

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMPUTER APPLICATION & MANAGEMENT

IJR  
CM



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A., Google Scholar,

Open J-Gate, India [link of the same is duly available at Infibnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)],

Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland with IC Value of 5.09 & number of libraries all around the world.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 5220 Cities in 187 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

<http://ijrcm.org.in/>

# CONTENTS

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>TITLE &amp; NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1.	<b>TRADE FLOW ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OF INDONESIAN LOBSTER EXPORT</b> <i>LIA NUR ALIA RAHMAH, RINA OKTAVIANI &amp; HENY K. DARYANTO</i>	1
2.	<b>A STUDY ON TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENT IMPACT ON PURCHASE PSYCHE OF A CONSUMER</b> <i>NAVEEN.V &amp; DR. SANJEEV PADASHETTY</i>	6
3.	<b>KEY ACTIVITIES IN MANAGING SOFTWARE PROJECT EFFORT</b> <i>AMIT KUMAR PARMAR &amp; DR. P. K. SHARAN</i>	10
4.	<b>E-SPEAKING AS GOOD PUBLIC SERVICES FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA</b> <i>OUK TOM &amp; MAO YU</i>	15
5.	<b>REVIEW ARTICLE ON MODERN PORTFOLIO THEORY: MARKOWITZ MODEL</b> <i>KRISHNA JOSHI &amp; DR. CHETNA PARMAR</i>	19
6.	<b>UNIFIED PAYMENT INTERFACE (UPI) FOR LESS-CASH INDIA</b> <i>SRIHARI SUBUDHI</i>	22
7.	<b>IMPACT OF SPIRITUALITY AT WORKPLACE ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE</b> <i>KANIKA BHUTANI ANAND</i>	25
8.	<b>BUILDING BRAND VALUE THROUGH INNOVATIVE CSR PRACTICES</b> <i>SHWETA SINGH</i>	28
9.	<b>FARMER PRODUCER COMPANY MODEL AS FARM TO MARKET LINKAGE: LEARNING AND CASES FROM CHHATTISGARH</b> <i>SANJAY KUMAR JOSHI &amp; SANT RAM LODHI</i>	39
10.	<b>IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP QUALITIES OF EMPLOYEES IN CORPORATE HOSPITALS IN CHENNAI</b> <i>P.LIBIA</i>	44
	<b>REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK &amp; DISCLAIMER</b>	48

**CHIEF PATRON****PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL**

Chairman, Malaviya National Institute of Technology, Jaipur  
*(An institute of National Importance & fully funded by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India)*

Chancellor, K. R. Mangalam University, Gurgaon

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Faridabad

Founder Vice-Chancellor (1998-2008), Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi

Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

**FOUNDER PATRON****LATE SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL**

Former State Minister for Home &amp; Tourism, Government of Haryana

Former Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri

Former President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

**FORMER CO-ORDINATOR****DR. S. GARG**

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Business &amp; Management, Urjani

**ADVISOR****PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU**

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

**EDITOR****PROF. R. K. SHARMA**

Professor &amp; Dean, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management &amp; Research, New Delhi

**EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD****DR. CHRISTIAN EHIOBUCHÉ**

Professor of Global Business/Management, Larry L Luing School of Business, Berkeley College, Woodland  
 Park NJ 07424, USA

**PROF. SIKANDER KUMAR**

Chairman, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

**DR. JOSÉ G. VARGAS-HERNÁNDEZ**

Research Professor, University Center for Economic & Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

**PROF. RAJENDER GUPTA**

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

**DR. TEGUH WIDODO**

Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, Telkom University, Bandung Technoplex, Jl. Telekomunikasi, Terusan  
 Buah Batu, Kabupaten Bandung, Indonesia

**PROF. S. P. TIWARI**

Head, Department of Economics &amp; Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

**DR. KAUP MOHAMED**

Dean &amp; Managing Director, London American City College/ICBEST, United Arab Emirates

**SUNIL KUMAR KARWASRA**

Principal, Aakash College of Education, ChanderKalan, Tohana, Fatehabad

**DR. MIKE AMUHAYA IRAVO**

Principal, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Westlands Campus, Nairobi-Kenya

**PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU**

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

**DR. NEPOMUCENO TIU**

Chief Librarian & Professor, Lyceum of the Philippines University, Laguna, Philippines

**PROF. PARVEEN KUMAR**

Director, M.C.A., Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, Meerut, U. P.

**DR. ANA ŠTAMBUK**

Head of Department in Statistics, Faculty of Economics, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

**PROF. H. R. SHARMA**

Director, Chhatrapati Shivaji Institute of Technology, Durg, C.G.

**DR. CLIFFORD OBIYO OFURUM**

Director, Department of Accounting, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

**DR. SHIB SHANKAR ROY**

Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

**PROF. MANOHAR LAL**

Director & Chairman, School of Information & Computer Sciences, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

**DR. SRINIVAS MADISHETTI**

Professor, School of Business, Mzumbe University, Tanzania

**PROF. ANIL K. SAINI**

Chairperson (CRC), Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

**PROF. R. K. CHOUDHARY**

Director, Asia Pacific Institute of Information Technology, Panipat

**DR. VIJAYPAL SINGH DHAKA**

Dean (Academics), Rajasthan Institute of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur

**PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN**

Professor, Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

**DR. EGWAKHE A. JOHNSON**

Professor, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria

**DR. ASHWANI KUSH**

Head, Computer Science, University College, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**PROF. ABHAY BANSAL**

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

**DR. BHARAT BHUSHAN**

Head, Department of Computer Science & Applications, Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Yamunanagar

**MUDENDA COLLINS**

Head of the Department of Operations & Supply Chain, The Copperbelt University, Zambia

**Dr. MURAT DARÇIN**

Associate Dean, Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy, Ankara, Turkey

**DR. YOUNOS VAKIL ALROAIA**

Head of International Center, DOS in Management, Semnan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran

**SHASHI KHURANA**

Associate Professor, S. M. S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

**DR. SEOW TA WEEA**

Associate Professor, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Parit Raja, Malaysia

**DR. OKAN VELI ŞAFAKLI**

Associate Professor, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Cyprus

**DR. MOHINDER CHAND**

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**DR. BORIS MILOVIC**

Associate Professor, Faculty of Sport, Union Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade, Serbia

**DR. IQBAL THONSE HAWALDAR**

Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, Kingdom University, Bahrain

**DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA**

Associate Professor, Government College, Hodal

**DR. ALEXANDER MOSESOV**

Associate Professor, Kazakh-British Technical University (KBUT), Almaty, Kazakhstan

**DR. MOHAMMAD TALHA**

Associate Professor, Department of Accounting &amp; MIS, College of Industrial Management, King Fahd University of Petroleum &amp; Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia

**DR. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN**

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**DR. RAJESH MODI**

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**WILLIAM NKOMO**

Asst. Head of the Department, Faculty of Computing, Botho University, Francistown, Botswana

**YU-BING WANG**

Faculty, department of Marketing, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan

**DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE**

Faculty, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

**DR. MELAKE TEWOLDE TECLEGHIORGIS**

Faculty, College of Business &amp; Economics, Department of Economics, Asmara, Eritrea

**DR. BHAVET**

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering &amp; Technology, Urjani

**DR. THAMPOE MANAGALESWARAN**

Faculty, Vavuniya Campus, University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka

**ASHISH CHOPRA**

Faculty, Doon Valley Institute of Engineering &amp; Technology, Karnal

**SURAJ GAUDEL**

BBA Program Coordinator, LA GRANDEE International College, Simalchaur - 8, Pokhara, Nepal

**DR. SAMBHAVNA**

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

## **CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS**

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to the recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography; Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript** **anytime** in **M.S. Word format** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website (**[FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE](#)**).

## **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT**

### 1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

**DATED:** \_\_\_\_\_

**THE EDITOR**

IJRCM

**Subject:** SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF \_\_\_\_\_.

**(e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)**

**DEAR SIR/MADAM**

Please find my submission of manuscript titled ' \_\_\_\_\_ ' for likely publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published anywhere in any language fully or partly, nor it is under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to inclusion of their names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

**NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

Designation/Post\*

Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code

Residential address with Pin Code

Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code

Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No)

Landline Number (s) with country ISD code

E-mail Address

Alternate E-mail Address

Nationality

\* i.e. Alumnus (Male Alumni), Alumna (Female Alumni), Student, Research Scholar (M. Phil), Research Scholar (Ph. D.), JRF, Research Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Junior Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Assistant Professor, Co-ordinator, Reader, Associate Professor, Professor, Head, Vice-Principal, Dy. Director, Principal, Director, Dean, President, Vice Chancellor, Industry Designation etc. **The qualification of author is not acceptable for the purpose.**

**NOTES:**

- a) The whole manuscript has to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. **pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration.**
  - b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail**:  
**New Manuscript for Review in the area of** (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)
  - c) There is no need to give any text in the body of the mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.
  - d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB**.
  - e) Only the **Abstract will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.
  - f) **The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty-four hours** and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of the manuscript, within two days of its submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.
  - g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except on the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.
2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be typed in **bold letters, centered and fully capitalised**.
  3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** Author (s) **name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline number (s), and email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.
  4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.
  5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in **fully italic printing**, ranging between **150 to 300 words**. The abstract must be informative and elucidating the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA**. **Abbreviations must be mentioned in full**.
  6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations etc.
  7. **JEL CODE:** Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at [www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php](http://www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php). However, mentioning of JEL Code is not mandatory.
  8. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. **It should be free from any errors i.e. grammatical, spelling or punctuation. It must be thoroughly edited at your end.**
  9. **HEADINGS:** All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
  10. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
  11. **MAIN TEXT:**

**THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:****INTRODUCTION****REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESIS (ES)****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****LIMITATIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE****The manuscript should preferably be in 2000 to 5000 WORDS, But the limits can vary depending on the nature of the manuscript.**



12. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR, centered, separately numbered** & self-explained, and the **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.**
13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE:** These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, left aligned with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word may be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.
14. **ACRONYMS:** These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section e.g. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.
15. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. **The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript** and they may follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to ensure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper.** The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
  - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
  - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
  - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc., in chronologically ascending order.
  - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
  - The title of books and journals should be in italic printing. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
  - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.
  - **Headers, footers, endnotes and footnotes should not be used in the document. However, you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point,** which may be placed in number orders before the references.

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**

**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS**

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

**JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES**

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

**CONFERENCE PAPERS**

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19-23

**UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS**

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

**ONLINE RESOURCES**

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

**WEBSITES**

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>



## KEY ACTIVITIES IN MANAGING SOFTWARE PROJECT EFFORT

AMIT KUMAR PARMAR

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

B.R.A.B. UNIVERSITY

MUZAFFARPUR

DR. P. K. SHARAN

PROFESSOR

UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

B.R.A.B. UNIVERSITY

MUZAFFARPUR

## ABSTRACT

Accurate effort estimation is a crucial task for software business progression: for customers, acquiring software products or making project contracts for software implementation, accurate effort estimation enables adherence to schedule and budget without delay in deployment and introduction (Conte, et al., 1986; Sommerville, 2001). A software supplier organization strives to estimate the effort needed in building software as accurately as possible to ensure the project's budget and schedule, and the success of resource allocation. Despite the numerous effort estimation approaches and applications available, the estimates have remained inaccurate. The objective of this paper is to find out the management practices of software development project effort, resulting in increased effort estimate accuracy. In the quest of its goal, the paper commences by presenting the theoretical background and the key concepts related to software project effort management approach. This paper focuses on an activity set of general software project activities, which are found to be one of the major software project activity categories besides software construction and project management effort.

## KEYWORDS

project management, software development effort management, software engineering, software cost estimation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Software providers require cost, price, and time-to-market calculations which are not possible without knowledge of effort and its distribution. Workload estimation is needed for work and staffing plans. Sufficiently accurate effort estimation is important for software engineers, because successful resource allocation decreases working pressure and haste. Accurate effort estimation is a crucial task for software business progression: for customers, acquiring software products or making project contracts for tailored software implementation, accurate effort estimation enables adherence to schedule and budget without delay in deployment and introduction (Conte, et al., 1986; Sommerville, 2001). The numerous formal models, methods and tools available for estimation have reached accuracy levels which are too low for the software industry companies. In practice, the same level of accuracy can be achieved with the informal expert judgment technique, which has remained as the most commonly employed estimation technique (Jørgensen, 2007). Two factors are emphasized in respect to the difficulty in producing accurate estimates: software sizing and the available data for estimations (Armour, 2002). Moreover, it has been argued that the formal effort estimation models are too complex and uncertain for practical use (Sommerville, 2001). The applications of these models are usually not transparent, i.e., the factor weights used for effort derivation are not obtainable in order to validate them. Transparency would be required by the estimator to evaluate the reasonability of the gained estimate, i.e., what comprises the effort and the costs.

An important, yet overlooked, factor explaining poor estimates is the light consideration on different activities involved with the project. The estimators employing the expert judgment technique frequently consider only those activities that they are in relation with in a software project and focus on the effort of actual software construction (Jørgensen, 2004b, 2005; Jørgensen and Sjøberg, 2004). Moreover, the focus in effort estimation research and estimation applications has been on software construction (i.e., analysis, design, implementation and testing) and project management (Boehm, et al., 2000; MacDonell and Shepperd, 2003), whilst neglecting other software project activities.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical background for the key activities related in managing effort in a software project is introduced in this section.

## 2.1 EFFORT AND COST ESTIMATION

The *effort* of a software development project can be generally defined as the time consumed by the project, and it can be expressed as a number of person hours, days, months or years, depending on the size of the project (Chatters, et al., 1999). Brooks (1975) has defined effort as the product of people and time, i.e.,  $\text{effort} = \text{people} * \text{time}$ . Effort is estimated in most projects, especially in projects employing traditional project management methods, to derive the project costs that are needed to justify the business case. In agile software development, the project costs are derived from the estimated software size (Cohn, 2008). An *estimate* is a probabilistic assessment with a reasonable accurate value of the centre of a range. Formally, an estimate is defined as the median of the (unknown) distribution (Fenton and Pfleeger, 1997). An estimate is a prediction; hence, an estimation model can be considered as a prediction system. *Effort estimation* is often used as a synonym for cost estimation but, to be precise, *cost estimation* is derived from the effort estimate by valuing the effort using the cost of project personnel and some other major project costs. Thus the outcome of effort estimation is a time value, whereas the cost estimate outcome is some monetary value (Conte, et al., 1986; Fenton and Pfleeger, 1997; Sommerville, 2001).

## 2.2 EFFORT DISTRIBUTION

Although effort can be distributed in a project between project activities or project phases in many different ways, *effort distribution* is a less-investigated effort estimation area. Indeed, it has been disputed whether it is useful to distribute effort in the first place (Blackburn, et al., 1996; MacDonell and Shepperd, 2003). Yet examples exist in the software engineering literature; Brooks' (1975) suggestion for rule-of-thumb effort distribution for software construction among the first in the mid-1970s. Effort distribution can also be used to compare different projects with each other (Heijstek and Chaudron, 2008).

## 2.3 WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (WBS)

Effort is distributed on software project activities and sets of activities that form a *work breakdown structure*, WBS. A WBS is a particular defined tree-structure hierarchy of elements that decomposes the project into discrete work tasks (Royce, 1998; Wilson and Sifer, 1988). It can be very useful to organize project activity elements into a hierarchical structure for project budgetary planning and control purposes (Boehm, 1981). An early establishment of a WBS helps to divide the effort into distinct work segments that can be scheduled and prioritized (Agarwal, et al., 2001).

WBS is also required by the currently employed capability maturity models. For example, the staged representation of CMMI (SEI, 2006; SEI, 2010) requires WBS on its maturity level 2. However, no standardized way to create a WBS exists, and the software engineering literature provides only a few general WBS including

ones applied with the two COCOMO models (Boehm, 1981; Boehm, et al., 2000), the *Rational Unified Process* (RUP) activity distribution (Royce, 1998), and the ISO/IEC 12207 work breakdown structure for software lifecycle processes (ISO, 1995). It is noted that although the concept and practice of using a WBS is well established, the topic is largely avoided in the published literature because the development of a WBS depends on the project management style, organizational culture, customer preference, financial constraints, and several other project-specific parameters (Royce, 1998).

Another structure for work breakdown is provided in the OPEN process Framework (Henderson-Sellers, 2003), which in one of the five major framework components is Work Units, which results as a Work Product. A *Work unit* is defined as a functionally cohesive operation performed by a Producer (people). The three major classes of Work Unit are Activity (e.g., 'project planning' or 'modeling and implementation'), Task (e.g., 'code' or 'evaluate quality'), and Technique (e.g., 'class naming 'prototyping' or 'unit testing'). These classes form pairs and are linked with each other, e.g., Activities are linked with Tasks, and Tasks with Techniques.

## 2.4 EFFORT MANAGEMENT

The concept of effort management is rarely used in software engineering or information system research. The concept was introduced in information system research first in 1995. Young (1995, p. 716) defines *effort management* as a management area that "tracks the commitment of resources against undertakings, both project and non-project". In fact, Young (1995) emphasizes the non-project consideration over project. We, on the other hand, implicitly limit our consideration to software projects, and define effort management as an organized process to estimate, collect, monitor and control, and analyse effort related to software projects and their activities.

Effort management can be considered to include all necessary functions which manage effort in a software project. These functions include effort estimation, effort collection, and effort assessment and analysis, for instance. Simplified, during project planning, effort is initially estimated with the method in use. The estimate is revised during project execution with both collected and assessed effort data from the project. During project closure, the delivered project and its effort are analysed, and a project final report is drawn. To assist effort management, some frameworks have been proposed: *Software Development Management* (SDM) framework (Tsoi, 1999), and the frameworks proposed in (Fairley, 1992; Vesterinen, 1998). These frameworks are fairly limited, both in terms of project lifecycle phases and effort functions. For example, the SDM framework is limited mostly to the pre- project and project phases. The proposed frameworks also concentrate mostly on the effort estimation function.

## 2.5 EFFORT ESTIMATIONS AND RE-ESTIMATIONS

The effort of a software project can be estimated and modelled, and estimation techniques can be classified in several ways. In the following, we present the evolution from the first effort and cost estimation approach classifications by Boehm (1981) and Conte, et al., (1986) to the later classifications by Fairley (1992), Fenton and Pfleeger (1997) and Briand, et al., (1999, 2000).


Boehm (1981) divided the methods into seven categories: algorithmic models, expert judgment, analogy, Parkinson, price- to-win, top-down, and bottom-up. The algorithmic models include linear models, multiplication models, analytic models, tabular models, and composite models. Later, this division was reduced to two main antithetic approaches: algorithmic and non-algorithmic approaches. Conte, et al., (1986) divided the approaches of effort estimation on the highest level into micro-model and macro-models of effort. The macro-models of effort were divided further into historical-experimental models, statistically-based models, theoretically-based models, and composite models. The historical-experimental models include expert judgment technique. The statistically-based models include techniques such as regression analysis, linear models, and non-linear models.

In 1992, Fairley (1992) addressed the different estimation techniques which included the traditional approaches (categorized into empirical techniques, regression techniques, and theory-based techniques) and the advances in the popular approaches at that time (advances in analogy-based estimation, function point techniques, regression modelling, theory-based models, and in size estimation). Fairley (1992) predicted that analogy-based methods with expert system decision rules will emerge into future estimations.

Fenton and Pfleeger's (1997) division was based much on Boehm's division, but included only four categories: expert opinion, analogy, decomposition, and models. Each of these techniques can be applied either bottom-up or top-down.

Briand, et al., (1999, 2000) divided the effort estimation techniques into parametric and more advanced non-parametric modelling techniques (Figure 1). The non-parametric modelling techniques have emerged gradually into effort estimation, but applications are still in short supply.

FIGURE 1: THE NON-PARAMETRIC EFFORT ESTIMATION TECHNIQUE CLASSIFICATION (adopted from Briand, et al., 1999, 2000)



Since the beginning of the 1990's research on effort estimation has increased and new approaches have been proposed and presented. These approaches include various machine learning techniques and artificial intelligence. Based on the evaluations of these advanced techniques (e.g., (Finnie and Wittig, 1996; Mukhopadhyay and Kekre, 1992; Shepperd and Schofield, 1997; Srinivasan and Fisher, 1995)), one cannot conclude a superior estimation technique, although case-based reasoning seems to be a promising one out of the advanced formal approaches. The results of the evaluations depend on the case and are partially in conflict with each other. Although new approaches have been introduced, in practice the methods employed are mostly old approaches. A reason for this is that the new approaches, such as artificial neural networks, produce results hard to interpret in practice (Briand, et al., 1999).

In fact, formal techniques in general are seldom employed in the software engineering industry. Studies (Gray, et al., 1999; Hihn and Habib-agahi, 1991; Jørgensen, 2005; Jørgensen and Sjøberg, 2004; Kitchenham, et al., 2002; Virtanen, 2003) imply that applied techniques in the software industry are primarily informal, and based on analogy and expert analysis, particularly since there is no conclusive evidence that a formal method outperforms the informal expert analysis (Jørgensen, 2004a, 2004b, 2007; Kitchenham, et al., 2009). The analysis of fifteen studies comparing the accuracy of expert estimates with model estimates reported that findings were distributed equally, i.e., five studies were in favour of expert estimations, five studies found no difference and five studies were in favour of formal model-based estimation (Jørgensen, 2004b).

In another study (Niessink and van Vliet, 1997), the expert judgment technique has been reported to outperform the Function Point Analysis based estimations in the context of predicting maintenance effort. *Expert judgment estimation* is defined as an “estimation conducted by a person who is recognized as an expert on the task and who follows a process that is, to some degree, non-explicit and non-recoverable” (Jørgensen and Sjøberg, 2004, p. 317). Reasons for applying expert judgment instead of formal estimation methods include flexibility regarding required input for estimations and time spent on estimations.

Software project effort estimation has been increasingly studied since 1960's both in the academia and in the software industry. In particular, the research interest lies within *modelling* effort and cost estimation. As models in general, they describe a phenomenon *ex post*, and thus their use *ex ante* for estimation can be challenging; rather, they can be used for simulating the software project effort after project's completion when the actual effort is in hand. Moreover, the models require information as input parameters which cannot be obtained before the project is completed. For example, COCOMO model (Boehm, 1981) requires the number of lines of code when modelling software project effort.

Effort and cost estimation has existed in software engineering research literature since 1960's when the first models to estimate effort and cost were introduced (Conte, et al., 1986). These pioneering models included linear statistical models such as Nelson and Farr-Zagorsky. The famous formal models are from the turn of the 1970-80's, and include the Putnam SLIM model, Price-S model, the Jensen model, and the COCOMO model.

According to (Pressman, 2005; Royce, 1998; Smith, et al., 2001), the most widely known models include the COCOMO (Constructive Cost Model) (Boehm, 1981) and COCOMO II (Boehm, et al., 1995, 2000) models, which are primarily based on software size in lines of code, and the *Function point* (FP) count (Albrecht and Gaffney, 1983). The FP count, or *Function Point Analysis* (FPA), is based on the software functionality, and can be used to derive effort with a known productivity factor, and has many variants such as Mark II FP (Symons, 1988).

Boehm (1981) introduced the original COCOMO model in 1981. The original *COCOMO model* is a collection of three different models: The Basic model, the Intermediate model, and the Detailed model. The purpose of using a more complex model is to achieve more accurate estimation by taking more factors into account. This in turn requires more details to be known. The Basic model, which can be applied in the early stage of the project, estimates the effort based primarily on the software project's size in terms of program lines of code (*kilo delivered source instructions*, KDSI). The Intermediate and Detailed models use an *Effort Adjustment Factor* (EAF) and slightly different coefficients for the effort equations. The EAF is a product of the six-scaled Effort Multiplier and the corresponding cost driver. The COCOMO cost drivers consists of fifteen independent Product, computer, personnel and project attributes which determine the project's effort. The major difference between the Intermediate and the Detailed model is that Effort Multipliers are in the Detailed model used for each project phase (Agarwal, et al., 2001; Boehm, 1981; Fenton and Pfleeger, 1997). COCOMO was enhanced to *COCOMO II* in the mid-1990's in order to develop the model to address the new needs of evolving software engineering such as distributed software and component techniques (Boehm, et al., 2000; Fenton and Pfleeger, 1997). COCOMO II categorization is not, however, suitable for all project situations, and should be adjusted via context and judgment to fit individual projects (Boehm, et al., 2000). COCOMO II model's equation for counting effort corresponds with the original COCOMO's Intermediate (or Detailed) model's equation. The amount of Effort Multipliers considered depends on the project's development phase as the knowledge on the project grows (Agarwal, et al., 2001). Moreover, besides using only lines of code for the software sizing, object or function points can be used (Fenton and Pfleeger, 1997; Pressman, 2005).

Besides estimating effort and cost, the COCOMO models provide effort distributions over different work breakdown structures. A WBS was suggested for projects employing a waterfall project lifecycle process in (Boehm, 1981). The WBS is applied with the COCOMO cost estimation model as the model estimates how effort is distributed on different activities between eight major categories, namely requirement analysis, product design, programming, test planning, verification and validation, project office functions, configuration management and quality assurance, and manuals, each having specific activities in the four project lifecycle phases. These phases were based on earlier estimation methods and the waterfall lifecycle model (Boehm, 1981).

COCOMO II has been developed to be usable by projects employing either waterfall or spiral software engineering processes. In the waterfall approach of COCOMO II, software activity work was divided into five major categories: management, system engineering, programming, test and evaluation, and data. This breakdown was adapted from the COCOMO's eight categories, which were partly reorganized and renamed. The requirements, product design, and configuration management and quality assurance categories were organized as system engineering sub-activities. 'Verification and validation' was renamed 'test and evaluation', 'manuals' became 'data', and 'project office functions' became 'management' (Boehm, et al., 2000).

The COCOMO II spiral approach is based on the same WBS approach applied in the RUP (Royce, 1998). The RUP default WBS is based on seven main categories, namely management, environment, requirements, design, implementation, assessment, and deployment. Each of these seven categories includes activities relating to four project phases (inception and elaboration of the engineering stage, and construction and transition of the construction stage) (Royce, 1998). The COCOMO II WBS for spiral process is based much on the same seven categories, yet RUP's 'environment' became 'environment and configuration management' in COCOMO II. Also, the activities within the four phases partly differ (Boehm, et al., 2000). Moreover, COCOMO II dropped COCOMO's modern- programming-practices parameter in favour of a more general process-maturity parameter. COCOMO II was also enhanced with several new parameters (Chen, et al., 2005), for example, with the development of reuse, multi-site development, architecture and risk resolution, and team cohesion. Moreover, the organization can add new proprietary parameters reflecting its particular situations.

## 2.6 EFFORT DATA COLLECTION

The software engineering literature (e.g., Pressman, 2005; Royce, 1998; Sommerville, 2001) describes effort-related functions during project execution (collection, monitoring, assessments, and re-estimations) very superficially compared to the effort-related functions during project planning (e.g., effort estimation, scheduling etc.).

However, a few descriptions exist. In the beginning of the 1980s, Boehm (1981) described a follow-up system for projects' effort (cost) information. He pointed out that in the beginning effort estimation is imperfect and actual effort data is needed for calibration and change management. Moreover, not every project fits into the estimating model. Hence, the employed formal effort estimation model requires a particular follow-up system. This system both supports effective project management and benefits the long-range effort estimation capabilities. The data collected in a consistent manner via control activities over several projects can be analysed to determine how the actual effort distribution differs from the estimates. The differences are fed back to calibrate the model. For a new project, data collection should be considered to calibrate their estimating models (Boehm, 1981).

The importance of the effort-related functions during project execution, such as effort collection, was raised also in (Tsoi, 1999), where a framework for software project development management was proposed. This framework concentrated on the pre-project and project phases (referred as acquisition and operation phases, respectively), and especially on the monitoring the effort in a software project. The framework relied on two basic principles which occur in software projects: the existence of change due to the dynamic environment, and the need for dynamic, continuous measurement on project progress to collect real-time information.

## 2.7 EFFORT ASSESSMENTS AND POST-MORTEM ANALYSES

The projects are assessed after a specific time period, e.g., project phase, iteration, increment, or sprint, and the project is analysed in detail after it has been completed. This retrospective analysis is called an *assessment* or *post-mortem analysis*, a *project closure* or *retrospective*, or a *post-project analysis* (Brady and DeMarco, 1994; Collier, et al., 1996; Haapio and Eerola, 2006; Jalote, 2000). The motivation of the analysis is to consider the finished project or its phase and its results carefully in order to understand and explain it. The teams and organizations want to learn from experience and collect information for future utilization, to improve software processes, and to facilitate product development based on learning. One of the goals of such assessment is to decrease the future effort estimation inaccuracies.

Effort assessments and post-mortem analyses are carried out as a part of SPI. Analysed effort information is required by the maturity models, e.g., ISO/IEC 15504 (ISO, 1993) or CMMI (SEI, 2006; SEI, 2010) as evidence of process maturity. Effort is assessed regardless of the software development model, not only in waterfall-based projects but also the spiral, incremental, iterative, and agile approaches, such as widely employed RUP (Royce, 1998) or Scrum (Schwaber, 1995; Takeuchi and Nonaka, 1986).

The effort assessment takes a retrospective into the success of effort estimation while retrospective analyses are performed to get exact data from actual effort and project results in terms of requirements fulfilment of the stakeholders. A requirement is defined as “something that the product must do or a quality that the

product must have" (Pobertson and Pobertson, 1999, p. 5). The software product holds both functional and non-functional requirements (Pobertson and Pobertson, 1999), and on the other hand, both user and system requirements (Pressman, 2005). The functionality of the product, i.e., things that the product must do, and the data manipulated by the functions, is stated as the functional requirements. The non-functional requirements, on the other hand, are the product's qualities, i.e., the requirements for look and feel, usability, performance, operational, maintainability and portability, security, cultural and political, and legal (Pobertson and Pobertson, 1999). The user requirements are statements of "what services the system is expected to provide and the constraints under which it must operate" whereas the "system requirements set out the system services and constraints in detail" (Sommerville, 2001, p. 118).

The rationale for performing assessments and post-mortem analyses is well-represented in the literature as an essential part of software engineering process and organization's knowledge management (Pus and Lindvall, 2002), and highly endorsed by both IT consultants (Lacovou and Dexter, 2005) and scholars. To put it simply, the analysis can increase the odds of project success (Verner and Evanco, 2005) and improve project cost estimation (Birk, et al., 2002). Despite the benefits, the minority of the organizations employ assessments consistently (29% according to (Verner and Evanco, 2005)). The proposed analysis processes may require rather large resources (both time and personnel) which, in practice, are quite limited in the software industry. Moreover, in many cases the analysis descriptions provide only general guidelines without detailed methods. As the general software engineering literature (e.g., (Sommerville, 2001)) attempts to cover the whole spectrum of software engineering, it provides understandably only rough descriptions of assessments and post-mortem analyses. In 1990s, the interest in post-mortem analysis increased in particular (Brady and DeMarco, 1994), moving from analysing the developed system (Kumar, 1990) to analysing the process how the systems were developed (Collier, et al., 1996), and from closing the project to improve the software engineering process.

Conducting post-mortem analyses have also been criticized. Post-mortem analyses, by nature, take a reactive approach, i.e., analyse a project after it failed, while proactive actions would be more advantageous in preventing the project from failing (Awazu, et al., 2004). Assessing effort during the project is one of these steps; it enables necessary, even drastic, measures be taken before the project is completed. It is also reminded that documented and recorded information does not improve anything unless the knowledge is shared and available, and the tools attract to utilize the information (Lyytinen and Pobey, 1999; Petter, et al., 2007).

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Several different research strategies have been proposed for the software engineering and information systems research. These research methodologies can be found very useful, but no-one is sufficient by itself to form a well-grounded research program. In fact, Nunamaker, Chen and Purdin (1991, pp. 95-96) state: "where multiple methodologies are applicable, they appear to be complementary, providing valuable feedback to one another." This study uses qualitative information in order to prepare an explanatory theoretical paper to study the key functions in managing software project effort. The paper reviews literature to describe, analyse and understand the software project effort activities.

### 4. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Software engineering literature (Pressman, 2005; Royce, 1998; Sommerville, 2001) focuses on project management and effort concepts, but the emphasis is on effort estimation and effort-related planning (e.g., scheduling) rather than on the total management of effort. Effort has not been seen as an independent area of management like risk or quality. Literature discusses risk management, quality management and configuration management individually but effort is covered as a part of software project management. In other words, research has particularly focused on improving effort estimation, and has concentrated on the software construction effort of the software projects.

Several effort and cost estimation models and methods have been proposed during the last decades. Despite the numerous applications available for estimation, effort is, however, frequently underestimated (Gruschke and Jørgensen, 2008; Kitchenham, et al., 2009). According to studies (Briand, et al., 1999; Shepherd, et al., 1996), the effort estimation methods and tools have reached only low accuracy levels with MPE-values worse than 0.30, whereas the target value between the estimated and actual effort for software industry companies can be three times smaller, for instance. The effort estimation research and the different estimation techniques emphasize two factors in respect to the difficulty in producing accurate estimates: software size and the available data for estimations (Armour, 2002). Most formal effort and cost estimation models and methods require a determination on the size of the software to be produced. The size is generally determined for example in terms of *lines of code* (LOC), *function points* (FP), or *use case points* (UCP). The prediction of the size of the final software product is, however, challenging and complex. Another factor which reflects to inaccurate effort estimates is the shortage of knowledge on the software to be produced since these estimates are made especially in the early stages of the software development process (Armour, 2002; Boehm, 1981).

Although several formal approaches have been proposed for effort estimation they are seldom employed in practice. As mentioned in literature, the applied effort estimation approaches are in most cases informal, and based on analogy and expert analysis. Jørgensen daunts that it might not be possible to develop effort estimation models that replace expert judgment, and therefore the best effort estimation improvement strategy may be to improve the judgment-based effort estimates (Jørgensen, 2005).

An overlooked, possible factor explaining poor effort estimates is the light consideration on different activities involved with the project. Therefore, the likelihood of unintentionally leaving out significant activities affecting the estimation is significant. Also, the focus in effort estimation research and estimation methods has been on software construction and project management (MacDonell and Shepherd, 2003), whilst presenting the other activities related to the project merely as a fixed proportion from the software construction effort, and as effort overhead. These activities, which are not directly related to software construction or project management, include various management and support activities, each carried out by several members of the project.

Experiences from the software industry imply that in effort estimations where expert judgment technique has been applied the estimators consider exclusively those activities that occur for them in a software project and focus on the effort of actual software construction. Indeed, research (e.g., (Jørgensen, 2004b, 2005; Jørgensen and Sjøberg, 2004)) confirms this observation. Also, there is a correlation between years of experience and the variety of different project activities considered for the estimate (Jørgensen and Sjøberg, 2004) more experienced experts consider a larger variety of project activities. Different experts estimate different areas, e.g., programmers estimate the amount of programming effort.

A reason for the effort estimate inaccuracy can be the inadequacy of previous projects' effort data collection when effort is both reported badly and collected without analysing it properly afterward. The collected effort data is used for both improving team performance in upcoming project phases and project and in calibrating the weights that adjust the factors and drivers which are used for the effort estimate derivation in the organization in question.

The proposed processes for post-mortem analysis (Collier, et al., 1996) describe post-mortem of the whole project, and provide general guidelines without a detailed method to analyse effort. Furthermore, the proposed analysis processes require rather large resources (both time and personnel) which, in practice, are quite limited in the software industry.

Thus from the effort-related challenges described above in the sub-chapters and theoretical background section, it can be concluded that *Estimators consider mostly core construction activities, relevant in their work and when estimating and Effort data quality is bad, i.e., it is not reliable, Effort and cost estimates are inaccurate. Also the estimator cannot judge the accurate result.*

### REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, P., Kumar, M., Yogesh, Mallick, S., Bharadwaj, P.M. & Anantwar, D., 2001. Estimating software projects. *ACM JIGIOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 26(4), pp. 60-67.
2. Albrecht, A.J. & Gaffney, J.E., 1983. Software Function, Source Lines of Code, and Development Effort Prediction: A Software Science Validation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 9(6), pp. 639-648.
3. Armour, P., 2002. Ten Unmyths of Project Estimation. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(11), pp. 15-18.
4. Awazu, Y., Desouza, K.C. & Evaristo, J.P., 2004. Stopping Punaway Information Technology Projects. *Business Horizons*, 47(1), pp. 73-80.
5. Blackburn, J.D., Scudder, G.D. & Van Wassenhove, L.N., 1996. Improving Speed and Productivity of Software Development: A Global Survey of Software Developers. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 22(12), pp. 875-885.



6. Boehm, B., Clark, B., Horowitz, E., Westland, E., Madachy, P. & Selby, P., 1995. Cost Models for Future Life Cycle Processes: COCOMO 2. *Annals of software Engineering*, 1, pp. 57-94.
7. Boehm, B., Horowitz, E., Madachy, P., Peifer, D., Clark, B., Steece, B., Brown, A., Chulani, S. & Abts, C., 2000. *software Cost Estimation with COCOMO II*. Upper Saddle Piver, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
8. Boehm, B.W., 1981. *software Engineering Economics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
9. Briand L.C., El Emam, K., Surmann, D., Wiecezorek, I. & Maxwell, K.D., 1999. An Assessment and Comparison of Common Software Cost Estimation Modeling Techniques. In: *21st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE'99)*, Los Angeles, California, USA, 16-22 May 1999. ACM, pp. 313-322.
10. Briand, L.C., Langley, T. & Wiecezorek, I., 2000. A replicated Assessment and Comparison of Common Software Cost Modeling Techniques. In: *22nd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE'00)*. Limerick, Ireland, 4-11 June 2000. ACM Press, pp. 377-386.
11. Brooks, F.P. Jr., 1975. *The Mythical Man-Month. Essays on software Engineering*. Peadig, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
12. Chatters, B., Henderson, P. & Postron, C., 1999. An Experiment to Improve Cost Estimation and Project Tracking for Software and Systems Integration Projects. In: *25th Euromicro Conference (ESROMIC'99)*. Milan, Italy, 8-10 September 1999. IEEE Computer Society, pp. 2177- 2184.
13. Chen, Z., Menzies, T., Port, D. & Boehm, B., 2005. Finding the Right Data for Software Cost Modeling. *IEEE Software*, 22(6), pp. 38-46.
14. Cohn, M., 2008. *Agile Estimating and planning*. Upper Saddle Piver, NJ: Prentice Hall.
15. Collier, B., DeMarco, T. & Fearey, P., 1996. A Defined Process for Project Post-Mortem Review. *IEEE Software*, 13(4), pp. 65-72.
16. Conte, S.D., Dunsmore, H.E. & Shen, V.Y., 1986. *Software Engineering Metrics and Models*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company.
17. Fairley, P.E., 1992. Recent Advances in Software Estimation Techniques. In: *14th International Conference on Software Engineering*. Melbourne, Australia, 11-15 May 1992. ACM Press, pp. 382-391.
18. Fenton, N.E. & Pfleeger, S.L., 1997. *Software Metrics: A Rigorous & practical Approach*. 2nd ed. Boston, MA: PWS Publishing Company.
19. Finnie, G.P. & Wittig, G.E., 1996. AI Tools for Software Development Effort Estimation. In: *1996 International Conference on Software Engineering: Education and practice (JE: E&K '96)*. Dunedin, New Zealand, 24-27 January 1996. IEEE, pp. 346-353.
20. Gray, A.P., MacDonell, S.G. & Shepperd, M.J., 1999. Factors systematically associated with errors in subjective estimates of software development effort: the stability of expert judgment. In: *Sixth International Software Metrics Symposium*. Boca Paton, FL, USA, 4-6 November 1999. IEEE, pp. 216-227.
21. Gray, C.F. & Larson, E.W., 2006. *project Management: The Managerial process*. 3rd ed. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
22. Gruschke, T.M. & Jørgensen, M., 2008. The Pole of Outcome Feedback in Improving the Uncertainty Assessment of Software Development Effort Estimates. *ACM Transactions on software Engineering and Methodology*, 17(4), pp. 20.1-34.
23. Heijstek, W. & Chaudron, M.P.V., 2008. Evaluating RUP Software Development Processes Through Visualization of Effort Distribution. In: *34th Euromicro Conference Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (JEA '08)*. Parma, Italy, 3-5 September 2008, pp. 266-273.
24. Henderson-Sellers, B., 2003. Method Engineering for OO Systems Development. *Communications of the ACM*, 46(10), pp. 73-78.
25. Hihn, J. & Habib-agahi, H., 1991. Cost Estimation of Software Intensive Projects: A Survey of Current Practices. In: *13th International Conference on Software Engineering*. Austin, Texas, USA, 13-16 May 1991. IEEE, pp. 276-287.
26. Jørgensen, M. & Sjøberg, D., 2001. Impact of effort estimates on software project work. *Information and Software Technology*, 43(15), pp. 939-948.
27. Jørgensen, M., 2004a. A review of studies on expert estimation of software development effort. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 70, pp. 37-60.
28. Jørgensen, M., 2004b. Top-down and bottom-up expert estimation of software development effort. *Information and Software Technology*, 46, pp. 3-16.
29. Jørgensen, M., 2005. The "Magic Step" of Judgment-Based Software Effort Estimation. In: *International Conference on Cognitive Economics*. New Bulgarian University, Sofia, 5-8 August 2005, pp. 105-114.
30. Jørgensen, M., 2007. Estimation of software development work effort: evidence on expert judgment and formal models. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 3(3), pp. 449-462.
31. Kitchenham, B., Brereton, O.P., Budgen, D., Turner, M., Bailey, J. & Linkman, S., 2009. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering - A systematic literature review. *Information and Software Technology*, 51, pp. 7-15.
32. Kitchenham, B., Pfleeger, S.L., McColl, B. & Eagan, S., 2002. An empirical study of maintenance and development estimation accuracy. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 64(1), pp. 57-77.
33. Lyytinen, K. & Pobey, D., 1999. Learning Failure in Information Systems Development. *Information Systems Journal*, 9(2), pp. 85-101.
34. MacDonell, S.G. & Shepperd, M.J., 2003. Using Prior-Phase Effort Records for Re-Estimation During Software Projects. In: *Ninth International Software Metrics symposium (METRIC'03)*. Sydney, Australia, 3-5 September 2003. IEEE Computer Society, pp. 1-13.
35. Mukhopadhyay, T. & Kekre, S., 1992. Software Effort Models for Early Estimation of Process Control Applications. *IEEE Transactions on software Engineering*, 18(10), pp. 915-924.
36. Niessink, F. & van Vliet, H., 1997. Predicting Maintenance Effort with Function Points. In: *1997 International Conference on software Maintenance (ICIM '97)*. Bari, 1-3 October 1997. IEEE, pp. 32-39.
37. Nunamaker, J.F. Jr., Chen, M. & Purdin, T.D.M., 1991. Systems Development in Information Systems research. *Journal of Management Information systems*, 7(3), pp. 89-106.
38. Petter, S., Mathiassen, L. & Vaishnavi, V., 2007. Five Keys to Project Knowledge Sharing. *IT professional*, 9(3), pp. 42-46.
39. Pobertson, S. & Pobertson, J., 1999. *Mastering the Requirements process*. Harlow, UK: Addison-Wesley.
40. Pressman, P.S., 2005. *Software Engineering: A practioner's Approach*. 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
41. Pus, I. & Lindvall, M., 2002. Knowledge Management in Software Engineering. *IEEE software*, 19(3), pp. 26-38.
42. Royce, W., 1998. *software project Management: A unified Framework* reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
43. Schwaber, K., 1995. Scrum Development Process. In: J. Sutherland, D. Patel, C. Casanave, J. Miller & G. Hollowell (eds.), *Business Object Design and Implementation: OOKJA'95 Workshop proceedings*. London: Springer.
44. SEI, 2006. *CMMI for Development, Version 1.2, CMMI-DEV, V1.2. Technical Report CM5/JEI-2006-TR-008, EJC-TR-2006-008*. Pittsburgh, PA: CMU/SEI.
45. SEI, 2010. *CMMI for Development, Version 1.3, CMMI-DEV, V1.3. Technical Report CM5/JEI-2010-TR-033, EJC-TR-2010-033*. Pittsburgh, PA: CMU/SEI.
46. Shepperd, M.J. & Schofield, C., 1997. Estimating Software Projects Effort Using Analogies. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 23(12), pp. 736-743.
47. Sommerville, I., 2001. *Software Engineering*. 6th ed. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
48. Srinivasan, P. & Fisher, D., 1995. Machine learning approaches to estimating software development effort. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 21(2), pp. 126-137.
49. Symons, C.P., 1988. Function Point Analysis: Difficulties and Improvements. *IEEE Transactions on software Engineering*, 14(1), pp. 2- 11.
50. Takeuchi, H. & Nonaka, I., 1986. The new new product development game. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(1), pp. 137-146.
51. Tsoi, H.L., 1999. A Framework for Management Software Project Development. In: *1999 ACM symposium on Applied computing (IAC'99)*. San Antonio, Texas, USA, 28 February – 2 March 1999. ACM Press, pp. 593-597.
52. Verner, J.M. & Evanco, W.M., 2005. In-House Software Development: What Project Management Practices Lead to Success? *IEEE Software*, 22(1), pp. 86-93.
53. Vesterinen, P., 1998. A framework and process for effort estimation. In: *9th European Software Control and Metrics Conference, 1999 ACM symposium on Applied computing*. Pome, Italy, 27-29 May 1998.
54. Virtanen, P., 2003. *Measuring and Improving Component-Based software Development*. PhD thesis: Turku, Finland: University of Turku.
55. Wilson, D.N. & Sifer, M.J., 1988. Structured Planning: Project Views. *software Engineering Journal*, 3, pp. 134-140.
56. Young, M.P., 1995. A new paradigm for IS development: Effort management. In: *26th Annual seminarsymposium*. New Orleans, LO, 16-18 October 1995. Project Management Institute.

## **REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**Dear Readers**

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Computer Application & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue, as well as on the journal as a whole, on our e-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com).

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward to an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

**Academically yours**

Sd/-

**Co-ordinator**

## **DISCLAIMER**

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

## ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

## *Our Other Journals*

