTheme2.2: The ISP requires interoperability at a syntactic level, but does not define interoperability at different levels

The system is more geared to loading Data before flight & using it to execute a plan

Adjusting plans takes place before loading data into aircraft systems

Interoperability is included as an objective but only up to the syntactic level

Control of information is provided by interoperability functions that support transfer of data in various formats

Interoperability levels labeled 0, 1 or 2 are used but not defined, let alone operationalized with measures specified



Theme3: Establish processes for evolution of Aviation planning capabilities & their quality attributes

SubTheme3.1: If providing a capability like adjusting plans in-flight is an objective, planning & analysis is needed across programs responsible for the multiple systems enabling the capability

Sensor, planning & information sharing systems are mutually responsible for enabling plan adjustment during flight

There are technical, tactical & human limitations on the extent to which planning & missions can be reframed both pre & during flight

Multiple systems have to interoperate throughout their evolution

SubTheme3.2: Establish a process for defining, operationalizing & aligning quality attributes like agility & interoperability across combat forces and systems


Agility & interoperability are quality attributes for both combat forces and systems that need to be operationalized & aligned

There are semantic & pragmatic levels of interoperability that need to be reached in addition to technical & syntactic levels

Planning & plan reframing provide context for specifying agility & interoperability measures



Scaling Up the Process



Concluding Thoughts

What has been shown is the potential for CA to

- uncover misalignments among documents describing capabilities & systems
- identify quality attributes in these documents that need to be better defined & operationalized

These results can be used in KJ analyses in the form of common concepts that can be combined in statements, subthemes & themes in

- multiple face-to-face interview probing
- collaborative interpretation of concept maps derived from different documents leading to determinations of their alignment or misalignment.

So far this combined use of CA & KJ has shown promise when used informally with a few representatives of military organizations.

The next step is to refine the emerging process with greater numbers of people and documents in multiple settings.



Thank you for your attention!

For further information,
please contact:

Ira A. Monarch
iam@sei.cmu.edu
1.412.268.7070

Dennis R. Goldenson
dg@sei.cmu.edu
1.412.268.8506


Robert W. Stoddard II
rws@sei.cmu.edu
1.412-268




Backup




Army C2 Doctrine (FM 6-0 2003) – plan, adjustment, lead, flexibility, commander, staff, interoperability, execution, situational_understanding



Army Command & Control Doctrine (FM 6-0)



Type Decision	Situation	Action
Execution	Minor Variances from the Plan Operation proceeding according to plan. Variances are within acceptable limits.	Execute Planned Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commander or designee decides which planned actions best meet situation and directs their execution. Staff completes follow-up actions. Decision may be permissive. FRAGO not normally issued.
	Anticipated Situation Operation encountering variances within the limits for one or more sequels.	Execute a Branch or Sequel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commander or staff review branch/sequel plan. Commander receives assessments and recommendations for modifications to the plan, determines the time available to refine it, and either issues guidance for further actions or directs execution of a branch/sequel. Staff issues FRAGO. Staff completes follow-up actions.
Adjustment	Unanticipated Situation— Friendly Success Significant unanticipated positive variances result in opportunities to achieve the end state in ways that differ significantly from the plan.	Make an Adjustment Decision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commander recognizes threat/opportunity and determines time available for decisionmaking. Commander selects a decisionmaking method. If there is not enough time for a complete MDMP, the commander directs the staff to refine a single COA or directs actions by subordinates to counter the threat/exploit opportunity and exercise initiative within the higher commander's intent. Commander normally does not attempt to restore the plan. Commander issues a verbal WARNO or FRAGO to subordinate commanders. Staff resynchronizes operation, modifies the criteria of success, and begins assessing operations for progress using the new criteria of success.
	Unanticipated Situation— Enemy Threat Significant, unanticipated negative variances impede mission accomplishment.	



Application of the Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) prior to execution projects synchronized application of combat power.

During execution variances due to unanticipated situations disrupts synchronization.



Interpreting Analysis of TP 525-3.3 & FM 6-0: Quality attributes need to be specified & operationalized

Plan reframing during **mission** execution is a form of **leader agility** (inference from Battle Command graphic TP 525-3.3 and **leaders** cluster in concept map)

- *Agility, as it applies to joint C2, has six key elements: robustness, resilience, adaptability, responsiveness, flexibility, and innovation (TP 525-3.3)*

Plan adjustment during mission execution is a form of **leader flexibility** (inference from and lead cluster)

- *No **plan** survives intact once contact is made. Tactical **flexibility** requires **flexible leaders** capable of adapting to rapidly changing circumstances; and **staffs** able to recognize significant **changes** in the **situation**, and resynchronize the operation by coordinating the **changes** to alter the **plan** (FM 6-0).*

Agility & flexibility depend on (**semantic & pragmatic**) **interoperability**

- *in order to share needed information when it is needed & in a form it can be **understood** and **acted on with confidence** (TP 525-3.3).*

Agility, flexibility & interoperability are battle command quality attributes

- need to be operationalized with numeric thresholds and objectives specified
- Planning & plan reframing provide context for specifying these measures.



Interpreting the Significance of Adjust_Plan in the PAM DFD


Statements in the document do not explicitly commit to **plan adjustments** in-flight.

While the document says

- *“The ... interface to the Maneuver Control System (MCS) ... provides the aviation commander with continuous updates of the friendly and enemy situation and allows the commander to rapidly **adjust his plan** to accomplish his assigned mission.”*
- it also says, *“The assigned missions, orders and map data are then transferred down to the air crew level where specific air crew mission planning takes place. This mission information is then loaded into the aircraft systems via hardware or digital radio transfer for use during mission execution.”*
- In fact, in conversation with aviation mission planning acquisition people, they asserted their system only served pre-flight planning.

High level **interoperability** requirements are stated, but not clearly defined or operationalized with measures specified.





Interpreting the Significance of Interoperability in the PAM ISP

According to the ISP, most of the **interoperability** functions support **data transfer** in various **formats** enabling the **planning** system to be

- the collector & consolidator of all pertinent battlefield **information** needed for effective aviation **missions** thereby serving as an information **consumer**
- capable of in-flight re-targeting and re-planning (though this is only stated once as an objective)

However, supporting data transfer in various formats is syntactic **interoperability** – not semantic or pragmatic **interoperability** needed for in-flight re-targeting & re-planning.

Interoperability levels labeled 0, 1 or 2 are used but not defined, let alone operationalized with measures specified.

