



SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OUTSOURCING DECISION SUPPORT TOOL WITH NEURAL NETWORK LEARNING

THESIS

James D. Newberry, Captain, USAF
AFIT/GCS/ENG/04-16

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY
AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or United States Government.

SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING DECISION SUPPORT TOOL WITH NEURAL NETWORK LEARNING

THESIS

Presented to the faculty of the

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Graduate School of Engineering & Management

Air Force Institute of Technology

Air University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

James D. Newberry, B. S.

Captain, USAF

March 2004

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OUTSOURCING
DECISION SUPPORT TOOL
WITH NEURAL NETWORK LEARNING
THESIS

James D. Newberry, B. S.
Captain, USAF

Approved:



Brian G. Hermann, Lt Col, USAF
Chairman

12 Mar 2004

Date



Robert J. Weber, Maj, USAF
Committee member

12 Mar 2004

Date



Raghava Gowda, PhD
Committee member

March 13, 2004

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to praise God for blessing me with good health and a wonderful support environment. Without such blessings, all would be pointless.

I would like to say thanks to Mom, who was with me every step of the way, her belief in me gave me strength when I needed it the most. Thanks Dad for supporting Mom and her many trips to see me. Also, I would like to say thanks to all my family members and friends who provided words of encouragement.

Lt Col Brian G. Hermann was instrumental for my work. His leadership and patient support guided me throughout this research. Thank you for the confidence you had in me to continue your previous dissertation work.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Major Bob Weber and Dr. Raghava Gowda, for taking time away from their schedules to review my work. Dr. Dursun Bulutoglu, thanks for providing help with the statistical analysis. Also, the support staff at Neurosolution (Gary, Lisa and Dan), deserves a healthy thank you for answering dozens of phone calls and E-mail messages. Their expert neural network guidance was paramount for this research.

Lastly, I would like to thank the USAF and AFIT for supporting this thesis.

James D. Newberry

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
LIST OF FIGURES	8
LIST OF TABLES	9
ABSTRACT	10
1. RESEARCH INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 PROBLEM	11
1.2 BACKGROUND	11
1.3 THESIS GOAL	12
1.4 MOTIVATION	13
1.5 THESIS DOCUMENT LAYOUT	15
2. BACKGROUND	16
2.1 INTRODUCTION	16
2.2 SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OUTSOURCING	16
2.2.1 History	17
2.2.2 IT Outsourcing vs. Software Development Outsourcing	18
2.2.3 Benefits and Drawbacks	19
2.2.4 Strategies	20
2.2.5 Outsourcing Survey	27
2.2.6 Mitigation Efforts	34
2.2.7 Future	40
2.2.8 Software Outsourcing Topic Conclusion	45
2.3 LEARNING MECHANISMS	45
2.3.1 Neural Network History	49
2.3.2 Comparison Studies	50
2.3.3 Neural Network Project Planning Concerns	55
2.3.4 Neural Network Feasibility Concerns	57
2.3.5 Neural Network Data Concerns	59
2.3.6 Topic Conclusion	64
2.4 SUMMARY	65
3. METHODOLOGY	66
3.1 INTRODUCTION	66
3.2 PREVIOUS RESEARCH	66
3.3 RESEARCH ACTIVITIES	67
3.3.1 Tool Selection and Evaluation	67
3.3.2 New Survey Data Transformation	69

3.3.3	<i>New Survey Data Analysis</i>	70
3.3.4	<i>Regression Model Creation</i>	70
3.3.5	<i>NN Development</i>	71
3.3.6	<i>SODS2 Development</i>	72
3.4	SUMMARY	73
4.	IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS	74
4.1	INTRODUCTION	74
4.2	SURVEY DATA TRANSITION	74
4.3	SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS	75
4.3.1	<i>Outsourcing Experience Analysis</i>	75
4.3.2	<i>Outsourcing Project Assertion Analysis</i>	76
4.3.3	<i>Outsourcing Goal Importance Analysis</i>	86
4.3.4	<i>Outsourcing Goal Realization Analysis</i>	88
4.3.5	<i>Outsourcing Consequences Analysis</i>	90
4.3.6	<i>Survey Data Analysis Summary</i>	92
4.4	REGRESSION MODEL IMPLEMENTATION	93
4.4.1	<i>Regression Modeling Technique Validation</i>	93
4.4.2	<i>Regression Model Differences in 14 Goal Realizations</i>	94
4.4.3	<i>SODS2 Consequence Regression Models</i>	96
4.4.4	<i>Regression Model Summary</i>	123
4.5	NEURAL NETWORK IMPLEMENTATION	124
4.5.1	<i>Neural Network Design Portion</i>	124
4.5.2	<i>Cross Validation Portion</i>	125
4.5.3	<i>Neural Network Data Problem</i>	126
4.5.4	<i>Neural Network Training Without Cross Validation Portion</i>	126
4.5.5	<i>Neural Network Interface Portion</i>	127
4.5.6	<i>NN Implementation Summary</i>	127
4.6	SODS2 IMPLEMENTATION	128
4.6.1	<i>SODS2 Development Tool</i>	128
4.6.2	<i>SODS2 Validation Phase</i>	129
4.6.3	<i>SODS2 Implementation Summary</i>	132
4.7	SUMMARY	133
5.	CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK	134
5.1	INTRODUCTION	134
5.2	CONCLUSIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS	134
5.3	FUTURE WORK	137
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	139

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 OUTSOURCING BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS [7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17]	20
FIGURE 2 SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING FACETS [13]	21
FIGURE 3 SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING SCALE [11]	21
FIGURE 4 SOFTWARE APPLICATION OUTSOURCING EXAMPLE [13]	22
FIGURE 5 OUTSOURCING PERCENTAGE CHART [11]	23
FIGURE 6 COMPETENCIES INTERACTION DIAGRAM [13]	24
FIGURE 7 CORE VS. NON-CORE DECISION [13]	25
FIGURE 8 IN-HOUSE VS. OUTSOURCE DECISION MODEL [13]	26
FIGURE 9 SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OUTSOURCING MODEL [11]	27
FIGURE 10 SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING DECISION MAKERS [11]	30
FIGURE 11 PROCESS OUTSOURCING MEASUREMENTS [11]	31
FIGURE 14 OUTSOURCING GOAL SATISFACTION [11]	32
FIGURE 15 SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING CONSEQUENCES [11]	33
FIGURE 16 PARTNERSHIPS [36]	43
FIGURE 17 NN VISUAL DEFINITION [39-42]	48
FIGURE 18 NN VS. EXPERT SYSTEMS [43]	53
FIGURE 19 NN SOFTWARE LIFECYCLE MODEL [39]	56
FIGURE 20 MLP NN TRAINING ERROR PLOT [39]	63
FIGURE 21 CROSS-VALIDATION [39]	64
FIGURE 22 OLD SURVEY DATA OUTSOURCING EXPERIENCE [11]	75
FIGURE 23 OLD SURVEY DATA PROJECT ASSERTION ANALYSIS [11]	77
FIGURE 24 NEW SURVEY DATA PROJECT ASSERTION ANALYSIS	78
FIGURE 25 OLD SURVEY DATA RELATIONSHIP ASSERTION ANALYSIS [11]	79
FIGURE 26 NEW SURVEY DATA PROJECT ASSERTION ANALYSIS	79
FIGURE 27 OLD SURVEY DATA PROJECT GOAL ASSERTION ANALYSIS [11]	81
FIGURE 28 NEW SURVEY DATA PROJECT GOAL ASSERTION ANALYSIS	81
FIGURE 29 OLD SURVEY DATA PROCESS ASSERTION ANALYSIS [11]	82
FIGURE 30 NEW SURVEY DATA PROCESS ASSERTION ANALYSIS	83
FIGURE 31 OLD SURVEY DATA PRODUCT ASSERTION ANALYSIS [11]	84
FIGURE 32 NEW SURVEY DATA PRODUCT ASSERTION ANALYSIS	84
FIGURE 33 OLD SURVEY DATA PRODUCT RELATED ASSERTION ANALYSIS [11] ..	85
FIGURE 34 NEW SURVEY DATA PRODUCT RELATED ASSERTION ANALYSIS	86
FIGURE 35 OLD SURVEY DATA OUTSOURCING GOAL IMPORTANCE [11]	87
FIGURE 36 NEW SURVEY DATA OUTSOURCING GOAL IMPORTANCE	87
FIGURE 37 OLD SURVEY DATA OUTSOURCING GOAL SATISFACTION [11]	89
FIGURE 38 NEW SURVEY DATA OUTSOURCING GOAL SATISFACTION	89
FIGURE 39 OLD SURVEY DATA CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS [11]	90
FIGURE 40 NEW SURVEY DATA CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS	91
FIGURE 41 NEW SURVEY DATA CONSEQUENCE DIFFERENCES ANALYSIS	92
FIGURE 42 SUMMARY OF OLD, NEW AND COMBINED MODELS	98
FIGURE 43 VALIDATION SAMPLE	129
FIGURE 44 VALIDATION SUMMARY	131

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 FIVE MAIN CAUSES FOR SOFTWARE PROJECT FAILURE [4]	13
TABLE 2 A-76 FINDINGS [7]	14
TABLE 3 SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING DEFINITION'S THREE SERVICES [11]	17
TABLE 4 STRONG CONTRACT FACTORS [7].....	19
TABLE 5 SURVEY GOALS [11].....	28
TABLE 6 MITIGATION EFFORTS.....	34
TABLE 7 SOFTWARE OUTSOURCING SPECIFIC MITIGATION EFFORTS	37
TABLE 8 JOINT REVIEW ALIGNMENT STEPS [25]	37
TABLE 9 INFORMAL COMMUNICATION EFFORTS.....	38
TABLE 10 KNOWLEDGE SCOUT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS [28].....	38
TABLE 11 COCPIT SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION [23]	39
TABLE 12 BUYING/BUILDING SOFTWARE DRAWBACKS [35]	41
TABLE 13 ASP BENEFITS [35]	41
TABLE 14 ASP DRAWBACKS [35].....	42
TABLE 15 ASP CONTRACT ISSUES [34, 35].....	42
TABLE 16 NN KEY ATTRIBUTES.....	52
TABLE 17 COMPARISON STUDY'S NN [44]	54
TABLE 18 NN DRAWBACKS	55
TABLE 19 NN PROJECT DIFFERENCES [39]	55
TABLE 20 NN APPLICATION EXAMPLES	58
TABLE 21 REQUIRED NN CRITERIA [39, 41].....	58
TABLE 22 NN BENEFITS [39]	59
TABLE 23 NN RISKS [39].....	59
TABLE 24 MLP NN TASKS [39, 40].....	62
TABLE 25 COMMON NN PROBLEMS [39]	64
TABLE 26 SODS2 HIGH LEVEL REQUIREMENTS.....	73
TABLE 27 NEW SURVEY DATA OUTSOURCING EXPERIENCE.....	76
TABLE 28 VALIDATION SAMPLE TABLE.....	130

ABSTRACT

The Air Force (AF) needs an evolving software tool for guiding decision makers through the complexities of software outsourcing. Previous research identified specific outsourcing strategies and linked them to goals and consequences through a variety of relationship rules. These strategies and relationship rules were inserted into a decision support tool. Since that time, more historical data and outsourcing literature has been collected thus necessitating an update to such a tool. As the number of software outsourcing projects are completed, the AF must capture the outsourcing decision experiences which guided the projects and their outcomes. In order to efficiently incorporate this new experience, the decision tool must be redesigned to allow the additional knowledge to be added in such a way that the decision rule base is automatically updated. With this new feature, the tool would increase its precision of predicting software outsourcing success as the software outsourcing knowledge evolves. Capturing software outsourcing as knowledge instead of raw information will help guide decision makers down paths proven to succeed staying clear of risks that historically plagued software outsourcing projects of the past. Software outsourcing decision makers desire not only a characterization of past experiences and predictions of future outcomes, but also reasons to help them make informed decisions.

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OUTSOURCING DECISION SUPPORT TOOL WITH NEURAL NETWORK LEARNING

1. Research Introduction

1.1 Problem

The Air Force (AF) is rapidly losing tacit decision knowledge in the area of software development outsourcing as experienced decision experts leave due to a declining work force. Considering that knowledge is the greatest capital of an organization, a considerable effort must be made to capture it [1]. The raw data of past software development outsourced projects and associated outcomes must be captured and modeled for software outsourcing decision makers to predict solution paths for future software outsourced development projects. Neural networks and stepwise regression will provide the means of codifying and modeling this raw data into knowledge. Without the use of such learning mechanisms in the design of a software outsourcing decision support tool, the outsourcing experience data will go unused preventing the evolution of outsourcing costing the AF money and other resources.

1.2 Background

Under current policy and the given manpower shortages, software outsourcing is the first choice for USAF software development. Thus, most Air Force software project managers chose to partially or wholly outsource their software efforts with little thought to realistic outcomes. Another policy, utilization of best commercial practices, dictated

that we codify historical outsourcing data from industry and government projects and apply those lessons to current outsourcing strategy decisions.

Air Force software project managers, acquirers, and contract software developers would benefit from a continuous evolution of practical rules, models, and a tool to guide decision-making as it relates to software outsourcing ventures. As future project data is obtained, the tool should improve its ability to predict outsourcing consequences. Also, capturing software outsourcing knowledge from historical outsourcing data will help guide decision makers toward proven outsourcing strategies. Future decision makers will benefit from both projected outcomes and the knowledge behind the suggested strategies.

1.3 Thesis Goal

The primary goal of this research was to expand existing outsourcing decision-making support rules into new conventions that predict software outsourcing outcomes. This learning process must be incorporated into an extensible decision support tool designed to accept a flow of new historical outsourcing data. As the new data is processed, this tool should help identify and discover new relationships while at the same time quantify the usefulness of the tool's current decision-making rules that influence and predict software outsourcing consequences and results. This type of extensible tool will facilitate knowledge creation and future outsourcing strategy decisions. Neural Networks (NN) and statistical-based techniques had shown to be extremely useful for capturing such tacit knowledge; thus will be investigated as possible learning mechanisms.

1.4 Motivation

Past outsourced software projects have been plagued with drastic failures contributing with launching vehicles shooting wildly out of control, battle cruisers being towed back to port, stealth fighters losing access to their target support software due to a reboot, Patriot missile system falling off-track some 678 meters causing 28 deaths and 98 injured, etc... [2, 3] With only one out of ten projects finishing on time and within budget and 30% of government projects not even being delivered at all, software projects' results were woefully lacking especially considering Department of Defense (DoD) is paying \$42B annually for software acquisitions [2].

This track record could no longer be blamed on technology or shortage of computer power. Mosemann and other leading software practitioners viewed software management as the leading cause of software project letdown with the five most common software management failures elaborated in Table 1 [4].

Table 1 Five Main Causes for Software Project Failure [4]

1. Unrealistic project schedule with no true way to estimate development time
2. Inappropriate staffing, not enough expertise, or unstable staff
3. Changing of requirements (many essential to the project)
4. Poor quality of work normally brought on by poor quality processes
5. Belief that lost time will be made up later in schedule (reducing testing time)

Senior leaders of the U.S. Government have made it perfectly clear that we must improve our oversight management. President Bush publicly endorsed outsourcing and insisted that our top executives strive to apply outsourcing in the most effective manner utilizing the competitive market, providing the taxpayer the best possible fighting force [5]. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, at the 2003 DoD Budget Briefing, stressed using

outsourcing in a smart and efficient manner emphasizing that we must use new methods along with the A-76 study (outsourcing efficiency study) to correctly apply outsourcing [6]. In 1997, Secretary of Defense Cohen stated “we still do many things in-house that we could do better and cheaper through outsourcing.” [7] In 1994, Secretary of Defense Perry urged DoD to adopt current civilian best practices streamlining software development acquisitions into the experienced hands of commercial outsourced software developing vendors [8]. In 1996, the Defense Science Board, backed by bills in both House and Senate, mandated cost comparative A-76 studies to compare in-house vs. outsourcing for providing DoD information technology supporting functions [7]. With this senior leadership direction, skills and knowledge on outsourcing software development must be evolved to correct this less than desirable trend [4]. In a Naval Analysis Center study, Sam Kleinman researched a 1000 A-76 studies and his findings are summarized in Table 2, listed below [7]:

Table 2 A-76 Findings [7]

1. Savings were not from outsourcing but from reducing number of workers 2. Three percent of experienced government technical workers switched over to work for the contractor 3. Contractor audited show no such savings over government workers 4. Cost of A-76 competition was not included against projected savings 5. Savings represented were projected savings rather than actual savings

The A-76 findings were unacceptable and improvements crucial. To do this, one must know the when's, what's and how's of outsourcing. The experience of outsourced projects must be captured and analyzed. Given the amount of data and factors relating to this experience, analysis techniques must be explored so the knowledge can be formed from this raw data.

One such technique involved the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). On 3 Feb 1994, the USAF Assistant Secretary sent an AF publicly distributed letter concerning the use of AI. This letter urged the research and studies necessary to exchange information and improve decision making [9]. With this motivation to seek the advantages of AI, this thesis will focus on two techniques for analyzing this software outsourcing data: stepwise regression and NN systems.

1.5 Thesis Document Layout

Chapter Two will summarize the literature researched: 1) software outsourcing and 2) NN and stepwise regression techniques. Upon building a firm understanding of these topics, Chapter Three will outline a methodology plan for building a decision support tool. Along with this plan, measurements and validation concerns will be stated in Chapter Four. Finally, in Chapter Five, conclusions, issues and future work will be given so that this complex software outsourcing decision making knowledge can be evolved parallel with the evolution of software engineering.

2. *Background*

2.1 Introduction

This chapter includes a literature review helpful in establishing the foundation for the thesis. The research is separated into two main topics: software development outsourcing and neural network/stepwise regression. Software development outsourcing is broken into eight sub-topics: history, outsourcing differences, benefits and drawbacks, strategies, survey results, mitigation efforts, future trends, and topic conclusion. Neural Network (NN)/stepwise regression is divided into six sub-topics: NN history, comparison studies, NN project planning concerns, NN feasibility concerns, NN data concerns, and topic conclusion. The chapter concludes with a summary discussing the overall findings and results of the literature review.

2.2 Software Development Outsourcing

Outsourcing has been defined in numerous ways. Washington defined outsourcing as a “contractual agreement between a customer and one or more suppliers to provide services or processes that the customer is currently providing internally,” [7] and Power defined it as “the act of transferring some of a company’s recurring internal activities and decision rights to outside providers, as set forth in a contract.” [10] Herman expanded on these outsourcing definitions to include the specifics of software development outsourcing. His definition was broken into three services listed in Table 3 [11].

Table 3 Software Outsourcing Definition's Three Services [11]

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Development of complete or partial software products2. Purchase of packaged or customized package of software products3. Activities to aid in the software development lifecycle model |
|---|

Other terms associated with outsourcing included:

1. Privatizing - far left subset of outsourcing that includes the transfer of facilities, equipment and other government resources to private vendors to aid in the deliverance of the outsourced product,
2. Insourcing - augment the work force to handle work load ("rent-an-expert"),
3. Downsizing - eliminate employees, a common result of outsourcing, and
4. Alliance Outsourcing/Rightsourcing - use correct balance of in-house and outsourced resources to achieve maximum benefits [7, 10-14].

2.2.1 History

Outsourcing has had a distinguished past running parallel with the data processing history according to Ketler and Willems [15]. In the 1960's, large, expensive mainframes dominated the computer world. Software experts were very sparse. Companies were forced to outsource data processing needs due to these limitations. In the 1970's, computers and data processing became more powerful and less expensive. Few of the larger companies moved data processing function in-house to save money. Outsourcing still remained popular due to the lack of qualified computer experts. In the 1980's, computer cost declined while their popularity and usefulness drastically shot upward. Majority of companies concentrated on developing their own in-house Information Technology (IT) departments. In the 1990's, competitive market forces and in-house IT expenses forced companies to IT outsourcing using the 1989 Kodak IT outsourcing success story as their model. In the 2000's, after various outsourcing studies and research, companies faced a great decision: outsourcing vs. in-house [15].

2.2.2 IT Outsourcing vs. Software Development Outsourcing

Before delving into the factors of this decision, differences between IT and software development outsourcing must first be established. Power's thesis [10] included Kodak and Bell South Telecomm (BST) IT outsourcing case studies. Kodak found certain core software projects were best left in-house while successfully outsourcing non-core software. BST echoed similar results in that software outsourcing required complex monitoring, measuring, and planning. Power summarized by stating, "Software development is not easily defined, and does not produce easily measured outputs." He continued, "Much of software development fills the planning role since it involves analyzing processes within the company and designing software programs to accommodate the processes." His thesis showed that the companies studied had great success with other IT outsourcing not involving software development, but the complexities involved in software outsourcing exposed countless problems [10].

In Hermann's software outsourcing dissertation [11], he wrote: "Software development, however, differs from most outsourcing because companies are attempting to contract complex intellectual 'project' work rather than typical repetitious, well understood 'process' work." His point was aimed at showing how IT outsourcing was different than project-type software outsourcing. He continued by stating, "the vast collection of IT outsourcing experience literature is of limited value to a customer trying to select an outsourcing strategy to meet an organization's software development goals [11]."

In another DoD outsourcing case study performed by Washington [7], an AFMC \$87M Software System saw difficulty in meeting and identifying essential software requirements. As a result, the outsourced project failed acceptance testing costing the AF an additional \$4.5M to finish the project. In Table 4 below, Washington stated three factors needed for a strong contractual agreement which was crucial for the success of all outsourcing ventures.

Table 4 Strong Contract Factors [7]

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The products/processes being outsourced must be completely defined.2. Considerable effort must be spent to measure outsourcing productivity and savings.3. Fairly accurate time estimation methods must be enforced. |
|---|

In software development, these three factors plagued even the most successful projects which strengthened the belief that software development outsourcing must be considered differently than non-software IT outsourcing.

2.2.3 Benefits and Drawbacks

As identified above, software outsourcing created thorny challenges that could not be easily handled as other IT outsourcing. Benefits and drawbacks should be identified so that such challenges could be minimized. Several authors noted conflicting beliefs between benefits and drawbacks [7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17]. Figure 1 summarized these conflicts:

Outsourcing Benefits	Outsourcing Drawbacks
• Reduce Cost • Increased Flexibility (economy of scale) • Improved Focus ("do what we do best; outsrc the rest") • Increased access to new technology (reduce dev. time) • Access to needed expertise • Sharing risks • Improved control • Cash flow from sale of intellectual property • Access to higher CMM level processes • Capture knowledge (knowledge evolution) • Improved product quality	• Increased Cost • B-Team syndrome / subcontracting • Complexity of outsourced decision / oversight management • Contractual overhead / litigation • Reversibility • Increased risks • Reduced control • Legal ownership of intellectual property • Loss of essential org skill (knowledge) • Security / confidentiality • Negative work force psychological impact • Reduced quality

Figure 1 Outsourcing Benefits and Drawbacks [7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17]

This conflict accurately reflected the challenges from the Power and Washington case studies [7, 10]. Software outsourcing required complex outsourcing skills not found in IT outsourcing. To develop these skills, software outsourcing must be dissected into various parts and assembled into a model that can be comprehended. The goal was to maximize the required benefits while minimizing the drawbacks through using various strategies.

2.2.4 Strategies

Software development outsourcing strategies combined several aspects into a model used to comprehend the decisions that must be made to ensure such benefits are produced while keeping the drawbacks to a minimum. The first aspect reminded the decision maker of the different facets of software outsourcing. The relationship of these facets are summarized in Figure 2.




Figure 2 Software Outsourcing Facets [13]

People, processes and technology impacted the decision according to several references [11-13]. Software projects could require personnel expertise that was not available in-house. Certain Capability Maturity Model (CMM) level processes and/or methodologies requirements also affected this decision. Access to the latest technology could be required, but unavailable in-house. Each facet independently or collectively influenced the project [11-13].

A second aspect was concerned with the degree or type of outsourcing administered. Figure 3 showed the variety of outsourcing degrees/types:




Figure 3 Software Outsourcing Scale [11]

In this figure, Hermann illustrated software can be completely developed in-house, acquired, or somewhere in the middle with product and/or process outsourcing. Frequently, Abbas [13] noted that projects had the tendency to use alliance outsourcing as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4 Software Application Outsourcing Example [13]

Both referenced documents showed the above software outsourcing composition [11, 13]. Each component could be completely outsourced or developed in-house. Certain components may be developed partly in-house and outsourced. Another variable depended on outsourcing particular processes needed to develop the application [11, 13]. The decision was best viewed as a grid of possibilities as shown in Hermann's Figure 5:




Figure 5 Outsourcing Percentage Chart [11]

In the case of point A, roughly 1/3 of its in-house processes were outsourced while 1/4 of the application's components were developed in-house. The decision possibilities were endless with no perfect rule to follow for making a successful decision. Each project's management climate, in-house expertise, schedule, goals, and other similar factors will impact such a decision which emphasized the need for a decision support tool [11].

A third aspect separated the development into core vs. non-core competencies. Both Kodak and BST found certain software was best suited for in-house development, while non-core software could be successfully outsourced [10]. Regardless of the type of software, the software oversight management should remain in-house [13, 14]. Figure 6 illustrated this relationship.




Figure 6 Competencies Interaction Diagram [13]

The decision between core vs. non-core should be kept in the software managers' forethoughts, as they make their way through the outsourcing dilemma. This decision resulted in a greater amount of work because it forced management to perform an internal analysis, a feasibility study, and a market forecast as shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7 Core vs. Non-Core Decision [13]

The inputs of the analysis guided the software development decision by concentrating on the additional trust, safety, and control factors not associated with non-core software [11-14]. This added credence to Mosemann's DoD software outsourcing statement, "government needs enough in-house software expertise to know what it is buying" [4].

Taken together, these aspects and the desired benefits formed an outsourcing decision model, shown in Figure 8.




Figure 8 In-house vs. Outsource Decision Model [13]

The figure showed the required internal analysis input along with required benefits being fed into the second phase of studying the issues associated with outsourcing both on the management and technical levels. Management issues such as cost, control, responsibility, contract and outsourcing degree must be carefully thought out along with the technical issues of assurance/trust (safety levels), technology requirements, system interface, configuration management, maintenance, and similar issues. After the collection of the first and second phase information, an informed decision can be made (who, when, what degree and go/no go) [13].

If the decision was made to outsource, additional outsourcing knowledge, as shown in Hermann's software development outsourcing model, Figure 9, should be understood, so that outsourcing outcomes can be predicted based upon relationship rules built upon data collected on previous outsourced projects.




Figure 9 Software Development Outsourcing Model [11]

The similarities between both models in Figure 8 and Figure 9 were clearly evident. Each model took the various factors of the project and used them to point to an associated outcome. Before a consequence can be studied, the project's characteristics, the relationship management policies, the contractor's characteristics, and the degree of outsourcing information must be known. In addition, knowledge about the company's markets, domains, technologies and capabilities will help categorize such information relating to the outsourcing consequences [11].

2.2.5 Outsourcing Survey

In the section above, information was needed to predict a possible outsourcing outcome. Hermann [11] sought to do that very thing. He constructed a survey, included in Appendix G, to shift our focus from literature knowledge to real world experience

knowledge. Great care was taken to create a survey to minimize the influencing effects.

Five survey goals were targeted in Table 5.

Table 5 Survey Goals [11]

1. Identify outsourcing decision makers
2. Distinguish which type of software development is most common (custom, COTS, customizable COTS, or none, all built in-house)
3. Measure which style of outsourcing is used most often (product, process or both)
4. Recognize which outsourcing goals businesses wished to achieve and found important
5. Summarize software outsourcing relationship rules relating to consequences and goals

2.2.5.1 Survey Data

Each respondent entered a vast amount of information categorized in the following way:

1. Personal information,
2. Amount of software outsourcing,
3. Experience, domain information relating to their last outsourcing venture,
4. Outsourcing process strategy information, outsourcing product strategy information,
5. Overall project goals for deciding to outsource,
6. Overall project consequences or outcomes as they relate to outsourcing,
7. Information relating to those organization and contractor roles that drove the decision to outsource,
8. Information relating to the respondents roles, and
9. Project, outsourcing relationship, outsourcing expectation, product strategy, and process strategy assertion (methods believed that increase the success of outsourcing)

Though all captured types of information are important to help understand the outsourcing experience, Hermann synthesized the data elements of the outsourcing domains, strategies, consequences, and assertions into his Software Outsourcing Decision support tool version 1 (SODS1) which was a central product of his dissertation. The

Boolean variables dealing with domains and strategies were known to the SODS1 application as input variables. The consequences and assertions were categorized as SODS1 output variables. These variables were integer type data being built using a Likert scale. Each input and output variables were separated into individual divisions and were included in Appendix G. In Hermann's dissertation, 87 rows of data (1 row per each survey) were collected. The survey was placed in an interactive website allowing future respondents connected to the internet to take Hermann's survey online at <http://www.eas.asu.edu/~outsrc/survey/>. There were 48 new survey results collected since his initial research concluded [11].

2.2.5.2 Software Outsourcing Decision Support Tool Version 1 (SODS1)

SODS1 was designed using MS Access Visual Basic (VB) with an interactive (point and click) window type interface. The rules that were created and validated were then inserted into SODS1. The users entered their input data described in the survey data section. The relationship rules used this data to calculate an output. Such output was used by the users to forecast the consequence of their outsourcing decisions as it relates to their project [11].

2.2.5.3 Survey Results

Hermann captured outsourcing demographics goals, goal importance, consequences, and assertions about software outsourcing. This work established a baseline of outsourcing experience beyond anecdotal case studies. A few highlights of these findings were discussed below.

As expected, shown in Figure 10, the customer's project manager along with their corporate culture carried the most decision weight. It was interesting to note the impact that the vendor's project manager and company's culture had on the decision. Questions emerged from conflicts between the real world and researched materials. Researched materials implied the importance of technical and legal support [7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16-18]. These roles were listed in the figure but took a back seat to management's influence [11].




Figure 10 Software Outsourcing Decision Makers [11]

Next, Hermann established that custom software development was the predominant type of outsourced projects. The research also distinguished that hybrid outsourcing (the combination of process and product outsourcing) was most prevalent. Specifically, Figure 11 shows the frequency of outsourcing software process components.




Figure 11 Process Outsourcing Measurements [11]

Actual development processes were more commonly practiced vs. support processes. The top four outsourced processes, coding, design, testing and maintenance, were consistent with the literature, but surprisingly, requirements and specification which took about 30% of those who used process outsourcing, ranked higher than most of the support processes. This directly contradicted what the researched literature identified [11].

Third, Hermann's research also studied which goals that companies found important and wished to achieve with outsourcing shown in Figure 12.




Figure 12 Outsourcing Goal Satisfaction [11]

Without the valuable T-test, these results would be at first misleading. Those four goals indicated within the brownish tint failed to meet the 95% confidence level and should not be considered. Those goals considered significantly unimportant were identified within the blackish tint. The red number (1-6) shown at the bottom of Figure 12 identified those goals that were found significantly important. Pointing out such importance proved beneficial in determining the amount of effort and resourced invested in such goals. It was interesting that the goal, reducing schedule, was found to be the second highest goal of importance but could not be considered due to its low confidence level. The other five significantly important goals showed positive signs with adding people, expertise and quality [11].

Finally, the consequences of outsourcing software projects were cataloged in Figure 13.




Figure 13 Software Outsourcing Consequences [11]

Software outsourcing was found to give the customers more flexibility in their schedule, improved product quality, and increase responsiveness to both organization's and customer's objectives. However, it was found to worsen the risks, cost, schedule duration, control, overhead and visibility [11]. As given in the above sections, literature conflicts not only each other but with these results as well [7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16-18]. The question marks at the bottom of the figure signified the consequences that were unknown because the responses were either: 1) exceedingly neutral and/or 2) lacked a clear positive or negative tendency. Hermann used these assertions related to these goals as a means of guiding outsourcing mitigation efforts [11].

2.2.6 Mitigation Efforts

Given desired consequences, certain mitigation efforts may be employed to assure a positive software outsourcing environment that minimizes poor consequences. These efforts, for positively influencing software outsourcing, were taken directly from researched literature and summarized in Table 6 [4, 8, 10-14, 17-19, 22-31].

Table 6 Mitigation Efforts

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal support [11-14, 16, 27] 2. Clear and concise requirement and testing specification [11, 14, 30] 3. In-house software expertise [4] 4. Clear and concise contract and Request For Proposal (RFP) [11-14, 16] 5. Intellectual ownership [16] 6. Solid software management principles [12] 7. Requirement and testing specs agreement [8, 13, 14] 8. Visibility and control oversight management measures [8, 10-12, 14, 30] 9. Positive attitude and relationship management [18, 31] 10. Joint software reviews [25] 11. Informal communications (knowledge management) [13, 19, 24, 28] 12. Knowledge scouts [28] 13. Software dimensions alignment [23, 27] 14. Estimation and metric practices [8, 10-12, 14, 30] |
|---|

The first effort listed was concerned with the legal outsourcing relationship. Legal support was needed to provide guidance due to the possibilities of involving expensive court litigation and to the fact that software projects were plagued with failures according to [11, 12, 14, 16, 27]. The outsourcing oversight management team created two crucial documents, the contract and the RFP. These two products contained high level management goals for using outsourcing as well as providing legal guidance. By letting the contractor know the reason for outsourcing as discussed in the RFP, energies would then be focused on the same goals [11, 12, 14, 16, 27]. Requirement specification or the

process to attain such clear and testable requirements should also be stated in these documents [14]. Formal methods and function point analysis provided techniques to ensure a clear and testable process [11, 14, 30]. In-house software expertise support should be required for the oversight management team in their venture to produce the contract and RFP as preached in Mosemann [4]. The contract must also provide binding arbitration and cost reimbursement clauses that define penalties and award incentives preventing litigation. Oversight management should plan on handling disputes between customers and contractors. Chain of responsibility/authority and dispute management must be clearly stated to handle disputes at the lowest levels [14]. With nearly 30% of outsourced development ventures ending badly or even in court, legal support staff provided the oversight management team the best litigation prevention by ensuring the RFP and contract were written in terms to protect the customer [11, 14]. Intellectual property and security concerns should be addressed to prevent disastrous problems later in the development [16].

Other common outsourcing mitigation efforts involved solid software project management methods taught throughout the universities. In addition to these taught principles, testing standards must be planned, developed and agreed upon by both in-house software experts and outsourced vendors. Depending upon software criticality, quality and safety concerns, an Independent Verification and Validation (IVandV) contractor would serve as a watch dog protecting the interest of product quality and customer concerns [8, 13, 14].

Metrics offered the oversight management team visibility into the development of the software and some control over the final product. However, metrics were plagued with several cautions. They were expensive, require in-house analysis, were easily misleading, and should be included in the contract and RFP. Even with these cautions, metrics provided ways to track progress, schedule, errors, quality, and similar project measurements [12-14]

The oversight team must establish control mechanisms that make sense to the project and supported by the in-house software experts [4, 8, 13, 14]. With only one out of 10 large software projects completed on time, within budget and 30% of projects failing to be delivered (those delivered containing 42% of the planned requirements), oversight management team must be persistently involved [2, 14].

The [18, 31] articles added additional focus on personnel factors. Positive relationship and attitude management ensured communication flows freely in both directions. It eliminated the “We/They Finger Pointing”. Outsourced workers often had different agendas; therefore, must be checked especially when security concerns are at risk. Because of the individualistic goals of the contractor, care should be taken when assigning them to work with in-house teams [18]. People skills should also be carefully evaluated along with the technical skills when selecting a contractor to interface with in-house personnel [31].

Several authors showed mitigation efforts aimed specifically at software outsourcing. These efforts were included in Table 7.

Table 7 Software Outsourcing Specific Mitigation Efforts

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint software reviews [25] 2. Informal communication [13, 19, 24] 3. Knowledge scouts [28] 4. Software outsourcing dimensions [23, 27] 5. Estimation and metric clarification [8, 10-12, 14, 30] |
|--|

Joint software reviews provided an important communication mechanism for the contractor and customer to come together and to identify and solve issues relating to the project. Resources must be spent to ensure this review is successful and the review's efforts, energies and direction were aligned for all parties. To accomplish this alignment, six steps were listed in Table 8.

Table 8 Joint Review Alignment Steps [25]

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather all meeting members goals concerning the review 2. Create shared group vision and goals 3. Collect members intentions, preferences and justification regarding this vision or goals 4. Discuss consequences of not meeting goals 5. Prioritize goals 6. Seek group consensus to press forward with the review |
|--|

It was found that informal communication decreased as the distance between the customer and developing team increased. When this distributed (long distance) software outsourcing was compare to co-located software outsourcing, the co-located development finished 1.5 to two times faster than the development spread out over distance. The reason for this dealt with the decrease in informal communication and coordination [24]. In some instances, such as the need for certain types of software experts, this distributed software outsourcing was required; therefore, the following informal communication efforts listed in Table 9 should be implemented:

Table 9 Informal Communication Efforts

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instant messaging systems such as on-line chat seemed effective at building informal neighborhoods where knowledge transfer was found to increase [24] 2. Knowledge maps gave the developers an expert guide to who knows what (much like the yellow pages for the outsource development program). This decreased the time needed to solve coordination problems [19, 24, 32] 3. Identifying and building communication channels between experts that share common interest such as community of practices provided a synergy effect of knowledge creation vital to the development effort [24] 4. Web-based, shared calendars considered simple but effective at eliminating some of the basic coordination issues [24] 5. Knowledge scouts have proved useful in increasing informal communications [28]. |
|--|

According to [28] article, knowledge scouts were found crucial in increasing informal communications. A knowledge scout is a highly energized team focused on visiting the external contractual organizations to share/transfer knowledge. Face to face informal meetings provided trust, confidence, energy and a team atmosphere that was not available through video teleconferencing. Both contractual organizations must be willing to spend additional resources for this method to work. The following requirements listed in Table 10 will provide guidance for building an effective knowledge scout program:

Table 10 Knowledge Scout Program Requirements [28]

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The team must know key project development information. 2. The team is rewarded for being alert, productive and active. 3. They must plan and coordinate several visits to all associated players. 4. Knowledge scouts require resources and a special brand of openness therefore the program must be stated in the contract and associated RFP. 5. Each member's paycheck should be based on the amount of knowledge actually transferred. 6. The team should have an outgoing personality and people skills. 7. Members should be permanent because familiar faces seem to promote trust and confidence. 8. The knowledge scout program along with its visits should start early in the project to escape the investigator label. |
|--|

References [23, 27] stated that software development dimensions must be aligned because of the different goals and cultures represented by both the customer and contracting organization. Six software development dimensions, also known as the COCPIT dimensions, were explained in the [23] article and summarized in Table 11.

Table 11 COCPIT Software Development Dimension [23]

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>C</u>oordination/control focuses on different cultures between the companies. 2. <u>O</u>bjectives must be able to synch as well. Many contractors wanted to make a fast profit while the project needed a certain high degree of quality. Contractors in an effort to make more profit (their objective), assigned a B-team (a team with less expertise) to certain less lucrative projects so that their A-team could capture a large, expensive project. This was also the case when the contractors try to use subcontractors. Contract arrangements should account for some control in such events. 3. The project demands a certain type and amount of <u>C</u>apabilities. Having the skills not available and/or tied up in other projects adversely impacts the project. Selection of vendor should be based on capabilities not lowest bid. 4. Does the vendor define their methodology and <u>P</u>rocesses? The Capability Maturity Model (CMM) measure the maturity of such processes. The project due to its size and complexity may require a level 3, 4 or 5 CMM vendor. The oversight management team maturity level must also align well with the selected vendor or project frustrations might occur due to the gap between the organizations maturity levels. Methodologies also need to be judged between both teams. 5. <u>I</u>nformation communication was discussed in the earlier paragraphs. The oversight management teams should judge and select a vendor based on similar means of communicating and a willingness to communicate. 6. Both the software and development effort demands a certain level of <u>T</u>echnology. The software may require distributed-type qualities that influence how the software is built. Security/safety requirements influence both how the software may be built and/or the development nature of the software due to the software security classification. Also, technical concerns should focus on the digital communication needs between both customer and vendors. |
|---|

In support of the first COCPIT dimension, Air Force Times recently printed an article about Boeing losing \$1B due to integrity issues which fell out of alignment with the AF expectation [33]. In an extreme programming success article supporting the 4th

COCBIT dimension, case studies showed how important it is for both teams to be accustomed to the methodology (processes) before the projects starts [29]. In another article supporting such dimension it was found that certain methodologies work extremely well for certain projects of a certain size and complexity and not so well for the other software projects [22].

Rollo and Wright urged size/cost estimation and metric mitigation efforts focus their aims at providing a greater degree of control and visibility into the project. A planned, structured way of estimating must be practiced by the oversight management team. They also found that function point analysis was very successful at judging not only the size and complexity of a project, but the productivity of the vendor developing the software [30]. A planned, structured way of using metrics must also be practiced. References [8, 10-12, 14] noted that metrics can provide vital control information into a project's schedule, quality, and trouble spots, but are expensive in both collection and analysis; thus, they must show significant amounts of usefulness and be stated in the contract.

2.2.7 Future

Along with mitigation efforts, the future trends of software outsourcing tends to make outsourcing an easier choice over in-house development. The literature identified three future trends: 1) Application Service Providers (ASP) [[34, 35], 2) Partnerships [36], and 3) Knowledge Management [19, 32].

ASP's have become extremely popular in the software outsourcing world [34, 35]. In most cases, the provider supplied not only the software, but the service behind the

software such as, customer support, training, integration support, database access, internet access, backup services, recent software changes or version management, and server hardware support. It provided the customer the ability to lease the COTS product versus buying or building the software. Four drawbacks for buying/building software were summarized in Table 12.

Table 12 Buying/Building Software Drawbacks [35]

1. Development risk in building or customizing 2. Integration problems with other existing customer systems 3. New technology causes endless loops of software evolution meeting customer's need 4. Development or customization time is not fast enough

ASP had several benefits over buying/building software listed in Table 13 shown below:

Table 13 ASP Benefits [35]

1. 30% to 70% Cost savings due to the large number of ASP customers sharing the cost 2. Scalability based on customers' usage 3. ASP specific expertise offers faster software solutions to users 4. Promotes distributed/mobile workforce 5. Ensures customers have access to the best practices and usage of latest technology 6. Increases help support from other ASP subcontractors due to the importance of the large ASP's account to the subcontractors 7. Manages one ASP outsourcing relationship versus multiple outsourcing relationships with multiple vendors

Susarla [35] summarized the findings of an ASP survey including over 250 responses. The authors found that the biggest benefit dealt with speed of access, quality support, access to latest technology and processes, integration with other systems, and low cost. Many (51%) stated that they were up and fully operational in under a month. ASP's do have several drawbacks, as listed below in Table 14:

Table 14 ASP Drawbacks [35]

1. Not suitable for core (critical, unique) tasks (80%)
2. Non-customizable
3. Compared to a long successful custom built software lifetime, ASP cost can be higher
4. Dependent on oversight management to monitor performance and quality of service
5. Risk of interoperability with current core business practices

Several authors ASP articles included a list of cautionary items that should be taken prior to signing an ASP contract [34, 35]. These issues were summarized in Table 15.

Table 15 ASP Contract Issues [34, 35]

1. Performance and quality measures
2. Security guarantees
3. Backup/disaster guarantees
4. Legal support
5. Implementation plan
6. Required training and user support
7. A plan to back out and terminate service (data transfer)

According to Lee, the next evolution of software outsourcing focused on tightening the relationship into a partnership as illustrated in Figure 14 below [36]:




Figure 14 Partnerships [36]

Figure 14 showed that most current software outsourcing relationships were built upon the formal contract (win-lose) strategy. An outsourced vendor was paid even though the customer, caught on the losing end, found the delivered product worthless. In a partnership, the relationship was more tightly coupled. Many authors stated that outsourcing relationship was like a marriage making a partnership relationship like a marriage with kids. Both companies shared resources, personnel, risks, and confidential concerns. This relationship generated higher amounts of trust due to a win-win relationship, a relationship important for developing core type software [36]. Examples familiar to the AF included Federally Funded Research and Development Centers such as

Aerospace and Project Air Force (RAND) corporations. Both parties would be negatively impacted if the relationship fails as well as rewarded if the relationship prospers.

The final software outsourcing trend was identified as knowledge management [19, 32]. These articles continued with changing the view that software outsourcing was an acquisition of knowledge instead of a product. Improving business processes involved layers of various skill-sets connected by numerous communication channels. Software development took this same approach. The development normally implied an improvement of some business process. Such process meant knowledge must be captured, codified and evolved with management realigning their reasons for governing the outsourced vendor. The vendor was not just delivering software but added knowledge through the development of the software. This realignment affected vendor selection putting more emphasis on vendor's CMM level and making the vendor's methodology more important. The ability to attain knowledge from the documents and training was viewed as important as ensuring their quality. Other software outsourcing issues pushing knowledge management dealt with capturing and defining the processes used by software acquisition experts. With few true software acquisition experts, the ad hoc processes these individuals were captured and defined so that knowledge was transferred to the junior acquirers. In Nov 2001, DoD experienced its first federal acquisition team to achieve SA-CMM level two [26]. This team was the US Army Abrams Project Acquisition/Oversight team. Documenting the processes of how an

organization acquires software was an important step to the success of software outsourcing.

2.2.8 Software Outsourcing Topic Conclusion

As portrayed in the above graphs and figures, software outsourcing appears to be very complex. Numerous factors relating to consequences could not be explained in an easy formula. Given conflicts in the literature and rapid future changes in software outsourcing, literature research was simply not enough. Experienced insight proved important in capturing decision rationale which meant capturing the factors and goals for each project with the associated outcomes. From this experience, a standard practice of acquiring software development would emerge. Through analysis, outcomes could be measured in terms of doing worst, neutral or better given mitigation efforts and associated goals. In-house software expertise is required to support the acquisition/oversight team to eliminate reoccurring mistakes. This captured knowledge filtered out bad practices allowing only the proven, successful outsourcing methods to be kept.

2.3 Learning Mechanisms

Given the need to capture, codify and transfer software outsourcing decision-making knowledge, research offered two popular methods that were used to find significant relationship rules or patterns so that given enough analysis a model can be constructed. How these methods provide such information was quite different. Stepwise regression started with analysis to build an initial model along with the interacting data

affecting the outcome [37]. Data relating to this model was collected so that statistical analysis could be made to validate the relationships of the model. The second step involved adding and removing predictor variables according to the stepping criteria. The last step determined termination based on either the exhaustion of search possibilities of the stepping criteria or when desired performance had been reached. Stepwise was broken into two types of methods. The forward stepwise method was the process that started with the least number of effects in the model. Each effect was statistically tested against an entry statistic to see what effects could be added to the model. Immediately after all effects were added, a backward removal process was used to ensure that an effect could not be removed based upon a removal statistic. Backward stepwise method took an opposite approach. All effects were designed into the model at the beginning. Each was statistically tested against the removal statistic to decide which effects could be removed. After all selected variables were removed, a forward entry process was used to ensure that a variable could not be re-added based upon the entry statistic [37].

After the stepwise regression model was generated, two performance measurements were used to judge how the model related to a given set of observations. The first measurement, the correlation (R) value, focused on how well the model explained the variation within the observations. The second measurement, the Mean Squared Error (MSE), was used to determine the model's accuracy. MSE also referred to the amount of noise in the model. Both measurements were used together in explaining a model's performance [38].

Several authors stated NN took a completely different approach. It utilized patterns within the data in order for it to learn. Many definitions were offered in the field of computer science all sharing a common theme. This common theme considered NN as a patch work of many connected simple processors all with their independent amount of memory. These connections, considered as numeric weights, were used to carry input and output signals useful in predicting certain outcome patterns. NN could seek the advantage of each processor working in parallel with the other processors thus requiring a great deal of inner connectivity. However, it did not have to work in parallel given a simple NN model. Also, NN involved a training process (learning) where the connections and processors developed some learnt weights associated with input and output data that is being fed into it [39-42]. Figure 15 presented a visual diagram of two of the more common NN:




Figure 15 NN Visual Definition [39-42]

From this figure, the interconnecting processor acted upon the inputs and outputs that were fed into the NN. As the NN went through each input and output data set (patterns), the processors adjusted its weights accordingly not only to the current pattern but from the history of patterns recorded beforehand. This learning was broken into two categories: 1) Supervised learning - the target values and outputs were known. Both were fed into the NN during initial training so that the NN could establish weights matching its outputs with the inputs. 2) Unsupervised learning - the correct results were not known. The NN was fed with this unknown data. The NN would compress and cluster the data looking for connecting patterns. This type of learning was usually used for prediction type functions where the relationships were under study [39-42].

Another distinguishing NN category depended upon allowing learning cycles to develop within the NN [39, 41, 42]. If cycles were allowed, such that the output results were fed back as input, then the NN was classified as a feed-back NN. If cycles were not allowed the NN was classified as a feed-forward. This feed-back required a long amount of time before obtaining the desired learning performance measures. This drawback made training more complicated, but may be required given the type of data and the required accuracy of the NN [39, 41, 42]. Both methods, took advantage of historical data better known as backpropagation. This allowed the data to be introduced repeatedly into the NN. Upon each presentation, it fine tuned its associated weights corresponding to each pattern [42].

Authors stated that NN could be separated based on categorical or quantitative type input data. Categorical type data contained a finite number of possible values. Both supervised and unsupervised learning could be associated with categorical type outputs called classifications. Quantitative type data represented as numerical measurements that were associated with some arithmetic relation meaningful to the data and associated output [39, 41].

2.3.1 Neural Network History

Along with this definition, the NN history further introduced how NN had evolved [39, 42, 43]. NN existed before the 1950's. Relating it to only computer science, the first neuro-computer was built in 1954 by Marvin Minsky. In 1956, Dartmouth established a new research field of NN. Shortly after, in 1957, Frank Rosenblatt, with the support of Cornell University, demonstrated one of the earliest NN systems called the "Perceptron."

This system was capable of recognizing letters and received much attention until 1969 when the Minsky and Papert paper discussed the limitations associated with NN. Given this paper and the limits of computing power, research on NN came to a stand still for over a decade noted as the NN quiet years of '69 to '82. During these quiet years, expert systems or rule based systems took center stage in the artificial intelligence world. Numerous expert systems were built trying to create a truly intelligent system. These expert systems tended to require large amounts of programming and memory to encapsulate the rules and decision making steps implementing those rules. Finally, in 1982, Lecun and Papert discovered “backpropagation” which went around the limitations discussed earlier in the 1969 paper. Immediate following this discovery, DARPA started to provide NN research funding, and in 1986, Rumelhart and McClelland published the “Parallel Distributed Processing” book. This book became the bible for which several other NN topologies were designed and built. Later in the 1980's, Hecht-Nielsen released a paper that disproved the limitation associated in the 1969 paper, and the activity of NN has continued to grow since then [39, 42, 43].

2.3.2 Comparison Studies

Both NN and stepwise regression appeared to provide methods useful in capturing the software outsourcing decision making knowledge, but the question was does one method outperform the other method. Stepwise regression techniques were useful in creating a metamodel to describe simulation modeling as given by the [44] article. Both metamodel and simulation modeling were popular in the analysis of complex systems. However, simulation modeling involved a trial and error process in order to flush out

significant relationships used in predicting a set of outcomes. If the relationship did not meet the significant tests, the process was repeated until an accepted relationship was found. This iterative process was very time consuming and expensive [44].

To overcome this expense, simulation metamodels were used to establish relationship rules between inputs and outputs according to several sources, [37, 44-47]. These relationships could span over wide range of interests. Upon discovering and validating such relationship rules, an expert system could be created using such rules to solve or predict an outcome. Stepwise regression was one of the more common methods of flushing out such relationships based upon statistical analysis. Based on these relationships, a metamodel could be built to present how the relations between the significantly important variables interact to flush out certain outcomes [37, 44-47].

Both expert systems (built upon such relationship rules) and NN were used to approximate human decision making process, and in that respect, the two were similar. How they performed this approximation was different. Expert systems related to conventional data processing approach in that detailed programming logic must be used to evaluate the rules and associate the rules to the input data. This meant that the input must be complete and structured. This rigid environment often lost the accuracy because the decision making process involved a digital like yes or no results as it was calculated from predictable program logic. Thus, the weakness of the expert system was the rigid function and belief that the knowledge of the relationships could be effectively captured without loss of accuracy in the transformation. However, the knowledge of such rules

provided some insight to future learning and explanation of the problem being simulated [37, 39, 43-45, 48].

NN on the other hand was not a programmable set of rules. It learned from evaluating the input and output data; a process known as NN training. Given this dependence on the data and training, great care would be taken when collecting the data and using the data to train the NN. The NN key attributes were explained in Table 16.

Table 16 NN Key Attributes

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learning from experience: The input and output data would be considered the experience. Since the NN was data dependent, it used experience to make its choices [39-41, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50]. 2. Ability to generalize: Rigid dependence upon rules tended to be very specific and unforgiving. NN could take input data that was unfamiliar and make a general determination based off the experiences learned through training. As well as unfamiliar, this data could be incomplete or noisy (un-needed data that is not useful in making the decision) [39, 40, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50]. 3. Compute solutions faster: Having to based decisions upon large volumes of rules could be computationally intensive if not impossible. NN did not have to provide such a computational task because of its ability to use parallel processing between independent working neural processing models [39, 41, 43, 46, 50]. 4. Less reliance on the expert: Dependence on the rules meant dependence upon the expert or source of the rules. Sometimes this expert or rule discovery given such a number of variants was not available. Also, construction of those rules could be very demanding and tended to be very reliant on field experience. This construction could cause the introduction of various errors. NN was much more flexible providing decisions without such a heavy reliance on the rules. However, some domain expertise was required for choosing the correct neural network design and analyzing the input and output data [39-43, 46, 49, 50]. 5. Non-linearity: Development of rules that model non-linearity relationships were too complex. Behavior tended to be non-linear and related to experience which was how NN attained its decision making capability [39-43, 46, 47, 49, 50]. |
|---|

Tafti [43] contrasted the expert “rule based” decision making techniques with NN and found that both are needed. The shortcomings of one technique could be filled by the other. In several articles, both techniques were used to support each other. All authors

strongly encouraged domain and data analysis prior to the implementation of a NN solution [41, 43, 47, 49, 50]. Figure 16 summarized this NN and expert system comparison.

FEATURE	EXPERT SYSTEMS	NEURAL NETWORKS
Ability to handle fuzzy data	No	Yes
Capability of Providing explanations	High	Low
Learning by example	No	Yes
Self-adaptation to new situations	No	Yes
Programming effort	High	Low
Capability of processing large data	High	Low

Figure 16 NN vs. Expert Systems [43]

Several references introduced how both NN and stepwise regression techniques could be used together to build metamodels [44-46, 49]. The most popular metamodel technique was regression [43]. When an exhaustive amount of relationships, some possibly even hidden, NN was used to discover information needed in creating the metamodel. Stepwise regression then was used to validate this information. Constructing such a metamodel in this backwards approach captured the strengths of both techniques, but, this approach may introduce numerous errors transitioning from one technique to the other [44, 46]. A comparison was done comparing metamodels built by both techniques [44]. The modular function NN using the delta learning rules performed the best when compared to the following NN listed in Table 17:

Table 17 Comparison Study's NN [44]

▪ 3 General regression NN (each built with Projection, City Block and Euclidean summation) ▪ 3 Radial Basis Function (RBF) NN (each built with Projection, City Block and Euclidean summation) ▪ 4 Modular function NN (each built with Delta Rule, Delta Bar Delta, Quickprob and Maxprob learning rules) ▪ 4 Backpropagation NN (each built with Delta Rule, Delta Bar Delta, Quickprob and Maxprob learning rules) ▪ 1 Learning vector quantization NN (built with unsupervised learning Kohonen mapping)
--

In this study, each NN outperformed the stepwise regression model in almost every case. It was found that these summation functions do affect the outcomes in the general regression NN. Along the same lines, the modular function and backpropagation NN were found to be sensitive to the learning rule applied and the amount of training points used in training. The final finding showed the difference in training a NN needs in order to recognize quantitative vs. qualitative data. The report found that two separate NN metamodels would be needed depending upon the desired output data [44]. Also, in another similar test, the regression model was compared to NN model [49]. NN started to learn after 446 training patterns while the regression technique failed to even establish a relationship after 15000 training pattern sets [49]. Due to the nature of NN, it has several drawbacks. In Table 18, these drawbacks were summarized.

Table 18 NN Drawbacks

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First drawback includes the complexities involved in training. It boils down to trial and error with a major reliance on experience, intuition and domain knowledge [41, 42, 44, 49]. 2. Second drawback relates to deciding which inputs and output to use. Simplifying the network to only one output will tend to be faster, easier to debug, and to keep the amount of errors down [41, 42, 44, 49]. 3. Third drawback deals with over-fitting and over-training of the NN. This overfitting deals with the complexity of associating weights to a wide range of variants. The number of hidden weights should be associated to the number of inputs and classes of those inputs used to train the network. Over-training is training the NN with too similar input and output training data. The noise of this similar data will be learned causing errors during the NN prediction process [[41, 42, 44, 49]. 4. Fourth drawback is associated with its black box nature. The user accepts the output based on just the NN. Validation using stepwise regression is needed to associate the outputs into meaningful rules [37, 39, 43]. |
|---|

2.3.3 Neural Network Project Planning Concerns

Given these drawbacks, certain specialized software planning must be made when a NN is involved in a project. Differences that must be kept in mind when planning a NN software project vs. conventional software project were explained in Table 19.

Table 19 NN Project Differences [39]

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NN project are data intrinsic. Analyzing and collecting the data needed to train the NN takes considerable amounts of experience, time, effort and resources. 2. Training of a NN boils down to trial and error. Building prototypes and experimenting with them provides the only assured way to specify the correct solution. This iterative trial and error process is hard to control thus increasing the risk for budget and schedule over-runs. 3. Main emphasis of a NN project is performance not speed of processing. Requirement specification should establish a minimum performance value. Additional emphasis should be spent on selecting a method used to validate and test these performance measures. |
|---|

Several authors stated project planning should account for data collection, data analysis, prototyping, NN training, NN design and performance reviews, and performance

validation. Management must have different controls to allow for the iterative cycles required for trial and error of the NN. By using reviews, management can put some type of control on data, prototype cycle, and end of the prototype development phase. Reviews provided a way to align energies, effort and direction thus giving management visibility into the project which was critical to ensure the project is on time and within budget [39, 41].

The Figure 17 shows a typical NN software project life cycle:




Figure 17 NN Software Lifecycle Model [39]

The project lifecycle was separated into three main phases: 1) application identification and feasibility study phase 2) development and validation of prototype phase 3) conversion of prototype into deliverable software system phase. Along with

these main phases, the supporting process of configuration management and documentation had their own respective NN issues. Configuration management issues were aimed at the ability of keeping the data, used during the training and validation phases, separated and backed up. Meta-information regarding the prototype must be kept separated upon each experiment and prototype cycle. Documentation issues dealt with knowledge transfer. The ability to repeat the NN trial and error experiment exactly under the same conditions was crucial. Results and details were recorded along with any rationale so that decisions could be made during development and maintenance phases [39, 41].

2.3.4 Neural Network Feasibility Concerns

In the first phase of the lifecycle, the application should lend itself to a NN solution. Given true, the second phase focused on the expense of such a solution by asking feasibility questions such as: Has another similar NN project been accomplished? Is the data required available? Do all the resources exist to collect and analyze this given data? Upon successfully answering such questions, business feasibility questions regarding cost, benefits, and risks were also addressed [39, 41].

Experience and published examples were extremely useful in deciding what applications lend toward a NN solution. Table 20 listed a small sample of applications where NN had proven quite effective:

Table 20 NN Application Examples

1. Prediction and classification problems using myeloma survival data [51]
2. Deciding factors for circuit soldering [47]
3. Predicting optimal termination of abrasive air flow machining in air intake manifolds [50]
4. Cost, bond rating, stock and current exchange estimation [39, 45]
5. Fault diagnosis, condition monitoring, forecasting, signal/image analysis, pattern detection, fraud inspection etc... [39, 40, 45, 48]

With each application example and future NN applications, three criteria were applied in order for NN to be considered as an appropriate solution for the project [39, 41]. These criteria were listed in Table 21:

Table 21 Required NN Criteria [39, 41]

1. The problem can not be defined within a simple set of equations or rules.
2. A relationship must exist between input and output data
3. Large amount of suitable data exist to train and test the NN

Along with these requirements, a feasibility study was performed to evaluate the cost of a NN solution with its benefits [39]. In project planning, it was necessary to understand the cost of the NN was more than other typical software projects. The time-cost to iteratively collect, analyze, train and test the prototypes made schedule control extremely difficult. The budget-cost found the same forecasting pressures as well. The additional cost of data collection and resources required in analyzing and training the NN had to be factored within such a budget [39].

As with any software project, sound software engineering principles demanded analysis of the benefits and risk mitigation. Benefits should outweigh the concerns of going forward with a NN project. Table 22 provided some common NN benefits.

Table 22 NN Benefits [39]

1. Reduced staff cost
2. Improved decision making
3. Enhanced forecasting support
4. Increased monitoring leading to better performance
5. Improved fault detection
6. Increased knowledge with proper analysis of results increased knowledge

On the sunrise of these benefits, beware of the storm clouds of the associated NN project risks. These risks included but were not limited to those risks listed in Table 23:

Table 23 NN Risks [39]

1. Inability to get required performance
2. Unavailable expertise to lead NN project
3. Benefits blinds management feasibility study decision
4. Resistance of those that refuse to support NN
5. Inabilities to collect and analyze the data
6. Increased development time
7. Increased budget cost

The mitigation efforts to minimize these risks were found in one word, knowledge. Knowledge in literature, expertise and past solutions involving NN paid huge dividends in such mitigation efforts. Along with this knowledge, the application of sound software engineering processes increased the success of a software development project [39].

2.3.5 Neural Network Data Concerns

From the lifecycle, it was obvious that data was a major part of the NN project. The whole push behind the NN solution was its capability to take different types of data from different sources, and through a process known as data fusion, produced the target output. This reliance on data was its main drawback because the NN will only be as good as the quality and appropriate quantity of data used to train it [39].

As stated in the above, the amount of training data could cause error-prone side affects known as over-fitting and over-training. One of the advantages of NN was its ability to make generalizations about input data to formulate a respective output, better known as extrapolating. In order for the NN to do this reliably, it must first interpolate its training data to a best fit curve or weighted system necessary to calculate a certain output. Through data analysis and stepwise regression models, an approximation could be made concerning the amount of weights needed to acquire a certain output. The number of training input sets should be of the same order of these weights. Other experts believed that the number of training sets should be of the same order as these weights divided by the accepted level of error. Given a 90% confidence level, the number of input sets would be the same order of these weights times 10. Because this approximation was not an exact science, iterative trial and error training prototyping was required to tune the NN [39, 45].

Another problem associated with data regards missing data which was common after data collection. Three methods were used to handle such a problem. The first method simply used the computed mean or median as a substitute for the missing value. The second method required capturing this missing data from its neighboring sets. It used its neighbor values to fill in the missing data. The last method actually used a NN or a step wise regression metamodel to predict the value. This could require extensive amount of work, but given the importance of the missing data, it might be required to minimize the error given such a substitution [39].

Ambiguous input data also appeared to cause errors if not identified and appropriately handled prior to training. This type of error resulted from the same input pattern matching two different outputs. Special allowances must be made to ensure this does not happen especially in training, validation and testing [39].

The type of NN also impacted training. In the comparison studies, it was shown the differences associated with the type of NN did affect the outcomes and accuracy of the NN [44]. Unsupervised NN, such as those using Kohonen mapping, did not require the extensive separation of the data into training, validation and testing sets. All of the collected data sets were used in training. Data analysis was still required for validation purposes. This analysis called for statistical techniques such as normalization methods and mean squared error methods.

However, supervised NN separated the data into various sets. Two of the most common supervised NN architectures were Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) (a class of backpropagation NN) and Radial Basis Function (RBF) NN. Each of these two architectures had several associated data concerns regarding each [39, 40, 42, 45].

RBF was unique because it involved unsupervised learning along with supervised learning. In the first phase, the unsupervised learning portion associated a selected basis function with an associated width. In the second phase, the supervised learning portion associated the outer layer weights to the identified patterns distinguished in the first phase. These outer layer weights gave the NN ability to label its results. Setting the weights was a linear task using such methods as the least mean square algorithm. There was no validation associated with RBF. RBF did have an advantage in that its hidden

layer was accessible; thus, test patterns could be executed to determine if the NN was interpolating vs. extrapolating. Training times were slightly shorter for RBF vs. MLP. MLP had a higher performance in generalization and classification abilities. Also, RBF was restricted to a small number of inputs which was another drawback [39, 40].

MLP (a backpropagation NN) showed to be one of the highest performing NN in the comparison studies [44]. This performance came at a price because validation and testing were both required. Four main tasks were associated for this type of NN and listed in Table 24:

Table 24 MLP NN Tasks [39, 40]

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partitioning the data into training, validation and test sets 2. Training the MLP until stopping criterion is met 3. Selecting the optimal network based on validity checks 4. Testing the trained network using the test set |
|---|

Tarassenko [39] and Smith [40] insisted that multiple training runs must be executed against the NN. This was in part to its need for a random weight initialization. This randomization allowed the non-linear optimization of the associated weight sets. This initialization value was a small random number ranged from -0.01 to 0.01 and used to initialize each weight within the outer layer. As the network was iteratively trained, the weight sets adjusted appropriately. Upon each iteration, a validation or a stopping criterion was employed. As the training proceeded, the training error decreased while the NN accuracy increased, and the same was true for the validation error; up to an error validation minimum point. After this point, the validation error started increasing even though the training error showed that it was decreasing [39]. The following plot in Figure 18 illustrated this relationship between the training error and validation error:




Figure 18 MLP NN Training Error Plot [39]

In Figure 18, an epoch was defined as the collection of all patterns given in the input data set. It could take hundreds of epochs for learning to occur. With each epoch, learning increased, much as a student preparing for a test might re-iterate through their study material. Learning stopped when the error validation minimum point had been reached as displayed in the above figure [39, 40].

Tarassenko introduced concerns about the amount of data. The amount of data used to train the MLP NN should be known because this same amount will need to be used to validate the NN and again used to test the NN. This 1:1:1 ratio was very demanding on the amount of data collected; therefore, other methods may need to be exercised when data is at a premium. One such method was known as cross-validation which maximized the amount of data used in the training process. The original collected data was split up several times. After these several splits, the training process was performed on each split. For each smaller split, a smaller test set was required to test thus allowing more data to be used for training. An example of this was given in Figure 19.




Figure 19 Cross-Validation [39]

Other common problems associated with training of NN were summarized in Table 25.

Table 25 Common NN Problems [39]

1. Incorrect NN solution due to no relationship between the input and output data
2. Incorrect features of the input data used to predict a certain output which could cause misleading results (another reason why stepwise regression can be used to support findings and in creating a metamodel)
3. Incorrect initialization values (setting them to close to 0 or 1)
4. Incorrect normalization of the input variables
5. Insufficient number of training patterns found in the input and output data. This causes generalization problems and could lead to misleading results
6. Incorrect usage of NN causes extrapolation vs. interpolation. This could happen when the NN was trained for predicting a certain window of outcomes, but someone tries to predict something outside the window.
7. Incorrect classification results due to unbalance data sets. Expertise is needed to analyze the data. Given only few patterns relating to one set of classification predictions and several patterns relating to another set of classification predictions could cause this type of problem.
8. Over-fitting and over-training problems, as previously discussed in the background section, cause poor learning performance. These two problems are the most common errors associated with NN. Proper analysis of the data and carefully following the training steps will prevent such problems.

2.3.6 Topic Conclusion

NN supported a variety of decision making type software. In some areas, NN were more accurate than a rule based system created from stepwise regression. Stepwise

regression assumed linear type relationship among a minimum number of co-linearity variables. As the complexity increased, as the number of variables and relationships rose, and as the relationship tended to become more non-linear, NN proved to be the best decision tool. However, the importance of analyzing and understanding the data was still required. This comparison showed that NN and stepwise techniques support each other to draw out and capture the knowledge needed to make future decisions.

2.4 Summary

Future software outsourcing decision making knowledge must be captured and modeled so that knowledge evolution can proceed aiding the AF in saving resources. In order to represent the complexity involved, the literature has given us several models to use. NN has been shown to be useful in supporting the rules associated with stepwise regression techniques. NN projects, however, also cause additional management, feasibility and data concerns. All must be successfully mitigated to ensure the software decision support tool takes proper advantage of both stepwise regression rules and NN.

3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology or plan for survey data analysis and building a software outsourcing decision support tool. In Chapter Two, it was discovered that software outsourcing was very complex along with numerous factors relating to its final consequences. The literature review showed many conflicts involving software outsourcing consequences such as reduced cost vs. increased cost, improved control vs. reduced control, and reduced schedule vs. increased schedule just to name a few. These conflicts were summarized in Chapter Two's Figure 1. This was mainly due to the fact of a rapidly changing software outsourcing world. Experience proved to be invaluable in guiding the outsourcing decision. Also, the literature research uncovered the fact that both regression and NN should be used together to support each other's weaknesses. The primary goal of this project involved taking both regression and NN methods and applying them to all of Hermann's survey data collected prior to 2004. These learning mechanisms captured the knowledge hidden deep within raw survey data. Such mechanisms provided the tool an efficient means for displaying this knowledge to those outsourcing decision makers seeking such support.

3.2 Previous Research

Much of this research and project planning was built upon previous work that was accomplished in Hermann's dissertation titled, "A Decision Tool to Support Strategy Selection for Software Development Outsourcing [11]." The product of this research was

a survey, analysis methodology, and a decision support tool called Software Outsourcing Decision Support tool version 1 (SODS1). This work was reviewed because much of the validation of the new tool, SODS2, rested on the validation of SODS1. Without such a solid foundation on which to build, this methodology would be severely weakened.

3.3 Research Activities

Given the foundation listed above, this section covers the methodology used in data analysis, creation of stepwise regression models, development of NN's, and development of SODS2. Tool selection will be the first area discussed. Once the reader understands how the tools are selected and evaluated, the new survey data transformation and analysis will be introduced. From the analysis section, the two learning mechanisms, linear regression and NN, are incorporated in this design for the creation of SODS2 outsourcing consequence regression models and NN's. Finally, the actual plans or designs for SODS2 are presented listing the software requirements that must be met to give the outsourcing decision maker a truly, high quality decision support tool.

3.3.1 Tool Selection and Evaluation

Using this foundation, several tools by default had to be used in the development of SODS2. MS Access was used to contain and organize the data and allowed Open DataBase Connectivity (ODBC) compatible software tools to access such data through SQL scripts. MS Outlook was used to collect the new online surveys.

Hermann made reference to a statistical tool called SPSS, "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences." Using this information, along with suggestions made by the AFIT

statistical department, JMP version 5.0 statistical tool was used in applying the same statistical methods that Hermann used with SPSS. The tool proved to be a good fit as it connected directly to the MS Access database. This tool also provided the implementation of T-tests and stepwise regression necessary to compare the results of research results with Hermann's previous results and for the creation of the consequence regression models. In this comparison, the tool's results were incorporated into MS Excel charts in a similar manner accomplished in Hermann's dissertation. These similar charts delivered the analytical overview required during implementation.

Researching the NN tool was accomplished in the same manner as the statistical tool. The evaluation criteria for this NN tool were based on availability and the tool's ability to provide 20, quality NN's that can be easily accessed by SODS2.

The first NN tool evaluated was Stuttgart NN Simulator (SNNS). To design, train, test and interface the NN's with SNNS, a large host of separate components were required; most of which were written for the UNIX platform. The next discouraging find dealt with the complex script language required for SNNS to interface with SODS2.

The next NN tool evaluated was Neurosolutions 4.0. It provided a graphical display from a main window that drove everything from designing, training, testing and interfacing the NN's. It was an all in one tool that had no compatibility issues running on the MS Window platform which made fielding SODS2 a much cleaner approach. Its two highest selling points included:

1. Interfacing was delivered through the use of Dynamic Link Library (DLL) files which again made fielding this application much easier, and

2. It came complete with an interactive learning demonstration, NN help manual, and an excellent technical support staff. This support staff provided this research NN expert guidance. The support staff made Neurosolutions the choice NN development tool for this research.

MS Access VB was used as the SODS2 developing tool largely due to the Neurosolutions tool. Java for Togethersoft was first conceived to be the tool of choice. Previous Java experience showed great interoperability with other components. Java was also proven to work well with ODBC application such as MS Access. Because Neurosolutions directly interfaced MS Access VB through the use of DLL files, Java was not needed. MS Access VB became the selected developmental tool because the data and application could be contained in an all-in-one database reducing the complexities involved in fielding the SODS2.

3.3.2 New Survey Data Transformation

As discussed in the tool selection section, MS Outlook was used convert all survey E-mail messages into one text file. Using Togethersoft, a Java applet was developed using common text file input/output and ODBC commands to automatically transfer the 48 text based surveys into 48 data rows accepted by the MS Access database. After the successful completion of this task, the new database should have a total of 135 rows of survey data with the first 87 rows comprising the old surveys collected before 2000 and used in SODS1 and with the last 48 rows comprising the new surveys collected after 2000.

3.3.3 New Survey Data Analysis

The new survey data was evaluated as it relates to the old survey data reported in the dissertation. In Chapter Two, 2.2.5 Outsourcing Survey, Hermann introduced many MS Excel charts and tables on outsourcing assertions, goal importance, goal realizations, and consequences all of which related to SODS1. In this research, these initial responses were compared to the old data to determine the amount of similarities and differences. The analysis included the following statistical comparisons: mean, standard deviation, variance, frequency diagram, and T-test at 95% confidence level. The exit criteria for this phase was the successful completion of this research's MS Excel charts to be used in comparing with those created in the dissertation work.

3.3.4 Regression Model Creation

Once the similarities and differences were attained, both the new, old and combined survey data were used in making SODS2 consequence regression models. It was first conceived that only the combined survey data models were going to be created, but analysis results showed greater than expected differences between the old and new data sets. SODS1 consisted of 20 consequence regression rules and was supported by an additional 14 goal realization regression rules. The modeling techniques exercised by this research was evaluated against Hermann's regression techniques. Both techniques used stepwise selection procedures with an entrance statistic of 95% confidence level and removal statistic of 90% confidence level [11]. The exit criterion for this evaluation was the validation of this research's modeling techniques.

After such validations were met, 14 regression models for the outsourcing goal realizations were created and analyzed for similarities and differences. Once satisfied with the analysis and realization model results, 60 regression consequence models (20 models created using the new data set, 20 models created using the old data set, and 20 models using the combined data set) were carefully designed in the same method used to create the 14 goal realization models with the exception of an extending stepwise entry / removal statistics. It was first conceived that the same stepwise statistics used in Hermann's models would suffice, but during the analysis of the goal realization models, stepwise current configuration settings were not allowing the removal of any model input variables. Extending both the entrance statistic and removal statistic to 75% showed great results in the number of input variables allowed to be inserted into the model and the number of input variables that were first inserted and then removed from the model. This special attention to detail in building the outsourcing consequence models was significant because these 60 models were actually encoded into SODS2 having a direct affect on the output of the tool. Due to this importance, analyzing such differences and similarities not only validated a seamless transition from SODS1 to SODS2, but laid forth a means of allowing the outsourcing knowledge contained within the models to evolve.

3.3.5 NN Development

Chapter Two discussed differences between learning mechanisms based on regression models and NN's. It was discovered both are needed for this application's complete development. Also from Chapter Two, Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) with backpropagation and Radial Based Function (RBF) NN were found to be the most

popular. The MLP with the delta learning rules showed to have great promise. Its main drawback was the amount of data required for training, cross validating, and testing. RBF showed promise because it did not need to set additional data aside for cross validation [44]. As a result of these findings in literature, MLP was selected to be the primary option, and given any problems with not enough data, RBF would be a backup plan.

Neurosolutions tool selection was a major portion of this NN development. This research started out with very limited NN development experience. Neurosolutions demonstration, user manual, and support staff provided this research the NN design, training, testing and interfacing results recorded in Chapter Four. The exit criterion for this phase was the successful creation of 20, consequence NN's built to some degree of accuracy and capable of being interfaced by SODS2 during runtime.

3.3.6 SODS2 Development

Along with the new, complete survey database, SODS2 was created in MS Access VB. Neurosolutions provided this development tool a working sample showing how this application would interconnect SODS2 with the 20 NN's explained above. This was the cornerstone for using both Neurosolutions and MS Access together in building this application. SODS2 will need to meet several requirements listed in Table 26 below:

Table 26 SODS2 High Level Requirements

1. SODS2 will be user friendly with windows and point and click commands
2. SODS2 will allow the user to input all 38 input flags
3. SODS2 will output any of the 20 outsourcing consequences in an understandable report
4. SODS2 will allow the user to select a desired learning mechanism: NN or regression model
5. SODS2 will contain the learning logic behind the 60 regression models
6. SODS2 will interface with 20 NN by passing 38 inputs and receiving the selected consequence output
7. SODS2 will output an assertion report based on the user's outsourcing projects input
8. SODS2 will allow all reports to be printed and saved as a text file
9. SODS2 will provide instructions and help tags whenever deemed necessary

SODS2 was validated through the usage of several scenarios created directly from surveys collected after this implementation. These surveys were not used in the analysis or regression / NN creation; therefore are completely new to such research. Each new survey provided several scenarios matching the NN and regression estimated output against the actual survey outcome. The exit criteria for the SODS2 development phase was the collection of the validation results.

3.4 Summary

This chapter described the methodology for supporting, designing, building and testing SODS2. Key principles discussed in Chapter Two were used to create this research methodology and SODS2 design. Much of the validation from Hermann's work was implicitly inherited into SODS2. Since SODS2 was built upon the latest survey data using both regression models and NN learning mechanisms, more accurate information was available to the software outsourcing decision makers.

4. Implementation Results

4.1 Introduction

In Chapter Three, a methodology for analyzing the data, creating the regression models and NN, and development of SODS2 was presented. This chapter presents the outcomes of the aforementioned effort. During these results, the methodology changes documented in Chapter Three will be clearly brought forward showing the additional support associated with each change. Chapter Three also discussed the baseline from which this work was being built upon. This baseline remains unchanged and is the initial starting point for this chapter.

4.2 Survey Data Transition

As stated above and in Chapter Three, the new survey data was collected through E-mail messages. The old survey was organized neatly in a MS Access database. The goal for this implementation phase was to transition the data from the E-mail messages to the database. MS Outlook was first used to convert the 48 new survey data E-mail messages down to one complete text file. Outlook allowed multiple selections of all these messages and the “saved as text” function to convert such selected E-mail messages as one text file. The next step was to convert the text file to database records. A small program was written using Java Togethersoft to provide the logic and ODBC connectivity needed to complete this task. An ODBC data source for the database was created using MS Windows operating system. The Java ODBC recognized this data source and gave the program connectivity to the database by means of SQL.

Transitioning the text data into acceptable MS Access data elements was more challenging. Several string parsers and associated logic were designed and tested to move the data over from string data types to integer data types. Upon successful type conversion, a host of input SQL commands were developed and tested to finally convert the readable survey data into database records. The phase drew successful conclusion with a new database containing the 48 new survey responses along with the 87 previous survey responses.

4.3 Survey Data Analysis

This phase concentrated on analyzing the new survey data, now stored in the database, against earlier survey data. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if the new survey data was significantly different from the earlier responses.

4.3.1 Outsourcing Experience Analysis

Using JMP 5.0, the outsourcing experience data was analyzed first to summarize the difference between the amount of respondent's software development outsourcing between the new and old data. The old survey outsourcing experience statistics were shown in Figure 20:

	Number of Projects per Respondent	Percent of Outsourcing within Respondent Organization
Mean	5.5132	26.6753
Median	3.0000	10.0000
Mode	2.00	.00
Std. Deviation	7.0569	31.6712

Figure 20 Old Survey Data Outsourcing Experience [11]

The new outsourcing experience was listed below in Table 27:

Table 27 New Survey Data Outsourcing Experience

	Number of Software Outsourcing Projects per Respondent	Percentage of Software Outsourcing Practiced by Respondent's Organization
Mean	7.27	38.34
Median	5	30
Standard Deviation	6.48	27.16
Standard Error	0.72	4.40

The new data showed that recent respondents were using outsourcing significantly more than previous organizations. Such results identified, according to the new survey data, that software outsourcing's popularity and positive results were growing. The results also indicate the new survey results were built on more outsourcing experience than those previously captured. This was a harbinger of good data quality.

4.3.2 Outsourcing Project Assertion Analysis

In Hermann's dissertation, a percentage chart was used to summarize outsourcing assertion data. This chart was reproduced in the same manner except showing the new survey data analysis. The survey asked for a variety of assertion questions regarding outsourcing projects. The purpose of these questions was to distinguish methods or assertions believed to help make the outsourced project a success. Responses ranged from 1, "strongly disagree", to 5 "strongly agree." The chart simplified the response by converting responses 1-2 to mean "agree", 3 to mean "neutral", and 4-5 to mean "disagree." For a more in depth explanation of each assertion, please refer to Appendix G. The following subsections will analyze each type of assertions.

4.3.2.1 Outsourcing Project Assertion Analysis

Project assertions were methods set toward improving outsourced project as a whole regardless of outsourced strategy. The following Figure 21 summarized the project type assertions for the old data:




Figure 21 Old Survey Data Project Assertion Analysis [11]

The new survey data project assertion analysis was listed below in Figure 22:




Figure 22 New Survey Data Project Assertion Analysis

The results were similar with the exception of the larger project and effort assertions. The new data showed the respondents were neutral with no clear tendency going either way on those two assertions. A possible explanation for this result could lie with project outsourcing management. Maybe new outsourcing management techniques were allowing software outsourcing success for larger projects and efforts. However, since this analysis showed these two assertions as neutral, they were left out of SODS2.

4.3.2.2 Outsourcing Relationship Assertion Analysis

Relationship assertions were methods set toward improving buyer / vendor relationship and much like the project assertions affected the outsourced project as a whole regardless of the outsourced strategy. Figure 23 summarized the relationship assertions for the old data:




Figure 23 Old Survey Data Relationship Assertion Analysis [11]

The new survey data relationship assertion analysis was listed below in Figure 24:




Figure 24 New Survey Data Project Assertion Analysis

The results showed a decrease in every outsourcing relationship assertion. However, only proximity and distance assertions failed to be consistent with the results captured in the old data. Both of these assertions involved distances between the buyer and vendor. Proximity referred to the buyer and vendor being located within small distances while the distance assertion referred to the increased worked day due to the distances separating the buyer and vendor. Respondents felt that proximity was a factor in outsourcing success which was completely reversed in the old data. The distance assertion received a mixed reaction in the new data. Thus, this assertion was virtually neutral when compared to significant disagreement from the initial research. A possible explanation for both results could lie with the increase in communication tools making it possible to have a virtual face to face meeting over the internet and ability to communicate software development information needed by a software outsourcing project. Since there was no clear alternative for the proximity assertion and the mixed reaction regarding the distance assertion, both assertions were removed from SODS2.

4.3.2.3 Outsourcing Project Goal Assertion Analysis

Project goal assertions were methods set toward improving outsourcing goals and much like the project assertions affected the outsourced project as a whole. Figure 25 summarized the project goal type assertions for the old data:




Figure 25 Old Survey Data Project Goal Assertion Analysis [11]

The new survey data project goal assertion analysis was listed below in Figure 26:




Figure 26 New Survey Data Project Goal Assertion Analysis

The results were somewhat different. The new data showed more varying opinion regarding project goal assertions. The new data respondents saw aggressive cost project goals as a bad influence on outsourcing success by a two to one margin. However, they

had no clear tendencies regarding aggressive schedule project goals. This trend should be investigated to determine if software outsourcing was starting to offer more schedule flexibility. As a result, aggressive schedule project goal assertion was left out of SODS2.

4.3.2.4 Outsourcing Process Assertion Analysis

Process assertions were methods set toward improving outsourcing where process outsourcing strategy was being practiced. These assertions were aimed at the interactions between in-house and outsourced processes. Figure 27 summarized the process type assertions for the old data:




Figure 27 Old Survey Data Process Assertion Analysis [11]

The new survey data process assertion analysis was listed below in Figure 28:




Figure 28 New Survey Data Process Assertion Analysis

The results were very similar. Having a comparable maturity levels between vendor and customer showed a decrease, but with a near to two to one ratio, this assertion will remain unchanged. Since this analysis showed similar results, all process type assertions were included in SODS2.

4.3.2.5 Outsourcing Product Assertion Analysis

Product assertions were methods set toward improving outsourcing success where product outsourcing strategy was being practiced. These assertions were aimed at the outsourced development of a product or sub-product. Figure 29 summarized the product type assertions for the old data:




Figure 29 Old Survey Data Product Assertion Analysis [11]

The new survey data product assertion analysis was listed below in Figure 30:




Figure 30 New Survey Data Product Assertion Analysis

The results were very similar. Only the product size assertions showed no true tendency.

As a result, these two product assertions were not included in SODS2.

4.3.2.6 Outsourcing Product Related Assertion Analysis

Product goal assertions were methods set toward improving outsourcing goals where product outsourcing strategy was being practiced. These assertions were aimed at the outsourced development of a product or sub-product. Figure 31 summarized the product related type assertions for the old data:




Figure 31 Old Survey Data Product Related Assertion Analysis [11]

The new survey data product related assertion analysis was listed below in Figure 32:




Figure 32 New Survey Data Product Related Assertion Analysis

The results were somewhat different. The new data showed the respondents were neutral on complexity assertion, but the modularity assertion remained the same. As a result, the complexity assertion was left out of SODS2.

4.3.3 Outsourcing Goal Importance Analysis

The next type of data analyzed was the importance of outsourcing goals. Each respondent was asked for input regarding the importance of 14 possible outsourcing goals. The mean, median, standard deviation and error were important, but using these statistics alone could misconstrue the true results. Fourteen statistical T-test at the 95% confidence level were used in order to show the importance of these goals. This testing method accounted for the difference in the samples distribution as well as the mean value. The response scale from this question ranged from 1, “Not Important”, to 5, “Very Important.” Figure 33 shows the values captured from Hermann’s analysis of the old data:

Goal	Importance
Acquire Expertise not Available In-house	3.61
Reduce Schedule (Vendor Faster)	3.30
Improve Responsiveness to Organizational Objectives	3.29
Improve Responsiveness to Customer Objectives	3.21
Add People (insufficient in-house capacity)	3.15
Improve Product Quality	3.10
Reduce Schedule (through parallel activities)	3.06
Improve Control over Project Management	2.75
Non-Core Activities	2.63
Add People (short-term)	2.54
Reduce Cost (via economies of scale)	2.54
Keep Staffing Levels Stable	2.48
Risk Sharing	2.35
Cash Flow from Sale of Product Rights	1.49

Figure 33 Old Survey Data Outsourcing Goal Importance [11]

From Figure 33, each goal importance was ordered from those with the highest mean importance to the lowest. The last three goals, highlighted at the bottom, signified these goals were significantly less than neutral. Figure 34 showed the values captured from statistical analysis of the new data:

Null Hypothesis - Ho: Sample Mean = Neutral Alternate Hypothesis - Ha: Sample Mean > Neutral (95% CI)						
Goal	Importance (sample mean)	P-Val (chance importance = neutral)	T-Ratio (test prob of importance = neutral)	Z(alpha = .05) (critical point) T-dist (degrees of freedom ~ 100)	Rank	Old Rank
Reduce Schedule (To Vendor Faster)	3.89	~ 0%	5.80	1.69	1	4
Improve Responsiveness to Organizational Objectives	3.79	~ 0%	4.32	1.69	2	1
Reduce Cost (via economies of scale)	3.82	.01%	4.08	1.69	3	12
Improve Quality of Software Product	3.77	.05%	3.76	1.69	4	5
Improve Control over software development	3.79	.08%	3.62	1.69	5	8
Improve Responsiveness to Customer Objectives	3.63	.6%	2.91	1.69	6	3
Add People (Capacity)	3.58	.9%	2.72	1.69	7	6
Reduce Schedule (Outsourcing Parallel Activities)	3.49	2%	2.32	1.69	8	7
Keep Staffing Levels Stable	3.42	5%	2.01	1.69	9	11
Risk Sharing	3.43	6%	1.96	1.69	10	13
Acquire Expertise Not Available In-House	3.25	31%	1.02	1.69	11	2
Non Core Activities (allows focus on core activities)	3.14	57%	.58	1.69	12	9
Add People (Short Term)	3.05	82%	.23	1.69	13	10
Cash Flow from Sale of Product Rights	2.33	.83%	-2.78	1.69	14	14
Notes: White: Those goals that rejected Ho in favor of Ha (importance greater than neutral) Light Blue: Those goals that failed to reject Ho of being equal to neutral (importance is considered neutral) Grey: Cash flow from sale of product rights tend to be significantly not important (importance less than neutral)						

Figure 34 New Survey Data Outsourcing Goal Importance

The 14 T-tests indicated some significant differences between the new and old data. The new data showed an increase in the mean importance with each goal except for acquiring expertise. This could indicate that more companies now find it easier to

acquire software expertise than did their counterparts in the original study. Another interpretation of this reduce cost difference was the increased competitive nature of today's software industry. During the technology boom of the late 1990's, acquiring software expertise drove outsourcing development. With more software outsourcing corporations capable of such development, buyers are now focusing on reducing the cost to keep up with this competition.

4.3.4 Outsourcing Goal Realization Analysis

The next step was to analyze the realization of the outsourcing goals described above. Each respondent was asked for input regarding the satisfaction or realization of those 14 goals. Again the mean, median, standard deviation and error were important, but statistics had to be validated with T-tests to show if these goals were meeting the respondent's expectations. The T-test guarded against having bad results due to varying responses. The response scale from this question ranged from 1, "Significantly Worse Than Expectations", to 5, "Significantly Better Than Expectations." The middle response of 3 would indicate that software outsourcing was right on target so anything greater than 3 would signify outsourcing success while those lower than 3 would show outsourcing failure to meet those goals. Figure 35 showed the values captured from the old data:

Goal	Result Mean	Percentage of Positive Responses
Acquire Expertise not Available In-house	3.14	79%
Non-Core Activities	3.08	83%
Add People (insufficient in-house capacity)	3.06	81%
Add People (short-term)	2.93	83%
Keep Staffing Levels Stable	2.93	83%
Improve Responsiveness to Organizational Objectives	2.71	62%
Improve Responsiveness to Customer Objectives	2.65	59%
Risk Sharing	2.65	67%
Improve Product Quality	2.63	66%
Cash Flow from Sale of Product Rights	2.70	74%
Reduce Schedule (through parallel activities)	2.54	43%
Improve Control over Project Management	2.54	57%
Reduce Cost (via economies of scale)	2.54	57%
Reduce Schedule (Vendor Faster)	2.42	48%

Figure 35 Old Survey Data Outsourcing Goal Satisfaction [11]

From Figure 35, each goal satisfaction was ordered from those with the highest mean satisfaction to the lowest. Those goals highlighted in yellow indicated those goals found through T-testing to be equivalent to 3 or “right on target.” The last five goals in white signified the goals not found to be equivalent to 3 hence not “right on target.”

Figure 36 showed the analysis of the new goals satisfaction data:

Null Hypothesis - Ho: Sample Mean = Neutral Alternate Hypothesis - Ha: Sample Mean $\neq$ Neutral (95% CI)							
Goal	Importance (sample mean)	Percent of positive responses	P-Val (chance of being right on target)	T-Ratio (test prob of being right on target)	Z(alpha/2 = .025) critical point T-dist (degrees of freedom ~ 100)	Old Mean	Mean Diff
Add People (Capacity)	3.21	87%	20%	1.31	2.02	3.06	0.15
Improve Quality of Software Product	3.16	81%	30%	1.04	2.02	2.63	0.53
Keep Staffing Levels Stable	3.16	86%	31%	1.02	2.02	2.93	0.23
Improve Responsiveness to Organizational Objectives	3.15	76%	43%	.80	2.02	2.71	0.44
Reduce Schedule (Outsourcing Parallel Activities)	3.14	77%	41%	.83	2.02	2.54	0.60
Improve Responsiveness to Customer Objectives	3.10	78%	58%	.56	2.02	2.65	0.45
Reduce Cost (via economies of scale)	3.07	72%	69%	.40	2.02	2.54	0.53
Risk Sharing	3.00	76%	~ 100%	~ 0	2.02	2.65	0.35
Improve Control over software development	2.79	62%	25%	-1.18	2.02	2.54	0.25
Reduce Schedule (To Vendor Faster)	2.78	64%	17%	-1.40	2.02	2.42	0.36
Acquire Expertise Not Available In-House	3.26	84%	14%	1.50	2.02	3.14	0.12
Non Core Activities (allows focus on core activities)	3.03	83%	86%	.18	2.02	3.08	-0.05
Add People (Short Term)	2.97	76%	86%	-.18	2.02	2.93	0.04
Cash Flow from Sale of Product Rights	2.81	76%	18%	-1.36	2.02	2.70	0.11
Notes: White: Indicates those important goals that are right on target Light Blue & Grey (* Ranking): Indicates those goals that lack importance							

Figure 36 New Survey Data Outsourcing Goal Satisfaction

The new goal satisfaction report indicated numerous differences between the new and old data. The new data showed an increase in every goal satisfaction except for reducing non-core activities. Reducing schedule, improving quality, reducing cost, and increasing responsiveness to both customer and organizations had significant increases from 0.60 to 0.44 respectively. These improvements were even more notable since those same goals were the top five goals in terms of importance. With such significant differences between the new and old responses, the author realized they represented different populations and would likely produce different outsourcing consequences.

4.3.5 Outsourcing Consequences Analysis

Outsourcing consequences captured the overall outcome of outsourcing given the respondent's experience. Figure 37 summarized the outsourcing consequences for the old data:




Figure 37 Old Survey Data Consequence Analysis [11]

The new survey data consequence analysis was listed below in Figure 38:




Figure 38 New Survey Data Consequence Analysis

The results were very different. Every consequence had better present results. While these two figures provided an excellent overview of the changes, Figure 39 pointed out the actual differences:

Consequence	Response Mean	Stand. Dev	Stand. Error	Worse %	Neutral %	Better %	Old worse %	Old better %	Diff. better	Diff. worse
Schedule Flexibility	4.50	1.60	0.24	0.28	0.15	0.57	0.26	0.55	0.02	0.02
Product Quality	4.86	1.23	0.19	0.18	0.13	0.69	0.27	0.47	0.22	-0.09
Responsiveness to Organizational Objectives	4.52	1.30	0.20	0.16	0.30	0.54	0.31	0.42	0.12	-0.15
Responsiveness to Customer	4.73	1.21	0.18	0.10	0.34	0.56	0.29	0.36	0.20	-0.19
Cost Associated with Change	3.73	1.59	0.24	0.38	0.18	0.44	0.35	0.33	0.11	0.03
Rework	4.16	1.41	0.22	0.37	0.35	0.28	0.34	0.31	-0.03	0.03
Risks	3.75	1.54	0.23	0.34	0.23	0.43	0.39	0.31	0.12	-0.05
Level of Inhouse, Non-Core Activities	3.36	1.67	0.25	0.25	0.13	0.62	0.22	0.29	0.33	0.03
Costs	2.98	1.65	0.24	0.21	0.07	0.72	0.46	0.29	0.43	-0.25
Schedule Duration	3.41	1.33	0.20	0.24	0.15	0.61	0.50	0.28	0.33	-0.26
Likelihood of Project Failure	3.86	1.46	0.22	0.33	0.31	0.36	0.31	0.26	0.10	0.02
Control over Final Product	4.27	1.28	0.19	0.27	0.34	0.39	0.38	0.22	0.17	-0.11
Control over Development Process	4.00	1.56	0.23	0.43	0.20	0.37	0.48	0.23	0.14	-0.05
Administrative Overhead	3.61	1.77	0.26	0.37	0.11	0.52	0.44	0.22	0.30	-0.07
Project Learning Curve	3.93	1.51	0.23	0.33	0.27	0.40	0.31	0.20	0.20	0.02
Intellectual Capital	4.41	1.22	0.18	0.12	0.54	0.34	0.13	0.19	0.15	-0.01
Visibility in Development Process	4.14	1.34	0.21	0.32	0.33	0.35	0.51	0.17	0.18	-0.19
Turf Wars	3.93	1.44	0.22	0.26	0.38	0.36	0.39	0.08	0.28	-0.13
Inhouse Personnel Turnover	4.02	1.26	0.19	0.23	0.56	0.21	0.09	0.06	0.15	0.14
Culture, Language or Location Problems	3.98	1.14	0.17	0.28	0.47	0.25	0.37	0.03	0.22	-0.09

Figure 39 New Survey Data Consequence Differences Analysis

The differences (new minus old) were shown in the last two columns. Every consequence, except schedule flexibility and rework, had a 10 to 40 percent increase in success. The negative responses remained either constant or showed a slight decline. Cost, product quality, schedule duration, responsiveness to both customer and organizations, and level of non core activities showed to have the most positive shifts, now proving outsourcing could produce positive consequences in each of these areas. Five of the six consequences followed the previously discussed results from the goal importance and realization. Having this consistency within the survey was another harbinger of good survey data quality, thus should strengthen the support for SODS2.

4.3.6 Survey Data Analysis Summary

The outsourcing experience, assertions, goal importance and realization, and consequences old and new survey results were analyzed and compared with each other.

Significant differences were discovered throughout the analysis. The old and new survey results appeared to not be from the same population as thought to be true during methodology conception. Further explanation of such differences required regression modeling.

4.4 Regression Model Implementation

This implementation phase had three goals resulting from the previous analyses:

1. Validate regression modeling techniques are similar to those same techniques used in building the models for SODS1,
2. Research differences between the new and used data populations, and
3. Build regression models for outsourcing consequences similar to those used in SODS1 with the exception of using all three, old, new and used, data sets with 75% stepwise entry/removal statistics.

4.4.1 Regression Modeling Technique Validation

Before any comparisons could be made to the old survey data goal realization regression models, methodology was undertaken to validate the old model making techniques were the same as the new model making techniques used in this research. The same stepwise entry statistic of 95% and removal statistic of 90% were used. Goal realization of response to organization was randomly picked for this validation effort. Appendix A showed an exact match between this model and the model documented in the Hermann's dissertation. To reconfirm this result, response to customer goal realization was picked, and as shown in Appendix A, another exact match was produced. This confirmed that this author's modeling techniques were consistent with the techniques used in the dissertation.

4.4.2 Regression Model Differences in 14 Goal Realizations

Once the modeling techniques were validated, 14 goal realizations models were created using the new survey data and the same entry/removal statistics, 95%/90%, that were used by Hermann in creating his 14 goal realization models. The purpose for the creation of these models was two fold:

- 1) Help explain the differences between the new and used survey data and
- 2) Provide an overview of the modeling techniques that was going to be used in the creation of the consequence models.

Table 34 showed the differences between the models:

Table 34 Differences in Old and New Goal Realization Models

New Goal Realization Model	Old Goal Realization Model
AddPeopleCapacity = 3.10 - (1.97)sys-embed - (1.16)ent-acctng + (.75)proc-maint	[No Model Found Matching Entry/Removal Stats]
AddPeopleShortTerm = 2.97 - (.97)sys-device + (2.02)comp-os	AddPeopleShortTerm = 3.03 - (.62)prod-commoncust + (.87)ent-acctng
CashFlow = 2.74 - (.88)comp-development + (.74)proc-toolsup	CashFlow = 2.88 - (1.02)sys-device - (.43)ent-web
Control = 2.57 + (2.43)comp-case + (1.43)comp-os	Control = 2.55 + (.99)proc-reeng - (.69)proc-req
Expertise = 3.71 - (.71)prod-custom	Expertise = 2.86 + (.59)sys-all - (1.20)shrink-internet + (.64)proc-reeng
NonCore = 2.88 - (1.09)shrink-util + (1.14)comp-domain + (1.48)ent-mnft	NonCore = 3.25 - (.85)sys-device - (.48)prod-cots
Quality = 3.28 + (.86)proc-sweng - (.63)prod-cust	Quality = 2.73 - (1.33)sys-device
ReduceCost = 2.88 + (.82)proc-reeng	ReduceCost = 2.66 - (.58)proc-fielding
ScheduleParallel = 2.76 + (1.11)proc-spec	ScheduleParallel = 2.70 - (.66)proc-sweng + (1.05)sys-avionics
ScheduleVendor = 2.68 - (1.50)proc-design + (.97)proc-test + (1.21)proc-spec	ScheduleVendor = 2.25 + (.57)proc-req
ResponseCustomer = 2.73 + (1.34)comp-os - (1.05)comp-development - (1.20)proc-design + (1.36)proc-test + (.64)proc-applsup + (1.18)prod-none	ResponseCustomer = 2.92 - (.85)proc-sweng - (1.01)sys-device + (1.51)ent-oes + (.97)sys-avionics

ResponseOrganization = 2.97 + (1.36)shrink-util + (1.53)comp-os	ResponseOrganization = 2.31 - (1.18)sys-device - (.61)proc-sweng + (.79)proc-coding
RiskSharing = 2.90 - (.73)comp-development + (1.60)ent-payroll + (1.10)proc-none	RiskSharing = 2.86 - (.53)proc-sweng
StaffStable = 3.03 = (1.98)comp-os	StaffStable = 2.78 + (.69)proc-maint - (.76)proc-cm + (.45)proc-reeng + (1.22)prod-none

The differences were significant. There were no common input variables between the old and new models. Only four of the 14 had a similar intercept $\pm 10\%$ which could have been forecasted given the goal satisfaction analysis in the above paragraphs. After this point, the research methodology was modified slightly due to these differences uncovered in these models and during the analysis. Adding the new and used data together might overshadow important developments in software outsourcing. Yet, if the data was not added, the similarities running parallel through both data sets would never be manifested. The solution to this dilemma was unavoidable, all three (new, old and combined) data models were created and used in SODS2 to provide the support required to help decision makers.

Another concern brought forth from these changes was the number of variables included in each model under the stepwise entry statistic of 95%. This tight restriction failed to find any input variables for the adding people for capacity consequence model. Evaluating the 34 goal satisfaction and consequence models presented in Hermann's dissertation, the author found that no input variables had been removed. This was due to the tightly constrained removal statistic at 90%. Given this and the fact that SODS2 relied on the accuracy of the NN learning mechanism, the entry/removal statistics

expanded to 75% so that more input variables between the three data sets could be researched. This change resulted in an additional step in the research. The old data models were going to have to be recreated along with the new and combined models using the new 75% entry/removal statistics.

4.4.3 SODS2 Consequence Regression Models

While the model changes caused an increase in effort for this phase, this additional work was crucial to assuring that all of the models' input variables were being caught between the new, old and combined models. In Appendices B, C and D, the new, old and combined consequence regression models were listed in their fullest detail. This section explained the differences between the old and new outsourcing consequence models as summarized in Figure 40. The model differences showed that the project data samples appeared to be from different populations. This meant, according to the survey data, that the software outsourcing world had significantly changed from the original data collection of projects from 1995-2000 to the newer data collection of projects from 2000-2003. The differences may have been attributed to dramatic changes in the technology, economy and a longer history of software outsourcing experiences. In some cases, the intercept values of each model were significantly different which would clearly demonstrate this concept. While each independent (predictor) variable was compared across the models, the reader is cautioned to remember that a significant change in the intercept could intensify or eliminate differences between each predictor variable. Similar caution should be paid to interpolation effects. Interpolation was the effect of the model trying to make predicted outcomes based on little or no matching patterns in the

survey. The new data samples found little data relating to system (avionics, embedded and development tool) software domains, shrinkwrap (entertainment and utility) software domains, component (CASE and library class) software domains, enterprise (manufacturing, order entry, scripting and website) software domains, and outsourced (documentation and none) processes. Similarly, the old data samples found little data relating to shrinkwrap (entertainment and utility) software domains, component (CASE and library class) software domains, enterprise (manufacturing, payroll and order entry) software domains, outsourced (none) process and outsourced (none) products. These independent variables will thus be skewed more toward the intercept as the result of having no observations or toward a biased mean as the results of having few samples to be used in the computations. This was also another reason why the combined models were created even though there were many differences between the two data populations. All models along with their performance measures were included in Figure 40 listed on the next four pages.

Figure 40 Summary of Old, New and Combined Models

Old Data Model	Info	New Data Model	Info	Combined Data Model	Info
Cost = 3.57 + (-.50)sys-embed + (-.46)sys-comm + (-2.62)comp-case + (1.36)comp-os + (.92)ent-act + (4.29)ent-mnft + (-1.53)ent-oes + (.73)proc-spec + (-.85)proc-cm + (1.12)prod-cust + (.60)prod-cots	RSqr = .44 RMSE = 1.17 # Samples = 81	Cost = 3.70 + (.94)sys-comm + (-3.33)comp-case + (1.36)ent-mnft + (-1.72)ent-pay + (-1.38)prod-cust + (.89)prod-comcust	RSqr = .35 RMSE = 1.43 # Samples = 46	Cost = 4.04 + (-.54)shrink-bus + (-.88)shrink-int + (-2.75)comp-case + (1.52)ent-mnft + (-1.87)ent-pay + (1.35)ent-web + (.53)proc-design + (-.76)proc-test + (-.51)proc-maint + (.77)proc-spec + (-.77)proc-cm + (.57)proc-swengsup + (.42)prod-cots + (.41)prod-comcust	RSqr = .29 RMSE = 1.49 # Samples = 127
Sched = 3.42 + (1.57)sys-avia + (-.70)sys-comm + (-.68)shrink-bus + (-.85)ent-act + (2.72)ent-mnft + (1.03)proc-des + (.87)proc-reeng + (-.86)proc-doc + (1.41)proc-field + (-1.72)proc-cm + (.53)prod-cust	RSqr = .34 RMSE = 1.38 # Samples = 81	Sched = 3.14 + (.81)sys-embed + (-2.50)sys-dev + (1.10)shrink-bus + (1.10)shrink-util + (-1.15)ent-act + (-1.80)ent-script + (-.93)proc-maint + (.90)proc-reeng + (1.26)proc-train	RSqr = .51 RMSE = 1.04 # Samples = 46	Sched = 3.05 + (1.17)sys-avia + (.68)sys-embed + (-.87)sys-dev + (.61)shrink-bus + (-.82)ent-pay + (1.05)ent-web + (-.82)proc-req + (1.13)proc-design + (.82)proc-reeng + (-.55)proc-doc + (1.14)proc-field + (-1.45)proc-cm + (.58)proc-swengsup + (.51)prod-comcust	RSqr = .31 RMSE = 1.38 # Samples = 127
IntelCap = 4.71 + (1.09)shrink-bus + (-.99)shrink-util + (1.37)comp-domain + (-1.67)comp-case + (-.65)comp-dev + (1.40)ent-mnft + (.67)ent-script + (.51)proc-reeng + (.59)proc-appsup + (.95)proc-train + (-.44)proc-coding + (-1.68)proc-field + (-.59)proc-swengsup + (-.29)prod-cust	RSqr = .62 RMSE = .69 # Samples = 79	IntelCap = 3.38 + (.78)sys-dev + (1.36)shrink-int + (1.00)comp-domain + (-1.44)comp-os + (.84)ent-act + (.82)proc-maint + (-.77)proc-field + (-1.47)proc-cm + (1.50)proc-toolsup + (1.37)proc-swengsup	RSqr = .58 RMSE = .89 # Samples = 46	IntelCap = 4.05 + (.63)shrink-int + (1.08)comp-domain + (-.51)comp-dev + (-.56)ent-web + (-.36)proc-test + (.59)proc-reeng + (.67)proc-appsup + (.81)proc-train + (-.46)proc-spec + (.37)proc-coding + (-1.00)proc-field + (-1.04)proc-none + (-.55)prod-cots + (.35)prod-comcust	RSqr = .38 RMSE = .93 # Samples = 125
SchedFlex = 4.19 + sys-avia(-1.35) + sys-comm(1.06) + comp-CASE(-1.53) + comp-OS(-0.90) + ent-act(1.52) + proc-req(-1.14) + proc-reeng(0.76) + proc-spec(0.87) + proc-field(-0.83)	RSqr = .34 RMSE = 1.25 # Samples = 80	SchedFlex = 4.68 + sys-embed(-2.53) + shrink-bus(-1.10) + comp-CASE(-5.00) + comp-class(-2.94) + comp-dev(-1.32) + ent-act(1.92) + ent-pay(-1.19) + proc-des(-1.25) + proc-test(2.19) + proc-coding(0.55) + proc-CM(-3.01) + proc-SWEngSup(1.84) + prod-comcust(1.77)	RSqr = .74 RMSE = .97 # Samples = 46	SchedFlex = 4.57 + sys-avia(-1.00) + sys-embed(-0.93) + sys-comm(0.66) + shrink-bus(-0.42) + shrink-int(0.55) + comp-domain(-0.82) + comp-CASE(-1.14) + comp-OS(-0.67) + ent-act(0.66) + proc-field(-0.87)	RSqr = .21 RMSE = 1.39 # Samples = 126
AdminOverhead = 4.39 + sys-avia(2.31) + shrink-util(2.62) + shrink-int(1.26) + comp-domain(-1.47) + ent-mnft(2.87) + ent-OES(-1.26) + proc-appsup(.99) + proc-doc(-1.07) + proc-field(0.52) + proc-CM(-1.16) + prod-comcust(0.47)	RSqr = .43 RMSE = 1.05 # Samples = 80	AdminOverhead = 4.27 + shrink-int(0.78) + comp-class(-2.21) + comp-OS(-1.84) + proc-req(1.33) + proc-test(-1.22) + prod-comcust(1.52) + proc-SWEngSup(-1.70) + prod-comcust(0.78) + prod-none(-2.55)	RSqr = .53 RMSE = 1.36 # Samples = 46	AdminOverhead = 4.20 + sys-avia(1.16) + shrink-util(0.90) + comp-CASE(-1.28) + comp-class(-1.74) + comp-OS(-0.95) + ent-web(0.83) + proc-CM(-1.10) + proc-toolsup(0.97) + prod-comcust(0.62) + prod-none(-1.99)	RSqr = .31 RMSE = 1.33 # Samples = 126

(Figure 40 cont.) Summary of Old, New and Combined Models

Old Data Model	Info	New Data Model	Info	Combined Data Model	Info
Rework = 4.07 + sys-comm(-0.44) + sys-dev(1.36) + shrink-int(1.13) + ent-script(-0.80) + proc-reeng(-1.04) + proc-SWEngSup(0.39) + prod-COTS(1.19)	RSqr = .24 RMSE = 1.20 # Samples = 78	Rework = 3.83 + sys-avial(1.67) + shrink-util(1.86) + comp-dev(0.80) + proc-appsup(0.78) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.83) + prod-none(1.67)	RSqr = .32 RMSE = 1.26 # Samples = 44	Rework = 4.22 + sys-comm(-0.61) + shrink-util(1.22) + comp-OS(-0.74) + comp-dev(0.84) + ent-OES(-1.17) + proc-des(0.52) + proc-reeng(-0.42) + prod-coding(-0.52) + prod-none(1.28) + prod-COTS(0.78)	RSqr = .21 RMSE = 1.25 # Samples = 122
Visibility = 2.78 + sys-comm(0.69) + comp-dev(-0.71) + ent-OES(1.98) + ent-script(1.25) + ent-web(-0.48) + proc-des(-0.56) + proc-main(0.68) + proc-reeng(1.51) + proc-field(-0.88) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.38) + prod-cust(0.82) + prod-none(2.50)	RSqr = .42 RMSE = 1.09 # Samples = 80	Visibility = 4.13 + sys-avial(-0.75) + sys-embed(0.90) + sys-comm(1.59) + sys-dev(2.95) + shrink-util(-2.31) + comp-CASE(-1.13) + comp-OS(-2.38) + comp-dev(1.73) + ent-script(-1.30) + proc-test(1.10) + proc-reeng(-1.37) + proc-spec(0.84) + proc-coding(-2.27) + proc-CM(-1.34) + proc-SWEngSup(2.02) + prod-none(-3.64) + prod-cust(0.41) + prod-comcusc(-0.60) + prod-none(3.02)	RSqr = .87 RMSE = .66 # Samples = 43	Visibility = 2.86 + sys-comm(0.51) + shrink-bus(0.55) + ent-OES(2.06) + proc-reeng(0.38) + proc-appsup(0.70) + proc-coding(-0.37) + proc-field(-1.32) + prod-none(-2.20) + prod-cust(0.78) + prod-comcusc(0.37) + prod-none(2.56)	RSqr = .32 RMSE = 1.19 Samples = 123
ControlProduct = 4.19 + sys-dev(-1.08) + shrink-util(1.77) + comp-domain(-0.86) + proc-reeng(0.61) + proc-appsup(1.81) + proc-field(-0.66) + proc-toolsup(-0.76) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.46) + prod-COTS(-0.97) + prod-comcusc(-0.66)	RSqr = .39 RMSE = 1.09 # Samples = 80	ControlProduct = 3.70 + proc-req(1.29) + proc-test(-0.51) + proc-tram(0.50) + proc-field(-2.41) + proc-SWEngSup(0.95) + prod-none(1.70)	RSqr = .48 RMSE = .99 # Samples = 45	ControlProduct = 3.95 + sys-embed(-0.54) + shrink-util(1.68) + comp-domain(-0.78) + proc-reeng(0.84) + proc-appsup(0.83) + proc-doc(0.45) + proc-field(-1.17) + proc_toolsup(-0.48) + prod-COTS(-0.80) + prod-none(0.88)	RSqr = .30 RMSE = 1.15 # Samples = 125
ChangeCost = 4.07 + sys-avial(0.86) + shrink-int(1.39) + comp-OS(1.60) + ent-acct(1.34) + ent-mnfit(1.48) + ent-OES(-1.97) + ent-web(-0.88) + proc-SWEngSup(0.45) + prod-COTS(0.71)	RSqr = .35 RMSE = 1.08 # Samples = 79	ChangeCost = 4.22 + shrink-util(1.25) + comp-class(-2.27) + proc-coding(-0.71) + prod-none(1.86) + prod-comcusc(1.29) + prod-none(-2.08)	RSqr = .36 RMSE = 1.35 # Samples = 45	ChangeCost = 4.12 + sys-avial(1.19) + shrink-bus(-0.47) + shrink-mt(-0.50) + comp-class(-1.27) + comp-OS(0.78) + ent-mnfit(1.39) + proc-des(0.46) + proc-test(-0.65) + proc-spec(0.66) + proc-CM(-0.55) + prod-none(1.48) + prod-COTS(0.40) + prod-comcusc(0.76) + prod-none(-1.36)	RSqr = .28 RMSE = 1.29 # Samples = 124
LangCult = 4.07 + sys-avial(0.52) + shrink-util(1.50) + comp-OS(-0.35) + ent-acct(0.81) + ent-OES(-0.61) + proc-req(-0.45) + proc-des(0.72) + proc-field(-0.59) + proc-SWEngSup(0.50) + prod-cust(-0.37) + prod-comcusc(0.48)	RSqr = .46 RMSE = .62 # Samples = 78	LangCult = 5.09 + sys-embed(2.46) + shrink-util(-1.68) + comp-domain(1.30) + comp-OS(-0.92) + comp-OS(-2.14) + ent-pay(1.75) + proc-des(-1.58) + proc-reeng(-0.82) + proc-appsup(-1.07) + proc-spec(1.32) + proc-field(1.00) + proc-CM(0.87) + prod-cust(-0.64) + prod-none(-1.37)	RSqr = .61 RMSE = .87 # Samples = 44	LangCult = 4.11 + sys-avial(0.70) + sys-embed(0.59) + comp-class(-1.28) + comp-OS(-0.76) + comp-dev(-0.28) + ent-acct(0.41) + ent-pay(1.14) + proc-appsup(-0.51) + proc-SWEngSup(0.29) + prod-COTS(0.32) + prod-comcusc(0.44)	RSqr = .22 RMSE = .88 # Samples = 122

(Figure 40 cont.) Summary of Old, New and Combined Models

Old Data Model	Info	New Data Model	Info	Combined Data Model	Info
ControlProcess = 4.71 + shrink-util(1.89) + comp-domain(-1.25) + comp-dev(-0.69) + prod-des(-1.38) + proc-reeng(1.50) + proc-spec(0.52) + proc-toolsup(-0.67) + prod-COTS(-0.81) + prod-comeust(-0.46)	RSqr = .37 RMSE = 1.28 # Samples = 80	ControlProcess = 3.96 + sys-avial(-2.11) + sys-dev(1.79) + shrink-util(-1.48) + comp-OS(-1.48) + comp-dev(-1.67) + ent-mnt(-1.00) + ent-pay(-1.05) + proc-appsup(1.13) + proc-coding(-1.14) + proc-SWEngSup(1.10) + prod-COTS(0.86) + prod-none(-1.17)	RSqr = .63 RMSE = 1.10 # Samples = 46	ControlProcess = 4.19 + comp-domain(-0.74) + ent-act(-0.77) + ent-mnt(-1.20) + ent-pay(-1.71) + prod-des(-1.35) + proc-reeng(0.80) + proc-appsup(0.86) + proc-field(-1.22) + prod-CM(0.43) + proc-none(-1.69) + prod-cust(0.42)	RSqr = .35 RMSE = 1.30 # Samples = 126
InhouseNonCore = 3.64 + sys-avial(-1.21) + comp-dev(0.48) + ent-act(0.86) + ent-mnt(2.34) + ent-OES(-1.81) + ent-web(0.62) + proc-toolsup(-0.83) + proc-SWEngSup(0.85) + prod-COTS(0.67) + prod-none(-1.14)	RSqr = .40 RMSE = 1.07 # Samples = 78	InhouseNonCore = 2.65 + sys-comm(-0.92) + comp-OS(1.48) + comp-dev(1.86) + ent-script(-1.91) + proc-req(-1.00) + prod-des(2.06) + proc-test(-0.89) + prod-reeng(1.37)	RSqr = .44 RMSE = 1.38 # Samples = 45	InhouseNonCore = 3.61 + sys-avial(-1.53) + shrink-int(-1.01) + comp-class(-1.93) + comp-dev(0.93) + ent-act(0.81) + ent-pay(1.16) + ent-OES(-1.75) + ent-script(-1.30) + ent-web(0.86) + prod-des(0.32) + prod-none(-1.15)	RSqr = .32 RMSE = 1.26 # Samples = 123
InhouseTurnover = 4.31 + sys-avial(-0.45) + sys-dev(-0.44) + shrink-bus(-0.54) + comp-CASE(-0.89) + ent-act(0.60) + ent-OES(-0.65) + ent-script(-0.43) + prod-des(-0.22) + proc-maint(-0.35) + prod-CM(0.33) + proc-SWEngSup(0.32)	RSqr = .42 RMSE = .55 # Samples = 79	InhouseTurnover = 2.53 + comp-OS(1.74) + comp-dev(2.21) + ent-script(-1.65) + proc-req(-1.06) + prod-des(2.47) + prod-test(-0.88) + prod-reeng(1.11) + prod-spec(-0.72)	RSqr = .51 RMSE = 1.31 # Samples = 43	InhouseTurnover = 4.11 + sys-embed(0.42) + sys-dev(-0.52) + comp-CASE(-0.60) + comp-OS(-0.73) + proc-test(-0.36) + prod-SWEngSup(0.59) + prod-none(-2.11) + prod-comeust(0.25)	RSqr = .27 RMSE = .81 # Samples = 122
LearningCurve = 4.27 + comp-CASE(-1.56) + comp-class(-1.48) + ent-OES(-1.12) + ent-script(0.87) + proc-maint(-0.36) + prod-comeust(0.55)	RSqr = .42 RMSE = 1.06 # Samples = 79	LearningCurve = 3.15 + shrink-util(1.54) + comp-CASE(-3.72) + comp-class(-1.90) + ent-pay(-1.14) + proc-appsup(0.64) + prod-train(-0.70) + proc-coding(1.29) + prod-CM(-0.62) + prod-none(-1.15) + prod-comeust(1.91)	RSqr = .59 RMSE = 1.10 # Samples = 45	LearningCurve = 3.83 + shrink-util(0.70) + comp-CASE(-1.79) + comp-class(-0.94) + ent-pay(-1.29) + ent-script(0.66) + prod-train(-0.40) + prod-none(-1.83) + prod-cust(0.45) + prod-comeust(0.80)	RSqr = .29 RMSE = 1.13 # Samples = 124
Risk = 4.52 + sys-comm(-1.01) + ent-OES(-1.64) + ent-script(-1.27) + ent-web(-0.53) + proc-CM(-1.39) + proc-SWEngSup(0.63) + prod-COTS(1.02)	RSqr = .31 RMSE = 1.36 # Samples = 80	Risk = 3.48 + sys-embed(1.01) + shrink-util(1.51) + comp-OS(-1.49) + ent-pay(-0.99) + prod-comeust(1.52)	RSqr = .38 RMSE = 1.28 # Samples = 45	Risk = 4.42 + sys-avial(-0.89) + sys-comm(-0.80) + shrink-util(1.67) + comp-OS(-1.20) + comp-dev(0.60) + ent-OES(-2.48) + ent-script(-1.74) + ent-web(-1.00) + prod-reeng(0.43) + prod-train(-0.64) + prod-doc(0.87) + prod-CM(-0.54) + prod-SWEngSup(0.40) + prod-none(-1.78)	RSqr = .30 RMSE = 1.38 # Samples = 125
Quality = 4.55 + proc-reeng(1.15) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.63) + prod-COTS(-1.21)	RSqr = .19 RMSE = 1.36 # Samples = 79	Quality = 4.43 + sys-embed(-1.27) + sys-dev(1.83) + shrink-util(0.89) + shrink-int(0.87) + comp-CASE(1.44) + comp-class(-0.88) + proc-spec(0.89) + proc-coding(-1.33) + prod-cust(1.10) + prod-none(1.07)	RSqr = .48 RMSE = 1.01 # Samples = 45	Quality = 4.58 + sys-embed(-0.53) + shrink-util(0.75) + shrink-int(0.67) + comp-OS(1.20) + ent-OES(1.13) + prod-reeng(0.62) + prod-field(-0.60) + prod-COTS(-0.89) + prod-comeust(-0.45) + prod-none(0.82)	RSqr = .23 RMSE = 1.29 # Samples = 124

(Figure 40 cont.) Summary of Old, New and Combined Models

Old Data Model	Info	New Data Model	Info	Combined Data Model	Info
TurfWar = 4.28 + sys-avail(-0.63) + sys-dev(1.29) + shrink-int(1.32) + comp-class(-0.82) + comp-OS(-0.76) + ent-act(-0.87) + ent-mnft(1.54) + proc-reeng(-0.89) + proc-appsup(-1.99) + proc-spec(-0.53) + proc-toolsup(1.21) + proc-SWEngSup(0.95) + prod-COTS(0.94)	RSqr = .57 RMSE = .86 # Samples = 77	TurfWar = 5.11 + sys-embed(1.43) + sys-dev(-1.36) + shrink-int(-0.73) + ent-script(-1.82) + proc-des(-1.31) + proc-CM(1.48) + proc-SWEngSup(-1.75) + prod-comcust(0.85) + prod-none(-1.44)	RSqr = .48 RMSE = 1.17 # Samples = 45	TurfWar = 4.62 + sys-embed(0.47) + comp-CASE(-1.04) + comp-OS(-1.07) + comp-dev(0.48) + ent-act(-0.80) + ent-mnft(1.42) + ent-web(0.63) + proc-reng(-0.97) + proc-appsup(-1.15) + proc-train(-0.68) + proc-coding(-0.60) + proc-CM(-0.51) + proc-toolsup(1.55) + proc-none(-1.12) + prod-COTS(1.16)	RSqr = .36 RMSE = 1.14 # Samples = 122
FailLikely = 3.85 + sys-dev(1.04) + shrink-int(1.58) + proc-reng(-0.70) + proc-reeng(-0.90) + proc-CM(-1.09) + proc-toolsup(1.42) + proc-SWEngSup(0.95) + prod-COTS(0.82)	RSqr = .36 RMSE = 1.17 # Samples = 79	FailLikely = 3.56 + shrink-bus(-0.46) + shrink-util(2.31) + comp-class(-2.76) + ent-act(-1.29) + ent-script(-2.18) + proc-reng(-0.65) + proc-test(0.59) + proc-maint(0.43) + proc-reeng(1.08) + proc-field(2.14) + proc-toolsup(-1.20) + proc-SWEngSup(-1.59) + prod-COTS(-0.75) + prod-comcust(2.15)	RSqr = .75 RMSE = .87 # Samples = 45	FailLikely = 3.22 + shrink-int(0.52) + comp-domain(0.55) + comp-CASE(-0.92) + comp-class(-2.46) + comp-OS(-0.59) + comp-dev(0.40) + ent-mnft(1.34) + ent-pay(1.14) + proc-des(0.53) + proc-train(-0.50) + proc-CM(-1.27) + proc-toolsup(1.47) + prod-cust(0.43) + prod-comcust(0.83)	RSqr = .32 RMSE = 1.24 # Samples = 124
ResponseCustomer = 4.72 + comp-domain(-0.87) + ent-OES(1.84) + proc-maint(0.40) + proc-appsup(-1.22) + prod-cust(-0.52) + prod-comcust(-0.79)	RSqr = .22 RMSE = 1.24 # Samples = 80	ResponseCustomer = 4.17 + shrink-bus(-0.78) + shrink-int(0.52) + comp-domain(1.37) + comp-class(-2.05) + ent-act(2.08) + ent-script(-0.74) + proc-reng(0.86) + proc-des(-0.60) + proc-maint(-0.51) + proc-reeng(-0.47) + proc-appsup(-0.97) + proc-train(0.90) + proc-SWEngSup(0.96) + proc-none(-2.38) + prod-cust(0.87) + prod-comcust(0.67) + prod-none(2.10)	RSqr = .80 RMSE = .68 # Samples = 45	ResponseCustomer = 4.91 + sys-embed(-0.51) + shrink-util(1.38) + comp-domain(-0.62) + comp-CASE(1.55) + ent-OES(1.04) + ent-web(-0.45) + proc-reng(0.71) + proc-train(0.68) + proc-spec(-0.74) + proc-field(-0.83) + proc-CM(0.93) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.79) + proc-none(-1.41) + prod-cust(-0.47) + prod-COTS(-0.67) + prod-comcust(-0.39)	RSqr = .27 RMSE = 1.21 # Samples = 125
ResponseOrg = 3.67 + ent-OES(1.82) + proc-maint(0.74) + proc-appsup(-1.27) + proc-coding(0.66) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.77)	RSqr = .21 RMSE = 1.42 # Samples = 81	ResponseOrg = 3.92 + sys-comm(0.89) + shrink-util(-1.68) + comp-class(-1.22) + ent-act(1.02) + proc-reng(-1.15) + proc-train(0.62) + proc-field(-1.53) + proc-SWEngSup(2.51) + prod-none(0.88)	RSqr = .56 RMSE = .97 # Samples = 44	ResponseOrg = 4.21 + sys-comm(0.54) + sys-dev(-0.96) + comp-CASE(1.68) + comp-OS(0.74) + ent-mnft(-1.30) + ent-OES(1.41) + proc-reng(-0.51) + proc-coding(0.41) + proc-field(-0.93) + prod-CM(0.91) + prod-cust(-0.51)	RSqr = .20 RMSE = 1.38 # Samples = 125

4.4.3.1 Cost Consequence

The cost consequence dictated the money saved for projects using outsourcing rather than in-house development. Even though many organizations sought using outsourcing to reduce the overall cost of the software development effort, figures showed this goal was not outsourcing's strongest suit. Both models started out with similar intercepts that held this consequence at neutral which was even with those organizations that chose not to outsource. Embedded systems, operating system components, and enterprise (accounting and order entry) software domains along with outsourcing (specifications and configuration management) processes and COTS products were included in the original model but not in the new model. The new model found enterprise payroll software domain and outsourcing customizable common software products as indicating variables which were not included in the old model. System communication, CASE component and enterprise manufacturing software domains found a common theme in both models. System communication software domain saw an old model decreasing effect change into an increasing effect for the new model. CASE component software domain correlated with a significant decrease in cost and with similar magnitudes between the two models. Enterprise manufacturing software domain associated with higher cost though the magnitude of this increase was dramatically less in the new model. Outsourcing customizable/ specialized software products showed an increase in cost from the old model to a decrease in cost from the new model. Both models were considered somewhat similar with only 17 marks separating the two. The older model did have higher accuracy with a 0.44 R^2 value and less noise with a 1.17

Regression MSE (RMSE) value making it the choice model to use despite being built with older data.

4.4.3.2 Schedule Duration Consequence

The schedule duration consequence defined the outsourcing goals and efforts used in order to complete the software development project faster. Unlike the above cost consequence, both intercepts from both models signified that outsourcing was meeting this goal somewhat by slightly decreasing the project schedule duration when compared to those not outsourcing. The indicating variables included in the old model and not in the new model included: (avionic and communication) system software domains, enterprise manufacturing software domain, outsourcing (design, documentation, fielding and configuration management) processes, and outsourcing custom/special products. This moved these variables in line with the intercept of having a slightly decrease schedule. The (embedded and device) system software domains, shrink-wrap utility software domain, enterprise scripting software domain, and outsourcing (maintenance and training) processes found to be included in the new model but not in the original model. Shrink-wrap business software domain, enterprise accounting software domain, and outsourcing reengineering process were common to both models with the enterprise accounting software domain and outsourcing reengineering process sharing almost the exact multiplier. The shrink-wrap business software domain showed to have an increase effect to schedule whereas in the original model it was listed to having a negative effect. Given these changes, the two models were somewhat similar with only 21 marks

separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.51 and less noise with a RMSE value of 1.04 thus making it the choice model to use.

4.4.3.3 Intellect Capital Consequence

The intellectual capital consequence referred to an organization's (legal) ownership rights of a developed software product. Higher level rights were indicative of stronger ownership. A loss of intellectual capital was a concern for organizations, causing many to forgo outsourcing key software development for fear that external companies would hold their organization "hostage" since they alone possessed key information. The initial model showed an intercept with a slight increase in intellectual capital rights as compared to their counterparts who do not outsource software development. The new model showed a similar sized decrease in intellectual capital rights according to the intercept. The difference of 1.33 indicated that the new sample of outsourcing project was experiencing significantly reduce intellectual capital consequences. Shrink-wrap (business and utilities) projects, (CASE and development tools) component projects, enterprise (manufacturing and scripting) software projects, outsourced (reengineering, application support, training and coding/implementation) processes, and outsourced (custom/specialized) products were included in the initial model, but were no longer significantly correlated with intellectual capital consequences. Thus these project types and processes no longer experienced significant differences with their in-house counterparts. Several new independent variables including system development software, shrink-wrap internet products, operating system components, enterprise accounting software, outsourced (maintenance, configuration management and

tool support) processes were included in the new model and were absent in the original model. Operating system projects and configuration management outsourcing were now correlated with significant reduced intellectual capital while tool support outsourcing and Internet shrink-wrap products among the sample projects were indicative of significant higher intellectual capital. Domain framework components and outsourcing (fielding and software engineer support) processes were common to both models. While outsourcing the fielding process was still indicative of reduced intellectual capital, the magnitude of the reduction was significantly less than the original model. In both models, domain framework components indicated higher intellectual capital. In the original model, the outsourcing software engineer support was associated with a lower intellectual capital. The new model experienced a complete reverse effect showing software engineering support correlated with a significant higher amount of intellectual capital. Both models shared a higher than normal R^2 values along with lower than normal noise (RMSE) values. The new model was the model of choice due to being built with this latest observed data.

4.4.3.4 Schedule Flexibility Consequence

Schedule flexibility consequence gave the outsourcing organization the ability to change their schedule for possible reasons such as: increased number of projects being developed, decreased number of projects being developed, handle an increase in maintenance or reengineering tasks, or adding skilled personnel to any undermanned position that would otherwise cause a bottleneck in the project schedule. There was a slight difference between the original and new model. The original started out with a

neutral outcome meaning it was exactly the same as those who decided not to outsource. The new model, however, showed to have a slightly increase amount of schedule flexibility due to outsourcing. System (avionics and communications) software domains, operating system component software domain, and outsourcing (requirements, reengineering, specification and fielding) processes were found in the original model but not in the new model. Embedded system software domain, shrink-wrap business software domain, component (class library and development tool) software domains, enterprise payroll software domain, outsourcing (design, testing, coding, configuration management and software engineer support) processes and outsourcing customizable common products were all indicator variables included in the new model but not the old model. Enterprise accounting and CASE component software domains were common in both models. Enterprise accounting had almost the same multipliers, but CASE component software domain found to have twice the negative effect from the old model to the new model. The two models were somewhat separated with 31 marks between them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.74 and less noise with a RMSE value of 0.97, thus making it the choice model to use.

4.4.3.5 Admin Overhead Consequence

Administration overhead consequence concerned itself with goals to reduce the amount of management, legal support and paperwork needed by a software development project. It was assumed by many organizations that the overhead involved in outsourcing was a prime reason for not outsourcing. Figures have shown quite the opposite, and in some cases, actually decreased the amount of administrative overhead. Both models

started with an intercept placing this consequence as equal to those organizations not outsourcing. Those indicating variables found in the original model but not in the new model include: system avionics software domain, shrinkwrap utilities software domain, domain framework component software domain, enterprise (manufacturing and order entry) software domains, and outsourcing (application support, documentation, fielding and configuration management) processes. Those indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original include: component (class library and operating system) software domains, outsourcing (requirements, testing, tool support and software engineer support), and outsourcing no products. Shrinkwrap internet software domain and outsourcing customizable COTS products were common between both models with approximately the same increasing magnitude. The two models were somewhat different with 28 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.53, but the old model proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 1.05. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it was slightly more accurate and built with the latest data.

4.4.3.6 Control Process Consequence

Controlling the development process was a goal for organizations dissatisfied with their current control of their own in-house development shops. The initial intercept showed a small difference between the original and new model. The original model found that outsourcing could slightly improve this consequence whereas the new model showed only a neutral outcome. In either case, outsourcing did no worse at this control than those organizations not outsourcing. Domain frameworks component software

domain, outsourcing (design, reengineering, specification and tool support) processes, and outsourcing customizable COTS products were indicating variable in the original model but not in the new model. System (avionic and device) software domains, operating system component software domain, enterprise (manufacturing and payroll) software domains, outsourcing (application support, coding and software engineer support) processes, and total process outsourcing were indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original model. Shrinkwrap utility software domain, development tools component software domain, and outsourcing COTS products were common indicating variables between both models. Development tools component software domain and outsourcing COTS products found to alternate from decreasing this consequence in the old model to increasing this consequence in the new model. Shrinkwrap utility software domain saw the reverse of the above with it correlating with an increase of this consequence in the old model. While in the new model, this correlated with a decrease in process control. The two models were somewhat different with 25 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.63 and less noise with a RMSE value of 1.10 thus making it the choice model to use.

4.4.3.7 In-house Non Core Consequence

Effort spent on in-house non-core activities should be kept to a minimum. Some organizations sought to use outsourcing to minimize such non-core in-house activities. This saved time would allow organizations to put more in-house effort towards core or strategic type business. The intercept from the old model showed a neutral outcome which would be equal to those organizations not outsourcing. The new model found a

more favorable position. It had a slight decrease of the effort spent on non-core activities. These intercepts were suspected to change according to the selected indicating variable being used. For example, those organizations seeking to outsource their design process tended to find an increase in time spent on non-core tasks, but outsourcing requirements process would significantly decrease time used on non-core activities. System avionic software domain, enterprise (accounting, manufacturing, order entry and web-site) software domains, outsourcing (tool support and software engineer support) processes, outsourcing COTS product, and total process outsourcing showed to be indicators in the original models but not in the new models. System communication software domain, operating system component software domain, enterprise scripting software domain, and outsourcing (requirements, design, testing and reengineering) processes saw their way into the new model but not the old model. Development tools component software domain found to be the only common indicating variable between both models. It shared an increasing effect on this consequence. The two models were somewhat similar with 22 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.44, but the old model had less noise with a RMSE value of 1.07. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it was a slightly more accurate and built with the latest data.

4.4.3.8 In-house Personnel Turnover Consequence

Many organizations feared that outsourcing would increase in-house personnel turnover. Those that have outsourced found in many cases this was not true. Outsourcing seemed to keep job conditions favorable so that in-house personnel did not

leave the organization. There was a slight intercept difference between the original and new model. The original started out with a neutral outcome meaning it was exactly the same as those who decided not to outsource. The new model however showed favorable signs to slightly and maybe even significantly decreased turnover. System (avionics and device) software domains, shrinkwrap business software domain, CASE component software domain, enterprise (accounting and order entry) software domains, and outsourcing (maintenance, configuration management and software engineer support) processes were found in the original model but not in the new model. Component (operating system and development tool) software domains and outsourcing (requirements, testing, reengineering and specification) processes were all indicator variables included in the new model but not the old model. Enterprise scripting software domain and outsourcing design process were common in both models. Enterprise scripting software domain had the same increasing effect but showed a higher magnitude of this effect in the new model. Outsourcing design process showed to have a slightly negative effect in the original model but a significant increasing effect in the new model. The two models were somewhat similar with 18 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.51. The older model had less noise with a RMSE value of 0.81. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it was more accurate and built with the latest data.

4.4.3.9 Learning Curve Consequence

Learning curve consequence concerned itself with goals to reduce the learning curve. Time spent by employees climbing up the learning curve in order to develop the

software was expensive to both the schedule and to the total economical price tag associated with creating the software. For each hour spent learning what must be learned, the cost of the software project rose. For these reasons, some organization found it important to keep the learning curve as small as possible. Outsourcing was found to provide organizations a solution to reducing this learning curve. The old model started with its intercept placing this consequence as equal to those organizations not outsourcing. The new model's intercept showed favorable signs of slightly reducing this learning curve thus providing organizations a solution not realized by those who simply do not outsource. Those indicating variables found in the original model but not in the new model included: enterprise (scripting and order entry) software domains and outsourcing maintenance process. Those indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original included: shrinkwrap utility software domain, enterprise payroll software domain, outsourcing (application support, training, coding and configuration management) processes, and total product outsourcing. Component (CASE and class library) software domains and outsourcing customizable common products were common between both models. Component (CASE and class library) software domains significantly decreased the consequence in both models. Outsourcing customizable common products saw an increase in both models (a significant increase in the newer model). The two models were somewhat similar with 14 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.59, but the old model proved to have a little less noise with a RMSE value of 1.06. The new model was the model of

choice due to the fact it did a much better job explaining the outcome and built with the latest data.

4.4.3.10 Risk Consequence

Risk consequence referred to the ability for a project to use outsourcing in minimizing risks. Risk mitigation efforts among contract organizations provided the ability to pool creative solutions from multiple sources. The intercept from the old model showed a neutral to slightly increased outcome which would be at least equal to those organizations not outsourcing. The new model showed a complete different picture. It showed that risk minimization through outsourcing was slightly decreased which may be raised significantly depending upon how one chooses to outsource. System communication software domain, enterprise (order entry, scripting and web-site) software domains, outsourcing (configuration management and software engineer support) processes, and outsourcing COTS product proved to be indicators in the original models but not in the new models. System embedded software domain, shrinkwrap utility software domain, operating system component software domain, enterprise payroll software domain, and outsourcing customizable common products saw their way into the new model but not in the old model. Surprisingly, there were no common indicating variables. The two models were similar with 15 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.38 and proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 1.28. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it did a little better job explaining the outcome and was built with the latest data.

4.4.3.11 Quality Consequence

The quality consequence emphasized the quality of the end product. This end product could have been the software, a support process or documents. Both models started out with similar intercepts that hold this consequence between slightly increasing to a neutral outcome which was at least the same level of quality of those who do not outsource. Outsourcing (reengineering and software engineering support) processes and outsourcing COTS products were included in the original model but not in the new model. The new model found system (embedded and device) software domains, shrinkwrap (utility and internet) software domains, component (CASE and class library) software domains, outsourcing (specification and coding) processes, outsourcing custom/specialized software products, and total process outsourcing as indicating variables which were not included in the old model. Again, no indicating variables were found in common. These two models were similar with only 15 marks separating them, but the combined model suffered a poor 0.23 R^2 . The newer model achieved higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.48 and less noise with a RMSE value of 1.01 thus making it the choice model to use.

4.4.3.12 Rework Consequence

The last thing that organization desired was rework especially after paying an outsourced organization money for products and processes which they found themselves having to redo. The intercept from both models showed a neutral rework outcome which would be at least equal to the amount of rework accomplished by organization not outsourcing. System (communication and device) software domains, shrinkwrap internet

software domain, enterprise scripting software domain, outsourcing reengineering process, and outsourcing COTS products proved to be indicators in the original models but not in the new models. System avionics software domain, shrinkwrap utility software domain, component development tool software domain, outsourcing application support process, and total product outsourcing saw their way into the new model but not in the old model. Outsourcing software engineer support process was found to be the only indicating variable common in both models. Outsourcing software engineer support process saw in the original model to increase this rework, but in the new model, this indicating variable was found correlated with a decrease of rework. The two models were similar with 14 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.32 and proved to have similar noise with an approximate RMSE value of 1.20. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it did a better job explaining the outcome and was built with the latest data.

4.4.3.13 Visibility Consequence

Visibility in the development process was a goal for many organizations seeking some update about the software. The initial intercept showed a significant difference between the original and new model. The original model found that outsourcing decreased visibility whereas the new model showed a neutral amount of visibility. With the new model, outsourcing did no worse at this visibility than those organizations not outsourcing. Enterprise (order entry and website) software domains and outsourcing (design, maintenance and fielding) processes were indicating variables in the original model but not in the new model. System (avionic, embedded, and device) software

domains, shrinkwrap utility software domain, component (CASE and operating system) software domains, outsourcing (testing, specification, coding and configuration management) processes, total product outsourcing, and outsourcing customizable common products were indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original model. System communication software domain, development tools component software domain, enterprise scripting software domain, outsourcing (reengineering and software engineer support) processes, outsourcing custom/specialized products, and total process outsourcing were common indicating variables between both models. System communication software domain, outsourcing custom/specialized products, and total process outsourcing were all found to increase visibility in both models. Development tools component software domain and outsourcing software engineer support process showed to decrease visibility in original model, but in the new model, this was opposite with these variables having an increasing effect. Enterprise scripting software domain and outsourcing reengineering process showed to increase visibility in the original model, but in the new model, they found the opposite and actually decreased visibility. Given these changes, the two models were very different with 38 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.87 and proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 0.66 making it the model of choice.

4.4.3.14 Control of Product Consequence

Controlling the product consequence referred to the ability for the organization to induce control upon a software project. This control may have needed to inject a certain degree of accuracy between the product and requirements or used to ensure the product

meets a certain safety/testing criteria. The intercept from the old model showed a neutral control outcome which would be at least equal to those organizations not outsourcing. The new model showed a complete different picture. It showed that controlling the product through outsourcing was slightly decreased. Given certain outsourcing factors, this outcome may have been raised significantly. For example, those choosing total process outsourcing would find control of product to be raised to a slightly increasing level. System device software domain, enterprise utility software domain, domain framework software component domain, outsourcing (reengineering, application support and tool support) processes, and outsourcing (COTS and customizable common) products proved to be indicators in the original models but not in the new models. Outsourcing (requirements, testing and training) processes and total process outsourcing saw their way into the new model but not in the old model. Outsourcing fielding and software engineer support processes were common indicating variables found in both models. Outsourcing fielding process had a slight decrease effect in the original model that jumped dramatically to significantly decreasing this consequence in the new model. Outsourcing software engineer support process saw in the original model to decrease this control, but in the new model, this indicating variable was found correlated with an increase of the control of the product. The two models were similar with 16 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.48 and proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 0.99. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it did a better job explaining the outcome and was built with the latest data.

4.4.3.15 Change Cost Consequence

Change cost consequence concerned itself with goals to reduce the dollar amount charged for changes in the software project. These changes normally resulted in change in customer requirements or hardware restrictions. Of course, the changes were not restricted to just these types alone. Both models started with an intercept placing this consequence as equal to those organizations not outsourcing. As always, this intercept could have been adjusted depending upon which indicating variables were being used. For example, using the new model, those who are practicing total product outsourcing found a significant increase in this cost, but those who were practicing total process outsourcing found a significant decrease for this consequence. Those indicating variables found in the original model but not in the new model included: system avionics software domain, shrinkwrap internet software domain, operating system component software domain, enterprise (accounting, manufacturing, order entry and website) software domains, outsourcing software engineer support process, and outsourcing COTS products. Those indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original included: shrinkwrap utility software domain, component class library software domain, outsourcing coding process, outsourcing customizable common products, and total process outsourcing. No common indicating variable were found between the models. The two models were somewhat similar with 20 marks separating them. Both models did have similar accuracy figures with a R^2 approximate value of 0.36, but the old model proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 1.08. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it shared the same accuracy level but was built with the latest data.

4.4.3.16 Language Culture Problem Consequence

Language/culture problems consequence referred to the risk of increasing communication problems due to a difference between organizations especially those organizations from different nations. There was a slight difference between the original and new model. The original started out with a neutral outcome meaning it was exactly the same as those who decided not to outsource. The new model, however, showed to have a slightly increase amount of these types of problems due to outsourcing. System avionics software domain, enterprise (accounting and order entry) software domains, outsourcing (requirements and software engineer support) processes, and outsourcing customizable common products were found in the original model but not in the new model. Embedded system software domain, component (domain framework and class library) software domains, enterprise payroll software domain, outsourcing (reengineering, application support, specifications and configuration management) processes and total process outsourcing were all indicator variables included in the new model but not the old model. Shrinkwrap utility software domain, operating system component software domain, outsourcing (design and fielding) processes and outsourcing custom/specialized products were common in both models. Shrinkwrap utility software domain showed an increasing effect in the old model but showed a decreasing effect in the new model. Operating system component software domain showed a small decreasing effect in old model but a significant decreasing effect in the new model. Outsourcing design process correlated with a small increasing effect in original model but a significant decreasing effect in the new model. Outsourcing fielding process saw a

small decrease in the old model but an increase in the new model. Outsourcing custom/specialized products stayed consistent with a small decrease through out both models. The two models were somewhat separated with 25 marks between them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.61, but the old model had less noise with a RMSE value of 0.62. The new model was the model of choice due to the fact it did a much better job explaining the outcome and was built with the latest data.

4.4.3.17 Turf War Consequence

Turf war consequence referred to the friction found between different teams striving to complete their own independent task. Teamwork in both the contractor and customer organizations was the overall goal. This consequence described the effects outsourcing had on this teamwork goal. The initial intercept showed a significant difference between the original and new model. The original model found that outsourcing kept the turf war neutral which was equivalent to those not outsourcing whereas the new model showed a slightly increased amount of turf war. Indicating variable selection such as outsourcing software engineer support process would have decrease affect on the outcome. System avionic software domain, component (class library and operating system) software domains, enterprise (accounting and manufacturing) software domains, outsourcing (reengineering, application support, specification and tool support) processes, and outsourcing COTS products were indicating variables in the original model but not in the new model. System device software domain, enterprise scripting software domain, outsourcing (design and configuration management) processes, outsourcing customizable common products, and

total process outsourcing were indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original model. System embedded software domain, shrinkwrap internet software domain, and outsourcing software engineer support process were common indicating variables between both models. System embedded software domain had a consistent increasing effect on turf war consequence. Shrinkwrap internet software domain and outsourcing software engineer support process showed to have an increasing effect in the old model and a decreasing effect in the new model. The models were different with 24 marks separating them. The older model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.57 and proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 0.86 making it the model of choice despite being built with older data.

4.4.3.18 Failure Likelihood Consequence

Failure likelihood consequence concerned itself with outright project failure. It was assumed by many organizations that outsourcing may be a prime reason for project failure. Figures have shown quite the opposite, and in some cases, actually decreased the chance of project failure. Both models started with an intercept placing this consequence as equal or slightly less than neutral. This would imply that those organizations not outsourcing had about the same result with project failure. Those indicating variables found in the original model but not in the new model include: system device software domain, shrinkwrap internet software domain, and outsourcing configuration management process. Those indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original include: shrinkwrap (business and utility) software domains, component class library software domain, enterprise (accounting and scripting) software domains,

outsourcing (testing, maintenance and fielding) processes, and outsourcing customizable common products. Outsourcing (requirements, reengineering, tool support and software engineer support) processes and outsourcing COTS products were common between both models. Outsourcing (requirements and reengineering) processes showed to have a decreasing effect in the old model but an increasing effect in the new model. Outsourcing (tool support and software engineer support) processes and COTS products showed to have an increasing effect in the old model but a decreasing effect in the new model. The two models were somewhat different with 28 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.75 and proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 0.87. The new model was the model of choice.

4.4.3.19 Response to Customer Consequence

Increasing the response to the customer was a popular goal for many organizations regardless of outsourcing plans. The initial intercept showed a small difference between the original and new model. The original model found that outsourcing could slightly improve this consequence whereas the new model showed only a neutral outcome. In either case, outsourcing did no worse at this response than those organizations not outsourcing. Enterprise order entry software domain was the only indicating variable found in the original model but not in the new model. Shrinkwrap (business and internet) software domains, class library component software domain, enterprise (accounting and scripting) software domains, outsourcing (requirement, design, reengineering, training and software engineer support) processes, total product outsourcing, and total process outsourcing were indicating variables found

in the new model but not in the original model. Component domain framework software domain, outsourcing (maintenance and application support) processes, and outsourcing (custom/specialized and customizable common) products were common indicating variables between both models. Domain framework component software and outsourcing (custom/specialized and customizable common) products found to alternate from decreasing effect in the old model to increasing effect in the new model. Likewise outsourcing maintenance had an increasing effect in the old model to a decreasing effect in the new model. Outsourcing application support retained a decreasing effect throughout both models. The two models were somewhat different with 23 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.80 and less noise with a RMSE value of 0.68 thus making it the choice model to use.

4.4.3.20 Response to Organization Consequence

Response to organization consequence concerned itself with increasing the response to organization's standards and expectations. Many organizations wanted their outsourced organizations to respond to their demands rather than being influenced by other sources. Both models started with an intercept placing this consequence as equal or slightly less than neutral. This meant that those seeking response from a total in-house software development shop had similar results. Those indicating variables found in the original model but not in the new model included: enterprise order entry software domain and outsourcing (maintenance, application support and coding) processes. Those indicating variables found in the new model but not in the original included: system communication software domain, component class library software domain, shrinkwrap

utility software domain, enterprise accounting software domain, outsourcing (requirement, training and fielding) processes, and total process outsourcing. Outsourcing software engineer support process was the only common indicating variable found between both models. Outsourcing software engineer process showed to have a decreasing effect in the old model but a significant increasing effect in the new model. The two models were somewhat similar with 17 marks separating them. The newer model did have higher accuracy with a R^2 value of 0.56 and proved to have less noise with a RMSE value of 0.97. The new model was the model of choice.

4.4.3.21 SODS2 Consequence Models Summary

These models provided us an overview of the new, used, and combined data sets. With few exceptions, the new data models appeared to be more accurate by the RMSE and correlation values thus did a better job explaining the variation from response to response. By providing the user the ability to view results from all three sets, the user have a much thorough result set along with the accuracy provided by the NN's. This model quality evaluation was based on comparison of model outputs to data used to create the models. Later in this chapter's validation section, validation uses unprocessed survey data to establish external model validity.

4.4.4 Regression Model Summary

This section covered the regression model implementation in regards to the SODS2 development. The following three goals for this section were achieved:

1. Modeling technique validation,
2. Analysis on differences between models, and

3. Explanation of SODS2 consequence models.

4.5 Neural Network Implementation

The regression models provided an understandable, linear meaning to software outsourcing and its consequences. But these relationships between the input variables found in the above models were not always linear. As discussed in Chapter Two, these models along with the NN learning mechanism provided a more complete decision support tool. This section traverses the NN implementation for SODS2 by breaking it up in the following subsections.

4.5.1 Neural Network Design Portion

The Neurosolutions tool as discussed in Chapter Three was important for the design, training, testing and validation of the NN's. One of the reasons for this tool selection was its quality support staff. This research's primary Neurosolutions support representative, Mr. Gary Lynn, with over 11 years working with Neurosolutions holding a Michigan State University Computer Science Master's Degree, advised that this research use MLP with backpropagation following a function approximation architecture. This meant that the input axon for the hidden layer, a function that compresses all of the inputs into the hidden layer input, used a nonlinear tangent hyperbolic function to perform such mappings. This function provided the NN the ability to make soft non-linear decisions. Neurosolutions referred to this as the TanhAxon. The output axon (the function that messages the final output signal from the hidden layer) used a bias (linear) function. This provided the NN a degree of adaptability for the output when the NN was

forced to interpolate because of being trained with a relative low amount of training data. The learning algorithm used conjugate gradient method because from Lynn's experience this particular learning algorithm proved to be faster at training. One hidden layer was used due to the limited amount of data in regards to the high number of input variables. This NN design provided this research a solid fit given its problem according to the experts at Neurosolutions.

4.5.2 Cross Validation Portion

Data was configured and saved in a tab delimited text file for cross validation. Using this text file, Neurosolutions provided an easy graphical display for selecting input and output columns found in the file. Those columns selected for input were fed into Neurosolutions as input variables, and those columns selected for output were fed as output variables. A randomization function allowed the data rows to be fully randomized. This was highly recommended by Lynn to help destroy all possible order found within the data sets so that such order did not interfere with training. Selecting cross validation sets as mentioned in Chapter Two was also provided through graphical displays. Neurosolutions would break the rows down into percentages to allow the selection of such cross validation data. During actual training, the tool used these probe hooks for displaying the progress of the training versus cross validation. The NN performance measurements (specifically the Mean Square Error (MSE) and Correlation (R) Value) provided accuracy measure for the NN against both the training and cross validation data set. The data graph that compared the training MSE line with the cross validation MSE line proved most useful. This data graph copied exactly the intent behind

Figure 18 MLP NN Training Error Plot [39]. Appendix E contains the screen shots from Neurosolutions taken after each consequence cross validation. The performance measures and error plots (along with the basic graphical design of the NN) were captured within each screen shot.

4.5.3 Neural Network Data Problem

Upon review of the cross validation data and associated performance measurements, a problem was quickly noticed. Due to the limited number of available data and a pre-existing interpolation problem as discussed in the regression models, the cross validation data needed to somehow be included within the training data. Comparing all cross validation screen shots, it was reasonable to believe that overtraining could be kept low by stopping training at 50 epochs. By averaging out the cross validation/over-training minimum epoch point for each error plot, one could assure that overtraining would be minimized if training was stopped at the research average of 50 epochs. Lynn verified that this was a sound methodology for solving my interpolation problem caused by having a small amount of training data.

4.5.4 Neural Network Training Without Cross Validation Portion

Applying such methodology meant that this research retrained each NN with all rows of data added. During this retraining, the training data set performance measurement probe hook provided the NN accuracy information and using a new data graph probe hook for comparing the actual survey outputs vs. NN estimated outputs demonstrated a nice overview of the NN training. These values and graphs were placed

in the screen shots included in Appendix F. One Neurosolutions' learning hurdle dealt with the way the tool saved its weight files. Unless configured correctly, it would save dynamically the best weights associated with a history of training runs. This caused a problem when the goal was to capture the training screen shot with the weights currently used within the NN. By explicitly saving the initial weight files along with the final weight files, the training episode associated with a given screen shot could be reproduced. This information was from the excellent help support staff there at Neurosolutions and a crucial discovery that made building these NN that much easier.

4.5.5 Neural Network Interface Portion

With the above methodology for building NN in place, 20 NN were reasonably designed and trained. The only remaining portion dealt with interfacing the 20 NN with SODS2 during run time. As previously documented, one of Neurosolutions' most beneficial features, was the ability for it to create 20 DLL's and associated weight files using the MS Visual C++ compiler version 5.0 to 7.0. The author used the MS Access VB sample shell provided by Neurosolutions to understand how SODS2 would connect to these DLL files.

4.5.6 NN Implementation Summary

Twenty consequence NN's were designed, trained and created by the Neurosolutions under the expert guidance of Lynn. The interfacing portion used this tool to create 20 DLL files. These DLL files would allow MS Access VB to interface directly

with the 20 NN's. At this point with the NN's and models built, attention was turned to the development of SODS2.

4.6 SODS2 Implementation

This implementation section covered building the actual SODS2 application. This phase of the implementation will be broken into the following seven subphases.

4.6.1 SODS2 Development Tool

During the NN interfacing portion, this researcher was happy to discover that the Neurosolutions DLL files could actually be called from inside MS Access. This caused yet another change in methodology because the plan was to use Togethersoft Java in SODS2 development. By using MS Access VB as the developer's platform, MS Access would not only be used to store and organize the data, but would house the application along with this data. This promised an easier fielding of the application and less configuration management headaches. The disadvantage of this decision was that MS Access VB lacked the maintainability and software evolution that would have been offered through a fully dependent programming language such as Java, but this research found that software outsourcing was rapidly changing so the lifespan of such application would be a few years at most.

Using MS Access VB, the application was built meeting all the high level requirements found in Table 26. A more detailed outline of the SODS2 windows were included in Appendix I which showed how each requirement was incorporated in the SODS2 tool.

4.6.2 SODS2 Validation Phase

The SODS2 validation consisted of 120 scenarios created from six new survey responses gathered since the release of this research analysis data. Due to the fact these responses were not used in the formulation of either the regression models or NN's, unbiased results were captured. SODS2 validation used its scenario results from the New Data Regression (NDR), Old Data Regression (ODR), and Combined Data Regression (CDR) models along with results from the NN learning mechanism. These results were then compared against the actual survey responses. Figure 41 illustrated such comparisons as it relates to the cost consequence.




Figure 41 Validation Sample

This chart was created from the following data found in Table 28.

Table 28 Validation Sample Table

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	3.00	4.19	2.32	6.34	4.07	1.19	0.68	3.34	1.07
2	3.00	1.12	5.06	7.36	4.28	1.88	2.06	4.36	1.28
3	2.00	3.52	2.32	5.61	2.77	1.52	0.32	3.61	0.77
4	3.00	4.47	5.53	4.95	4.16	1.47	2.53	1.95	1.16
5	2.00	4.91	2.32	5.42	4.04	2.91	0.32	3.42	2.04
6	2.00	0.17	3.70	3.57	1.89	1.83	1.70	1.57	0.11
Total Difference (Neural Network):						10.80			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							7.61		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								18.25	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									6.43

This sample illustrated each respondent's (one through six) actual responses compared to the estimated outputs calculated with each learning mechanism. The distance from the actual response and each output was calculated and inserted in each of the Differences (Diff.) columns. Then these distances were summed together at the bottom of the sample's tables resulting in the total difference. This was graphically illustrated in the sample's chart. In respondent's one cost scenario, the NDR performed the best in actually predicting the outcome while in respondent's six cost scenario, the NDR performed the worst. All 120 scenarios were included in Appendix H.

After the 120 scenarios, a summarization was calculated from the total differences and inserted at the end of Appendix H. CDR slightly edge NN for best performance on these six data points. NDR and ODR were similarly close with significantly worse

performance. Interpolating effects due to the small amount of data used in building the NDR and ODR probably accounted for this performance. Another indicator of interpolation was the extreme estimates of greater than seven or less than one. The results of this summary were listed in Figure 42.




Figure 42 Validation Summary

Each learning mechanism performed reasonably well given the limited amount of data this research used to build all four mechanisms. This overall performance, as illustrated above, was well within the expectations of this research. The NN and CDR used all the training data captured in the combined survey data set; thus, proved to outperform the NDR and ODR even though these models showed better overall

performance within their own data sets. The driving push behind such results was the importance of capturing as much data as possible over a wide range of possible scenarios. This should help alleviate interpolation effects. Though NDR and ODR fell shortly behind, all resulting learning mechanisms' performances were reasonably accurate given such fluctuation in the validation survey set. SODS2 met this validation criteria in two different ways: 1) SODS2 learning mechanisms' performance measures provided decent estimated outputs, and 2) SODS2 performed brilliantly in processing the output for the 120 validating scenarios that used several, varying input combinations.

4.6.3 SODS2 Implementation Summary

This section covered the SODS2 implementation steps. Each of the seven sub-phases linked to a subset of requirements laid out in the methodology. The tool was built with MS Access VB with the intent of providing a user friendly, window type application. The point and click input features and associated help tags gave the user an efficient interface to enter their respective software outsourcing input parameters and navigate to viewing the associated reports. The reports were broken into an easy to decipher scale providing the user the predicted outcomes based upon their input selections.

This application was validated with the newest survey data yet to be inserted into either of the SODS2 learning mechanisms. This survey data allowed the creation of 120 scenarios based upon what the respondent might have entered given access to SODS2. By comparing these actual outputs with the SODS2 learning mechanisms' estimated outputs, one could see how this decision support tool would have performed given such

survey respondents inputs compared to real world output. The SODS2 learning mechanisms were highly adaptable at estimating such outputs. At this stage, SODS2 was completed and all associated requirements were fully met.

4.7 Summary

This chapter described the implementation results for this research. This effort began with the transport of new data into the MS Access database housing the previous collected survey data. The data was then analyzed using statistical methods such as T-testing and regression model building. Numerous differences with only a small amount of similarities were found between the old and new surveys. The analysis continued with the creation of the regression models. After the modeling techniques were validated and used to create the goal realization models, differences were again noticed from the old survey data goal realization models created in Hermann's dissertation and the new goal realization models created in this research. With these differences and a change in the stepwise entry/removal statistics, this research proceeded in creating 60 consequence regression models from the new, used and combined data sets. From the creation of these models, the attention turned toward the NN implementation phase. Neurosolutions tool along with its expert support staff provided this research properly designed and trained NN for each consequence. The tool also paved the way for interfacing with SODS2 by means of DLL files. With the NN's and models built, the SODS2 implementation was initiated. SODS2 was successfully built with all requirements fully achieved and validated with 120 scenarios.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will summarize this research along with providing conclusions and suggestions for future work. The results will sum up the contributions brought forth by this work. After these contributions are summarized, this chapter concludes with a vision for future work.

5.2 Conclusions and Contributions

Many new discoveries were noted along the way in developing Software Outsourcing Decision Support tool version 2 (SODS2). The first discovery came through the analysis of the new survey data. It was previously assumed that this data would share many common similarities with a sprinkling of differences between the analysis and consequence rules used in Hermann's first version of the tool (SODS1). This was hardly the case. These differences slightly repositioned this research's methodology. Instead of building the 20 stepwise regression consequence models from only the combined survey data, now, they should be built using all three sets of survey data, the new, used and combined totaling 60 regression models. Discovering the fact that outsourcing experience is rapidly changing in a significant positive way was this research's first contribution.

The next major discovery dealt with creating a new methodology for extending the current SODS1 decision support tool to allow the addition of neural network technology. Because of the accuracy that neural network technology promised to the SODS2 user, a

change in the stepwise entrance / removal statistics from 95% / 90% confidence level to 75% / 75% confidence level was allowed. Expanding this stepwise entrance / removal statistics caused dramatic inclusions of new variables into all 60 regression models used by SODS2. This change improved the understandability about the consequence outputs as they relate to even a greater number of variables selected for insertion into the models. However, with this expansion of the stepwise entrance / removal statistics, more noise was allowed into the new models so neural networks had to be used to provide SODS2 users the needed accuracy. This meant that this research designed and employed a new methodology for adding neural networks along with the regression models to the SODS2 tool. As a result of such methodology, 20 Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) with backpropagation neural networks were designed and verified by a notable neural network expert. New methods for applying cross validation to minimize the amount neural network overtraining and overfitting were also designed and applied. These new methods allowed the neural network to be trained with all of the collected input data, but by stopping the training based upon an average epoch calculated during cross validation, overtraining and overfitting were minimized. Such neural network training methods were reviewed and verified by Lynn. As a result, these 20 neural networks provided the accuracy as promised with a decent ability of explaining the varying combined survey outputs. This SODS2 addition, of using neural network artificial intelligence along with the three separate sets of regression models, provided outsourcing decision makers an in-depth consequence output regarding their proposed outsourced project. This new SODS2

methodology for adding neural networks with their associated changes was this research's second major contribution.

With the new methodology designed, this research proceeded to build and validate SODS2. During the development of the tool, much of the focus was on making it user friendly. Building the application inside the MS Access survey database provided the user an easy all-in-one portable tool. SODS2 development language, MS Access Visual Basic, provided the means for adding a window graphical interface with point / click type inputs. User tool guidance was included through help labels and smart description tags. The requirements shown in Chapter Three's Table 26 were fully met by SODS2.

After successful completion of SODS2, recent survey data was collected from the internet which was used to generate 120 scenarios for SODS2 validation. Such survey data was not used in the creation of the regression models nor the neural networks; therefore, providing an unbiased validation result set for this research. Each SODS2 learning mechanism, Neural Networks (NN), New Data Regression (NDR), Old Data Regression (ODR), and Combined Data Regression (CDR), aligned their estimates fairly favorable to each of the scenario's actual output as noted in Appendix H. NN and CDR were evenly matched with the best overall performance while NDR and ODR had similar performance and were not far behind. Such performances resulted from interpolation problems due to the amount of data used to create NDR and ODR versus the amount of data used to create NN and CDR. Such validation results showed the value that SODS2 could provide to a outsourcing software decision maker. With the SODS2 built and validated, a third and important contribution was added to this field of study.

5.3 Future Work

During the development of SODS2, over 128 regression consequence and goal realization stepwise regression models were created and analyzed. The new survey data and models were analyzed and compared against the findings presented in Hermann's dissertation. As previously discussed, the real world software outsourcing knowledge was found to be changing. Ongoing analysis of survey data will be paramount for the evolution of software outsourcing knowledge. In attempts to provide such analysis, enhancements to the online survey will be the first crucial step in capturing this knowledge. The survey response Likert scale can be adapted so that a graphical continuous scale can be used in its replacement; much like the scale used to adjust a computer's volume. This would allow the survey respondents to slide the graphical slider to real data type values between the whole numbers of one through five or one through seven respectively. Along with this improvement, additional changes to the survey could provide respondents an opportunity to add survey responses concerning their most vivid, worst, and/or successful software outsourcing project experiences. The goal with this change is the attempt to capture as much information from the user as possible. Another important survey change deals with changing software domain flags as categorical type input versus specific type input. Reducing the number of input variables should increase the accuracy of both the regression models and neural networks. In light of this, unfortunately, additional flags may be required to capture future software outsourcing trends such as Application Service Providers and/or outsourcing partnerships. Given

such changes, the drive for this future work will be to collect as much software outsourcing data using an revised online survey tool.

Due to the increase of such new survey data, future experimentation may be created to isolate the first cause and effect software outsourcing relationship. This research was purely observational with only opinions offered for the observed software outsourcing occurrences. Experimentation might concentrate on a very small subset of an outsourcing type and research to see if a cause and effect relationship can be found. While the over-arching observational tendencies have been documented, very little or possibly no work has ever attempted to study the cause and effect of a particular subset of software outsourcing.

Future efforts must also be spent on enhancing SODS2 to be more dynamic. Neurosolutions using neural network technology can be used to allow a SODS2 user the ability to accept a constant flow of incoming new neural network and stepwise regression update packages. This enhancement would function much like the antivirus software found on many computers. Once a considerable amount of surveys are collected, an auto-updating SODS server will need to be created. Its purpose includes:

1. Automate the regression model and neural network creation with reports providing a summary of the changes between the regression models and neural networks,
2. Allow the user version of SODS to automatically pull new model and neural network packages from this new server by means of the internet, and
3. Provide online communications for SODS users informing them about new updates and associated analysis reports, giving them a medium to voice their opinion.

The goals for this tool would not really change, but the process of capturing, codifying and evolving software outsourcing knowledge would be greatly enhanced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] T. Nonaka, *The Knowledge Creating Company*: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [2] P. Coyle, "Simulation Based Acquisition for Information Technology," presented at 1999 ITEA - GW Conference, Fairfax, VA, 1999.
- [3] Cable News Network, "Ariane 5 Blasts Off in Crucial Launch," 1997.
- [4] L. Mosemann, "Did We Lose Our Religion?," *Crosstalk the Journal of Defense Software Engineering*, vol. Aug 2002.
- [5] K. Lunney, "Bush Praises Top Executives, Pushes Outsourcing," in *Government Executive*, 2001.
- [6] D. Rumsfeld, "Secretary Rumsfeld Briefs the Fiscal 2003 DoD Budget," United States Secretary of Defense 04 Feb 2002.
- [7] W. Washington, "Outsourcing Automatic Data Processing Requirements and Support," in *Acquisition Review Quarterly*, vol. Spring 1999.
- [8] C. Jones, "Defense Software Development in Evolution," *Crosstalk the Journal of Defense Software Engineering*, vol. Nov 2002.
- [9] L. Mosemann, "New Air Force Policy on Artificial Intelligence," USAF Deputy Assistant Secretary 3 Feb 1994.
- [10] W. Power, "Application of Corporate Outsourcing Methods to the Department of Defense," in *Administration and Management*. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, 2000, pp. 101.
- [11] B. Hermann, "A Decision Support Tool to Support Strategy Selection for Software Development Outsourcing," in *Computer Science*: Arizona State University, 2000, pp. 250.
- [12] P. Tinnirello, "New Directions in Project Management," in *Best Practices Series*: Auerbach Publication, 2002.
- [13] R. Abbas, P. Dart, E. Kazmierczak, and F. O'Brien, "Outsourcing Software Applications Development: Issues, Implications, and Impact," University of Melbourne Dec 1997.
- [14] J. Butler, "Winning the Outsourcing Game," Auerbach Publications, 2000.
- [15] K. Ketler and J. Willems, "A Study of the Outsourcing Decision: Preliminary Results," presented at 1999 ACM SIGCPR Conference on Computer Personnel Research, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1999.
- [16] J. Statz and M. Epner, "Who's Right on Intellectual Property?," *Cutter IT Journal*, vol. 13, 2000.
- [17] C. Jones, "Build, Buy or Outsource?," *Computer IEEE*, vol. Dec 1994, 1994.
- [18] S. Ang and S. Slaughter, "Organizational Psychology and Performance in IS Employment Outsourcing and Insourcing," presented at 31st Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii, 1998.
- [19] C. Beath and G. Walker, "Outsourcing of Application Software: A Knowledge Management Perspective," presented at 31st Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii, 1998.

- [20] L. Fischman and K. McRitchie, "Off the Shelf Software: Practical Evaluation," *Crosstalk the Journal of Defense Software Engineering*, 2000.
- [21] R. Gardner, "The Software Solution for the E-Business Enterprise: Vendor or Partner?," Codehost Inc. Apr 2001.
- [22] D. Avison and G. Fitzgerald, "Where Now for Development Methodologies," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 46, 2003.
- [23] R. Heeks, S. Krishna, B. Nicholson, and S. Sundee, "Synching or Sinking: Global Software Outsourcing Relationships," *IEEE Software*, vol. March/April 2001.
- [24] J. Herbsled and A. Mockus, "An Empirical Study of Speed and Communication in Globally Distributed Software Development," *IEEE Transaction on Software Engineering*, vol. 29, 2003.
- [25] G. Kingston, J. Ross, and W. Huang, "An Explanatory Study on the Goal Alignment Problem in Joint Software Reviews," Commonwealth of Australia 2000.
- [26] D. Kotchman, "Achieving SA-CMM Level 2 at PM Abrahams," *Crosstalk the Journal of Defense Software Engineering*, vol. Aug 2002.
- [27] N. Kobitzsch and D. Rombach, "Outsourcing in India," *IEEE Software*, vol. March/April 2001.
- [28] A. Dutoit, J. Johnstone, and B. Bruegge, "Knowledge Scouts: Reducing Communication Barriers in a Distributed Software Development Project," *IEEE*, 2001.
- [29] J. Pelrine, "Modelling Infection Scenarios - A Fixed-Price Extreme Programming Success Story," presented at Conference on Object Oriented Programming Systems Languages and Applications, Minneapolis, MN, 2000.
- [30] A. Rollo and T. Wright, "A Method for Acquiring Custom Built Software or Let the Customer Manage Software Acquisition," presented at 12th Annual European Software Control and Metrics Conference, London, England, 2001.
- [31] M. Orsted, "Software Development Engineer in Microsoft: A Subjective View of Soft Skills Required," presented at 22nd International Conference on Software Engineering, Limerick, Ireland, 2000.
- [32] J. Gyorkos, A. Novakovic, I. Rozman, R. Leskovar, and R. Vajde-Horvat, "Decision Knowledge Gathering in Outsourced Projects," *IEEE*, 1999.
- [33] N. Gaudiano, "Air Force Retracts \$1 Billion from Boeing Deal," in *Air Force Times*, 2003.
- [34] R. Patnayakuni and N. Seth, "Why License When You Can Rent? Risks and Rewards of the Application Service Provider Model," presented at Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research 2001 Annual Conference, San Diego, CA, 2001.
- [35] A. Susarla, A. Barua, and A. Whinston, "Myths About Outsourcing to Application Service Providers," *IT Pro*, vol. May-Jun 2001.
- [36] S. Lee, K. Huynh, K. Chi-wai, and S. Pi, "The Evolution of Outsourcing Research: What Is the Next Issue?," presented at 33rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii, 2000.

- [37] StatSoft_Inc, "Building Models via Stepwise Regression," 2003.
- [38] J. Principe, N. Euliano, and W. Lefebvre, *Neural and Adaptive Systems*, 1st Edition ed: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2000.
- [39] L. Tarassenko, *A Guide to Neural Computing Applications*. London: Arnold Publishers, 1998.
- [40] L. Smith, "An Introduction to Neural Networks," University of Stirling 25 October 1996.
- [41] W. Sarle, "Comp.ai.neural-nets FAQ, Part 1 of 7: Introduction," Cary, NC 2002.
- [42] K. Smith and J. Gupta, "Neural Networks in Business: Techniques and Applications for the Operation Researcher," *Computer and Operation Research*, vol. 27, 2000.
- [43] M. Tafti, "Neural Networks: A New Dimension in Expert Systems Applications," presented at 1990 ACM SIGBDP Conference on Trends and Directions in Expert Systems, Orlando, FL, 1990.
- [44] M. Nasereddin and M. Mollaghasemi, "The Development of a Methodology for the Use of Neural Networks and Simulation Modeling in System Design," presented at 1999 Winter Simulation Conference, Phoenix, AZ, 1999.
- [45] R. Sharda and R. Rampal, "Neural Networks and Management Science/Operations Research: A Bibliographic Essay," *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, vol. 61, 1998.
- [46] R. Kilmer, A. Smith, and L. Shuman, "Computing Confidence Intervals For Stochastic Simulation Using Neural Network Metamodels," US Army Knowledge Engineering Group April 1998.
- [47] D. Coit, B. Jackson, and A. Smith, "Neural Network Open Loop Control System for Wave Soldering," *Journal of Electronic Manufacturing*, vol. 11, 2002.
- [48] L. Zhou, E. Gao, and P. Jin, "Comparison Between the Logistic Regression and Back Propagation Neural Networks," Shanghai Medical University Nov 1997.
- [49] D. Nguyen and D. Kira, "On a Unified Framework for Building Neural Network Expert Systems," presented at 27th Annual Proceedings of the Western Decision Sciences Institute, Reno, NV, 1998.
- [50] S. Lam and A. Smith, "Cascade-Correlation Neural Network Modeling of the Abrasive Flow Machining Process," University of Pittsburgh 1998.
- [51] D. Faraggi, M. LeBlanc, and J. Crowley, "Understanding Neural Networks Using Regression Trees: An Application to Multiple Myeloma Survival Data," *Statistics in Medicine*, vol. 20, 2001.

Appendix A - Validation Goal Realization Models

The following two models validate this research's JMP modeling techniques against the techniques exercised during Hermann's dissertation to ensure both techniques are the same:

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Goal Realizations (Response to Organization)

Response:
Column 53

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.050
Prob to Leave 0.100

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	Entered	Parameter	SSE 56.525847	DFE 65	MSE 0.8696284	RSquare 0.2382	RSquare Adj 0.2031	Cp -4.692347	AIC -5.75919	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"
		Intercept						Estimate 1.81216578	nDF 1	SS 0	0.000 1.0000
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}						0	1	0.094899	0.108 0.7439
		whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}						0	1	0.187166	0.213 0.6463
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}						0	1	0.097644	0.111 0.7404
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}						0.58890374	1	6.222779	0.0094 0.932539
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}						0	1	6.378797	0.432 0.5135
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}						0	1	0.085522	0.097 0.7565
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}						0	1	2.145915	2.526 0.1169
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}						0	1	0.919992	1.059 0.3073
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}						0	1	1.104542	1.276 0.2630
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}						0	1	0.021969	0.025 0.8752
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}						0	1	0.067513	0.077 0.7829
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}						0	1	0.425571	0.485 0.4885
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}						0	1	0.099378	0.113 0.7382
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}						0	1	0.254533	0.289 0.5924
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}						0	1	0.021969	0.025 0.8752
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}						0	1	3.009277	3.599 0.0623
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}						0	1	0.49241	0.562 0.4560
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}						0	1	0.073168	0.083 0.7743
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}						0	1	0.372773	0.425 0.5169
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}						0	1	0.326579	0.372 0.5441
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}						0	1	0.659481	0.755 0.3880
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}						0	1	0.905359	1.042 0.3113
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}						0	1	2.336888	2.760 0.1015
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}						0	1	0.690519	0.791 0.3770
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}						0	1	1.58186	1.843 0.1794
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}						0	1	0.010011	0.011 0.9155
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}						0	1	0.027099	0.031 0.8615
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}						-0.3961676	1	4.711611	5.418 0.0231
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}						0	1	0.848116	0.975 0.3272
		whatprocessCM{0-1}						0	1	0.341952	0.390 0.5348
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}						0	1	0.001773	0.002 0.9644
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}						0.30481283	1	5.345948	6.147 0.0158
		whatproductsustom{0-1}						0	1	0.112019	0.127 0.7226
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}						0	1	0.474052	0.541 0.4646
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}						0	1	1.239521	1.435 0.2354
		whatproductsnone{0-1}						0	1	0.108289	0.123 0.7271

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0029	9.252899	0.1247	-0.301	2
2	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0496	3.712542	0.1747	-1.999	3
3	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.0231	4.711611	0.2382	-4.692	4

Response Column 53
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.238226
RSquare Adj	0.203067
Root Mean Square Error	0.932539
Mean of Response	2.710145
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	69

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	3	17.677052	5.89235	6.7757
Error	65	56.525847	0.86963	Prob > F
C. Total	68	74.202899		0.0005

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	2	0.470291	0.235146	0.2643
Pure Error	63	56.055556	0.889771	Prob > F
Total Error	65	56.525847		0.7686
				Max RSq
				0.2446

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	2.3097148	0.315128	7.33	<.0001
whattypesystemsdevice{1-0}	-1.177807	0.4403	-2.68	0.0094
whatprocesscoding{1-0}	0.7923351	0.340401	2.33	0.0231
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	-0.609626	0.245877	-2.48	0.0158

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
Whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	6.2227790	7.1557	0.0094
Whatprocesscoding	1	1	4.7116115	5.4180	0.0231
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	5.3459482	6.1474	0.0158

RlzResponseOrg = 2.31 + (-1.18)sys-device + (-.61)proc-SWEngSup + (.79)proc-coding

Exact formula included in dissertation [11].

For additional confidence, revalidate it a second time with a different goal realization:

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Goal Realizations (Response to Customer)

Response:
Column 53

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.050
Prob to Leave 0.100

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
50.113114		61	0.8215265	0.3134	0.2684	5.0181432	-8.17455			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	3.22599671	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.483542	1	3.299417	4.016	0.0495			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.732816	0.890	0.3491			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.039665	0.048	0.8282			
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0.50514003	1	4.534135	5.519	0.0221			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.017865	0.021	0.8842			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.000048	0.000	0.9940			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	1.489246	1.838	0.1803			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.277158	1.569	0.2152			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.297152	0.358	0.5519			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	1.258009	1.545	0.2187			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.080823	0.097	0.7566			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.414954	0.501	0.4818			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.071278	0.085	0.7710			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.005279	0.006	0.9369			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	1.258009	1.545	0.2187			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.7524053	1	4.343437	5.287	0.0249			
		whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	0.21359	0.257	0.6142			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.059232	0.071	0.7908			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.437746	0.529	0.4700			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.034148	0.041	0.8404			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.71897	0.873	0.3538			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.197592	0.238	0.6278			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.70859	0.861	0.3573			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.20126	0.242	0.6246			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.013362	0.016	0.8998			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.165089	0.198	0.6577			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	1.326795	1.632	0.2064			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.586029	1.961	0.1666			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	2.140979	2.678	0.1070			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.061198	0.073	0.7874			
		whatprocess toolsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.011529	1.236	0.2707			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.42454695	1	9.945977	12.107	0.0009			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.026689	0.032	0.8587			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.32977	0.397	0.5308			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.830003	1.010	0.3188			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.866997	1.056	0.3082			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0028	9.585455	0.1313	15.196	2
2	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0119	6.107857	0.2150	9.7586	3
3	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.0378	3.879006	0.2682	7.0355	4
4	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0495	3.299417	0.3134	5.0181	5

Response Column 53 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.313376
RSquare Adj	0.268352
Root Mean Square Error	0.906381
Mean of Response	2.651515
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	66

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	4	22.871735	5.71793	6.9601
Error	61	50.113114	0.82153	Prob > F
C. Total	65	72.984848		0.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	3	2.106703	0.702234	0.8484
Pure Error	58	48.006410	0.827697	Prob > F
Total Error	61	50.113114		0.4731
				Max RSq
				0.3422

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	2.9197364	0.141338	20.66	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	0.967084	0.482566	2.00	0.0495
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	-1.01028	0.430037	-2.35	0.0221
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.5048105	0.654449	2.30	0.0249
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	-0.849094	0.24403	-3.48	0.0009

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	3.2994168	4.0162	0.0495
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	4.5341346	5.5192	0.0221
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	4.3434369	5.2870	0.0249
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	9.9459772	12.1067	0.0009

RlzResponseCust = 2.92 + (-.85)proc-SWEngSup + (1.50)ent-OES + (.97)sys-avia + (-1.01)sys-dev

Again, exact formula included in dissertation [11].

Given the number of indicator variables of both formulas, there is an extremely high confidence that these modeling methods are exactly the same as those practiced during the dissertation.

Appendix B - New Survey Data Consequence Models

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (Cost)

Response:
Column 39

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	Entered	Parameter	SSE 79.357834	DFE 39	MSE 2.0348162	RSquare 0.3547	RSquare Adj 0.2554	Cp -13.95063	AIC 39.08499	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"
		Intercept								0.000	1.0000	
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}								1.009938	0.490	0.4883
		whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}								0.38648	0.186	0.6687
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}								6.932706	3.407	0.0725
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}								0.054901	0.026	0.8720
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}								0.626525	0.302	0.5856
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}								0.078013	0.037	0.8477
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}								2.002562	0.984	0.3276
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}								1.046793	0.508	0.4804
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}								15.79366	7.762	0.0082
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}								1.788671	0.876	0.3551
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}								0.359632	0.173	0.6798
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}								1.501858	0.733	0.3973
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}								1.13712	0.552	0.4619
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}								4.29575	2.111	0.1542
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}								10.52068	5.170	0.0286
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}								1.505615	0.735	0.3967
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}								1.547712	0.756	0.3901
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}								0.103145	0.049	0.8252
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}								0.488836	0.236	0.6302
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}								1.821753	0.893	0.3507
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}								0.055011	0.026	0.8719
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}								0.1246	0.060	0.8082
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}								0.302146	0.145	0.7053
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}								0.018649	0.009	0.9252
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}								1.595572	0.780	0.3828
		whatprocessCM{0-1}								0.02836	0.014	0.9078
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}								0.211393	0.101	0.7518
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}								0.179373	0.086	0.7708
		whatprocessnone{0-1}								0.212452	0.102	0.7512
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}								17.4708	8.586	0.0056
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}								0.567121	0.274	0.6040
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}								4.87761	2.397	0.1296
		whatproductsnone{0-1}								0.098	0.047	0.8296

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0849	8.110728	0.0660	-15.87	2
2	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0778	8.106118	0.1319	-15.72	3
3	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.0658	8.361054	0.1999	-15.62	4
4	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0462	9.19192	0.2746	-15.71	5
5	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1110	5.554858	0.3198	-14.97	6
6	whattypeenterprise manufact{0-1}	Entered	0.1542	4.29575	0.3547	-13.95	7

Response Column 39 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.3547
RSquare Adj	0.255423
Root Mean Square Error	1.42647
Mean of Response	2.978261
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	46

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	6	43.62043	7.27007	3.5728
Error	39	79.35783	2.03482	Prob > F
C. Total	45	122.97826		0.0065

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	8	19.552278	2.44403	1.2669
Pure Error	31	59.805556	1.92921	Prob > F
Total Error	39	79.357834		0.2960
				Max RSq
				0.5137

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.7027908	0.413969	8.94	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	0.9399542	0.509235	1.85	0.0725
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-3.329864	1.19522	-2.79	0.0082
whattypeenterprise manufact[1-0]	1.3618402	0.93728	1.45	0.1542
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	-1.721772	0.75721	-2.27	0.0286
whatproductscustom[1-0]	-1.378167	0.470336	-2.93	0.0056
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.8923054	0.576332	1.55	0.1296

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	6.932706	3.4070	0.0725
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	15.793655	7.7617	0.0082
whattypeenterprise manufact	1	1	4.295750	2.1111	0.1542
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	10.520685	5.1703	0.0286
whatproductscustom	1	1	17.470805	8.5859	0.0056
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	4.877610	2.3971	0.1296

Cost = 3.70 + (.94)sys-comm + (-3.33)comp-case + (1.36)ent-mnft + (-1.72)ent-pay + (-1.38)prod-cust + (.89)prod-cumcust

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (Schedule)

Response:
Column 40

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 39.131272	DfE 36	MSE 1.0869798	RSquare 0.5056	RSquare Adj 0.3820	Cp -6.218063	AIC 12.56091		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDf	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	2.52914565	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0	1	1.016683	0.934	0.3406		
	X	whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	-0.4035016	1	1.553509	1.429	0.2397		
		whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	0.176682	0.159	0.6927		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	1.24929933	1	16.72195	15.384	0.0004		
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	-0.5496872	1	9.960641	9.164	0.0045		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	-0.5516462	1	2.622341	2.413	0.1291		
		whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	1.283646	1.187	0.2834		
		whattypescomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	0.00319	0.003	0.9577		
		whattypescomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	0.078564	0.070	0.7923		
		whattypescomponentclass(0-1)	0	1	0.013307	0.012	0.9137		
		whattypescomponentOS(0-1)	0	1	0.19009	0.171	0.6819		
		whattypescomponentdevelopment(0-1)	0	1	0.178055	0.160	0.6916		
	X	whattypesenterpriseacctng(0-1)	0.57666194	1	4.99132	4.592	0.0390		
		whattypesenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	1.116452	1.028	0.3176		
		whattypesenterprise payroll(0-1)	0	1	0.812725	0.742	0.3948		
	X	whattypesenterprise scripting(0-1)	0.89995918	1	5.758236	5.297	0.0273		
		whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.651667	0.593	0.4465		
		whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0	1	0.080085	0.072	0.7903		
		whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.199797	0.180	0.6743		
	X	whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0.46394251	1	6.252855	5.753	0.0218		
	X	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	-0.4486158	1	5.455645	5.019	0.0313		
		whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.069306	0.062	0.8047		
	X	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	-0.6298988	1	9.797314	9.013	0.0048		
		whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	0.008293	0.007	0.9318		
		whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0	1	0.047741	0.043	0.8374		
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.218545	0.197	0.6602		
		whatprocessCM(0-1)	0	1	0.122813	0.110	0.7419		
		whatprocessstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.000385	0.000	0.9853		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	0	1	0.001822	0.002	0.9680		
		whatproductsnone(0-1)	0	1	0.226425	0.204	0.6545		
		whatproducts custom(0-1)	0	1	0.905118	0.829	0.3689		
		whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	0.33404	0.301	0.5865		
		whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	0	1	1.153747	1.063	0.3095		
		whatproductsnone(0-1)	0	1	0.181474	0.163	0.6888		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	Entered	0.0650	5.959191	0.0753	-4.999	2
2	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.0173	9.126316	0.1906	-7.613	3
3	whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	Entered	0.0788	4.595922	0.2487	-7.936	4
4	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	Entered	0.1613	2.811707	0.2842	-7.357	5
5	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.1407	3.028336	0.3224	-6.888	6
6	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.0990	3.658833	0.3687	-6.738	7
7	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.0846	3.810213	0.4168	-6.664	8
8	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.0556	4.408042	0.4725	-6.892	9
9	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.1291	2.622341	0.5056	-6.218	10

Response Column 40
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.50562
RSquare Adj	0.382025
Root Mean Square Error	1.042583
Mean of Response	3.413043
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	46

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	40.020902	4.44677	4.0909
Error	36	39.131272	1.08698	Prob > F
C. Total	45	79.152174		0.0011

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	16	19.881272	1.24258	1.2910
Pure Error	20	19.250000	0.96250	Prob > F
Total Error	36	39.131272		0.2910
				Max RSq
				0.7568

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.1356591	0.273249	11.48	<.0001
whattypesystemsembedded[1-0]	0.8070031	0.675039	1.20	0.2397
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	-2.498599	0.637036	-3.92	0.0004
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	1.0983744	0.363172	3.03	0.0045
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.1032924	0.710324	1.55	0.1291
whattypesenterpriseacctng[1-0]	-1.153324	0.538213	-2.14	0.0390
whattypesenterprise scripting[1-0]	-1.799918	0.782022	-2.30	0.0273
whatprocessmaintenance[1-0]	-0.927885	0.386871	-2.40	0.0218
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.8972316	0.400491	2.24	0.0313
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	1.2597976	0.419622	3.00	0.0048

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsembedded	1	1	1.553509	1.4292	0.2397
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	16.721945	15.3839	0.0004
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	9.960641	9.1636	0.0045
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	2.622341	2.4125	0.1291
whattypesenterpriseacctng	1	1	4.991320	4.5919	0.0390
whattypesenterprise scripting	1	1	5.758236	5.2975	0.0273
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	6.252855	5.7525	0.0218
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	5.455645	5.0191	0.0313
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	9.797314	9.0133	0.0048

Sched = 3.14 + (.81)sys-embed + (-2.50)sys-dev + (1.10)shrink-bus + (1.10)shrink-util + (-1.15)ent-acct + (-1.80)ent-script + (-.93)proc-maint + (.90)proc-reeng + (1.26)proc-train

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (IntelCapital)

Response:
Column 40

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	28.008175	35	0.8002336	0.5829	0.4637	-5.192678	-0.82267			
Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"				
X	Intercept	5.3776271	1	0	0.000	1.0000				
	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.095315	0.116	0.7354				
	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.923402	1.159	0.2892				
	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.302138	0.371	0.5466				
X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	-0.3894834	1	1.594557	1.993	0.1669				
	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.243258	0.298	0.5888				
	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.943237	1.185	0.2840				
X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.6819844	1	11.70104	14.622	0.0005				
X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	-0.4996501	1	2.317897	2.897	0.0976				
	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.145889	0.178	0.6757				
	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.157367	0.192	0.6639				
X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.72092249	1	5.029578	6.285	0.0170				
	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.068966	0.084	0.7738				
X	whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	-0.4207597	1	2.633816	3.291	0.0782				
	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.187128	0.229	0.6356				
	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.410308	0.505	0.4819				
	whattypeenterprisescrptng{0-1}	0	1	0.02766	0.034	0.8556				
	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.489014	0.604	0.4424				
	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.032983	0.040	0.8425				
	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.425346	0.524	0.4740				
X	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	-0.40975	1	5.070822	6.337	0.0166				
	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.00577	0.007	0.9338				
	whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.146864	0.179	0.6747				
	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.368537	0.453	0.5053				
	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.748333	0.933	0.3408				
	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.133412	0.163	0.6892				
X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.38457251	1	1.115911	1.394	0.2456				
X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.73327355	1	7.324149	9.153	0.0046				
X	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	-0.7504809	1	6.372963	7.964	0.0078				
X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.6836766	1	8.930003	11.159	0.0020				
	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.333058	0.409	0.5267				
	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.415287	0.512	0.4793				
	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.067629	0.082	0.7760				
	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.331416	0.407	0.5277				
	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.020338	0.025	0.8760				

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0059	10.71914	0.1596	-4.106	2
2	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.0182	6.935211	0.2629	-6.763	3
3	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.0155	6.521159	0.3600	-9.141	4
4	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1331	2.327595	0.3947	-8.704	5
5	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0538	3.652109	0.4491	-9.157	6
6	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.1925	1.596481	0.4728	-8.229	7
7	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1247	2.156643	0.5049	-7.677	8
8	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.2109	1.395474	0.5257	-6.614	9
9	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1538	1.772972	0.5521	-5.805	10
10	whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	Entered	0.2097	1.340845	0.5721	-4.705	11
11	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Removed	0.4955	0.389541	0.5663	-6.443	10
12	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.2456	1.115911	0.5829	-5.193	11

Response Column 40 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.582915
RSquare Adj	0.463748
Root Mean Square Error	0.894558
Mean of Response	4.413043
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	46

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	39.143999	3.91440	4.8916
Error	35	28.008175	0.80023	Prob > F
C. Total	45	67.152174		0.0002

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	17	11.496054	0.67238	0.7372
Pure Error	18	16.512121	0.917340	Prob > F
Total Error	35	28.008175		0.7330
				Max RSq
				0.7541

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.3806104	0.228154	14.82	<.0001
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	0.7789669	0.551833	1.41	0.1669
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	1.3639689	0.356698	3.82	0.0005
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	0.9993003	0.587161	1.70	0.0976
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-1.441845	0.575124	-2.51	0.0170
whattypeenterpriseactng[1-0]	0.8415194	0.463852	1.81	0.0782
whatprocessmaintenance[1-0]	0.8195	0.32555	2.52	0.0166
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.769145	0.651331	-1.18	0.2456
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.466547	0.484759	-3.03	0.0046
whatprocesstoolsuppt[1-0]	1.5009619	0.531872	2.82	0.0078
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	1.3673532	0.40932	3.34	0.0020

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	1.594557	1.9926	0.1669
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	11.701037	14.6220	0.0005
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	2.317897	2.8965	0.0976
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	5.029578	6.2851	0.0170
whattypeenterpriseactng	1	1	2.633816	3.2913	0.0782
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	5.070822	6.3367	0.0166
whatprocessfielding	1	1	1.115911	1.3945	0.2456
whatprocessCM	1	1	7.324149	9.1525	0.0046
whatprocesstoolsuppt	1	1	6.372963	7.9639	0.0078
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	8.930003	11.1592	0.0020

IntelCap = 3.38 + (.78)sys-dev + (1.36)shrink-int + (1.00)comp-domain + (-1.44)comp-os + (.84)ent-acct + (.82)proc-maint + (-.77)proc-field + (-1.47)proc-cm + (1.50)proc-toolsup + (1.37)proc-swengsup

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (SchedFlex)

Response:
Column 40

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	30.045838	32	0.9389324	0.7399	0.6342	-2.396465	8.407807			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	-0.3545249	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.774739	0.820	0.3720			
	X	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	1.26487859	1	16.11252	17.160	0.0002			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.14589	0.151	0.7000			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.001872	0.002	0.9652			
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0.54952738	1	11.81094	12.579	0.0012			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.078544	0.081	0.7775			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.047695	0.426	0.5186			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.068426	0.071	0.7920			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	2.50028057	1	23.25663	24.769	0.0000			
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	1.47000467	1	15.04065	16.019	0.0003			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.492675	0.517	0.4776			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0.65905834	1	7.304894	7.780	0.0088			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.9622171	1	9.845101	10.485	0.0028			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.347059	0.362	0.5516			
	X	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0.59615824	1	4.067231	4.332	0.0455			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.649942	0.685	0.4141			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.053362	0.055	0.8159			
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0.62655563	1	5.195615	5.534	0.0250			
	X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	-1.0971388	1	17.88281	19.046	0.0001			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.238712	0.248	0.6218			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.138292	0.143	0.7076			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.009611	0.010	0.9213			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.445768	0.467	0.4995			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.000094	0.000	0.9922			
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	-0.2741587	1	1.452279	1.547	0.2227			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.972452	1.037	0.3164			
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	1.50517411	1	26.74184	28.481	0.0000			
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.022699	0.023	0.8793			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.9210343	1	10.97408	11.688	0.0017			
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.043465	0.045	0.8336			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.146213	0.152	0.6997			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.612217	0.645	0.4281			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.8867386	1	14.22332	15.148	0.0005			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.007464	0.008	0.9306			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0137	15.06589	0.1304	10.158	2
2	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.0150	13.05319	0.2435	5.379	3
3	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0123	12.25009	0.3495	1.0173	4
4	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0917	5.093144	0.3936	0.3723	5
5	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1199	4.159325	0.4296	0.2122	6
6	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1981	2.773217	0.4536	0.772	7
7	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1439	3.493746	0.4839	0.9577	8
8	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0431	6.321743	0.5386	-0.325	9
9	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.1824	2.60234	0.5611	0.3232	10
10	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.1993	2.363301	0.5816	1.0958	11
11	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Removed	0.4284	0.886522	0.5739	-0.444	10
12	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1359	3.071432	0.6005	-0.039	11
13	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Removed	0.4113	0.911691	0.5926	-1.565	10
14	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	Entered	0.0511	4.913742	0.6352	-2.117	11
15	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Removed	0.3929	0.900881	0.6274	-3.649	10
16	whattypeenterprisecctng{0-1}	Entered	0.1181	2.941165	0.6528	-3.177	11
17	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.0441	4.568681	0.6924	-3.549	12
18	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0479	4.029973	0.7273	-3.642	13
19	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.2227	1.452279	0.7399	-2.396	14

Response Column 40
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.739863
RSquare Adj 0.634182
Root Mean Square Error 0.968985
Mean of Response 4.5
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 46

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	13	85.45416	6.57340	7.0009
Error	32	30.04584	0.93893	Prob > F
C. Total	45	115.50000		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	19	25.379171	1.33575	3.7210
Pure Error	13	4.666667	0.35897	Prob > F
Total Error	32	30.045838		0.0096
			Max RSq	0.9596

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.6758251	0.357505	13.08	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-2.529757	0.610681	-4.14	0.0002
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	-1.099055	0.309881	-3.55	0.0012
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-5.000561	1.00476	-4.98	<.0001
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-2.940009	0.734569	-4.00	0.0003
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	-1.318117	0.472568	-2.79	0.0088
whattypeenterprisecctng[1-0]	1.9244342	0.594306	3.24	0.0028
whattypeenterprisepayroll[1-0]	-1.192316	0.572874	-2.08	0.0455
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-1.253111	0.532707	-2.35	0.0250
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	2.1942777	0.502795	4.36	0.0001
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	0.5483174	0.440884	1.24	0.2227
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-3.010348	0.564077	-5.34	<.0001
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	1.8420686	0.538814	3.42	0.0017
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	1.7734772	0.455661	3.89	0.0005

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	16.112522	17.1605	0.0002
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	11.810936	12.5791	0.0012
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	23.256633	24.7692	<.0001
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	15.040651	16.0189	0.0003
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	7.304894	7.7800	0.0088
whattypeenterprisecctng	1	1	9.845101	10.4854	0.0028
whattypeenterprisepayroll	1	1	4.067231	4.3318	0.0455
whatprocessdesign	1	1	5.195615	5.5335	0.0250
whatprocesstesting	1	1	17.882806	19.0459	0.0001
whatprocesscoding	1	1	1.452279	1.5467	0.2227
whatprocessCM	1	1	26.741840	28.4811	<.0001
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	10.974078	11.6878	0.0017
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	14.223322	15.1484	0.0005

SchedFlex = 4.68 + sys-embed(-2.53) + shrink-bus(-1.10) + comp-CASE(-5.00) + comp-class(-2.94) + comp-dev(-1.32) + ent-acct(1.92) + ent-pay(-1.19) + proc-des(-1.25) + proc-test(2.19) + proc-coding(0.55) + proc-CM(-3.01) + proc-SWEngSup(1.84) + prod-comcust(1.77)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (AdminOverhead)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	66.493031	36	1.8470286	0.5283	0.4103	-8.477527	36.94896		
Lock	Entered	Parameter			Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"
		Intercept			1.72251624	1	0	0.000	1.0000
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}			0	1	0.658375	0.350	0.5579
		whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}			0	1	0.243243	0.129	0.7221
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}			0	1	0.94832	0.506	0.4814
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}			0	1	1.277188	0.685	0.4133
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}			0	1	0.027209	0.014	0.9054
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}			0	1	1.785783	0.966	0.3324
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}			-0.3887688	1	3.906444	2.115	0.1545
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}			0	1	0.160176	0.085	0.7730
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}			0	1	1.715916	0.927	0.3422
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}			1.10308015	1	11.313	6.125	0.0182
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}			0.92052294	1	8.508319	4.606	0.0387
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}			0	1	0.009701	0.005	0.9434
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}			0	1	0.339783	0.180	0.6742
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}			0	1	0.124606	0.066	0.7992
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}			0	1	0.991785	0.530	0.4715
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}			0	1	0.038605	0.020	0.8874
	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}			-0.6649058	1	10.37938	5.620	0.0232
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}			0	1	0.747069	0.398	0.5324
	X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}			0.6084427	1	11.59251	6.276	0.0169
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}			0	1	0.02869	0.015	0.9029
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}			0	1	1.031179	0.551	0.4627
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}			0	1	0.466099	0.247	0.6223
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}			0	1	0.022942	0.012	0.9131
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}			0	1	0.379908	0.201	0.6566
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}			0	1	0.985615	0.527	0.4729
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}			0	1	0.78763	0.420	0.5214
		whatprocessCM{0-1}			0	1	0.313446	0.166	0.6864
	X	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}			-0.7607488	1	10.2072	5.526	0.0243
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}			0.8481211	1	15.13001	8.192	0.0070
		whatprocessnone{0-1}			0	1	0.178195	0.094	0.7609
		whatproductscustom{0-1}			0	1	0.680208	0.362	0.5514
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}			0	1	0.001691	0.001	0.9764
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}			-0.3922808	1	3.025995	1.638	0.2087
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}			1.2731605	1	23.11573	12.515	0.0011

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0058	22.63457	0.1606	-10.82	2
2	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0405	11.12195	0.2395	-11.75	3
3	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1290	5.790476	0.2806	-11.28	4
4	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1492	5.077765	0.3166	-10.61	5
5	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0503	8.90479	0.3798	-10.96	6
6	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1232	5.230746	0.4169	-10.34	7
7	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0382	8.891698	0.4799	-10.68	8
8	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1641	3.785499	0.5068	-9.68	9
9	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.2087	3.025995	0.5283	-8.478	10

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.528273
RSquare Adj	0.410341
Root Mean Square Error	1.359054
Mean of Response	3.608696
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	46

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	74.46349	8.27372	4.4795
Error	36	66.49303	1.84703	Prob > F
C. Total	45	140.95652		0.0005

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	17	39.147793	2.30281	1.6000
Pure Error	19	27.345238	1.43922	Prob > F
Total Error	36	66.493031		0.1610
				Max RSq
				0.8060

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.2691395	0.425788	10.03	<.0001
whattypeshrinkinternet{1-0}	0.7775376	0.534647	1.45	0.1545
whattypecomponentclass{1-0}	-2.20616	0.891425	-2.47	0.0182
whattypecomponentOS{1-0}	-1.841046	0.857787	-2.15	0.0387
whatprocessrequirements{1-0}	1.3298116	0.560972	2.37	0.0232
whatprocesstesting{1-0}	-1.216885	0.485733	-2.51	0.0169
whatprocessstoolsupt{1-0}	1.5214975	0.647224	2.35	0.0243
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	-1.696242	0.592659	-2.86	0.0070
whatproductscommoncust{1-0}	0.7845615	0.612957	1.28	0.2087
whatproductsnone{1-0}	-2.546321	0.719774	-3.54	0.0011

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	3.906444	2.1150	0.1545
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	11.312998	6.1250	0.0182
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	8.508319	4.6065	0.0387
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	10.379384	5.6195	0.0232
whatprocesstesting	1	1	11.592515	6.2763	0.0169
whatprocessstoolsupt	1	1	10.207198	5.5263	0.0243
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	15.130015	8.1915	0.0070
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	3.025995	1.6383	0.2087
whatproductsnone	1	1	23.115732	12.5151	0.0011

AdminOverhead = 4.27 + shrink-int(0.78) + comp-class(-2.21) + comp-OS(-1.84) + proc-req(1.33) + proc-test(-1.22) + proc-toolsup(1.52) + proc-SWEngSup(-1.70) + prod-comcust(0.78) + prod-none(-2.55)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (ControlProcess)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	40.357179	33	1.2229448	0.6331	0.4997	-0.041754	19.97988		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	4.62803471	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
	X	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	-1.0541902	1	7.475665	6.113	0.0187		
	X	whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	0	1	0.006575	0.005	0.9429		
	X	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	0.982319	0.798	0.3783		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	-0.8931264	1	9.175545	7.503	0.0099		
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.612079	0.493	0.4878		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	0.74174585	1	4.888518	3.997	0.0539		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	0.951513	0.773	0.3859		
	X	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	0.002036	0.002	0.9682		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	0.04261	0.034	0.8552		
	X	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	0	1	0.345931	0.277	0.6025		
	X	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	0.74050624	1	4.419838	3.614	0.0661		
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	-0.8331768	1	16.06059	13.133	0.0010		
	X	whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	0	1	0.54165	0.435	0.5141		
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0.50193772	1	2.415963	1.976	0.1692		
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	0.51834656	1	3.146373	2.573	0.1182		
	X	whattypeenterprise describing(0-1)	0	1	0.125498	0.100	0.7541		
	X	whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.116795	0.093	0.7625		
	X	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0	1	0.542842	0.436	0.5136		
	X	whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.12514	0.100	0.7544		
	X	whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	0.199997	0.159	0.6924		
	X	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0	1	0.149328	0.119	0.7325		
	X	whatprocessappsuppt(0-1)	-0.5635149	1	9.294997	7.601	0.0094		
	X	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	0	1	0.176959	0.141	0.7098		
	X	whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	0.515109	0.414	0.5247		
	X	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0.57219524	1	7.618211	6.229	0.0177		
	X	whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.331069	0.265	0.6105		
	X	whatprocessCM(0-1)	0	1	0.008992	0.007	0.9332		
	X	whatprocessstoolsuppt(0-1)	0	1	0.119657	0.095	0.7597		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	-0.5495356	1	7.75271	6.339	0.0168		
	X	whatproductnone(0-1)	0	1	0.371568	0.297	0.5893		
	X	whatproducts custom(0-1)	0	1	1.425588	1.172	0.2871		
	X	whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	-0.4300807	1	3.895401	3.185	0.0835		
	X	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	0	1	0.000772	0.001	0.9804		
	X	whatproductsnone(0-1)	0.58467308	1	4.759368	3.892	0.0570		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	Entered	0.0136	14.36098	0.1306	5.2973	2
2	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.0890	6.330916	0.1881	4.1664	3
3	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	Entered	0.0649	7.03668	0.2521	2.6865	4
4	whatprocessappsuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.0341	8.631018	0.3305	0.4181	5
5	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	Entered	0.0120	10.86669	0.4293	-2.956	6
6	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.1698	2.997959	0.4566	-2.438	7
7	whattypeenterprise manufact(0-1)	Entered	0.1353	3.451219	0.4880	-2.145	8
8	whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	Removed	0.2866	1.731321	0.4722	-3.289	7
9	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	Entered	0.1225	3.577699	0.5047	-3.058	8
10	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	Entered	0.1335	3.257695	0.5344	-2.669	9
11	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.1407	3.036362	0.5620	-2.171	10
12	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.2302	1.968589	0.5799	-1.145	11
13	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	Entered	0.2378	1.88283	0.5970	-0.076	12
14	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Entered	0.1842	2.341313	0.6183	0.7664	13
15	whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	Entered	0.1953	2.177043	0.6381	1.6898	14
16	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	Removed	0.5136	0.542842	0.6331	-0.042	13

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.633117
RSquare Adj 0.499704
Root Mean Square Error 1.105868
Mean of Response 4
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 46

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	12	69.64282	5.80357	4.7456
Error	33	40.35718	1.22294	Prob > F
C. Total	45	110.00000		0.0002

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	19	16.523845	0.86968	0.5109
Pure Error	14	23.833333	1.70238	Prob > F
Total Error	33	40.357179		0.9136

Max RSq 0.7833

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.9638148	0.482208	8.22	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	2.1083804	0.852761	2.47	0.0187
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	1.7862529	0.652124	2.74	0.0099
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	-1.483492	0.741993	-2.00	0.0539
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-1.481012	0.779039	-1.90	0.0661
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	1.6663535	0.459822	3.62	0.0010
whattypeenterprise manufact[1-0]	-1.003875	0.71423	-1.41	0.1692
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	-1.036693	0.646321	-1.60	0.1182
whatprocessappsuppt[1-0]	1.1270298	0.408803	2.76	0.0094
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	-1.14439	0.458512	-2.50	0.0177
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	1.0990712	0.436518	2.52	0.0168
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.8601614	0.481956	1.78	0.0835
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.169346	0.59275	-1.97	0.0570

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	7.475665	6.1128	0.0187
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	9.175545	7.5028	0.0099
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	4.888518	3.9973	0.0539
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	4.419838	3.6141	0.0661
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	16.060592	13.1327	0.0010
whattypeenterprise manufact	1	1	2.415963	1.9755	0.1692
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	3.146373	2.5728	0.1182
whatprocessappsuppt	1	1	9.294997	7.6005	0.0094
whatprocesscoding	1	1	7.618211	6.2294	0.0177
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	7.752710	6.3394	0.0168
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	3.895401	3.1853	0.0835
whatproductsnone	1	1	4.759368	3.8917	0.0570

ControlProcess = 3.96 + sys-avia(2.11) + sys-dev(1.79) + shrink-util(-1.48) + comp-OS(-1.48) + comp-dev(1.67) + ent-mnt(-1.00) + ent-pay(-1.04) + proc-appsup(1.13) + proc-coding(-1.14) + proc-SWEngSup(1.10) + prod-COTS(0.86) + prod-none(-1.17)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (InhouseNonCore)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC				
	68.748275	36	1.9096743	0.4379	0.3130	-9.489059	37.07051				
Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"					
X	Intercept	3.67722738	1	0	0.000	1.0000					
	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.21318	0.109	0.7434					
	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	2.378225	1.254	0.2704					
	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0.45975878	1	6.309406	3.304	0.0774					
	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.000025	0.000	0.9972					
	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	1.800434	0.941	0.3386					
	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.273127	0.140	0.7109					
	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	2.56645	1.357	0.2519					
	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	2.168816	1.140	0.2929					
	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.103161	0.053	0.8199					
	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.938755	0.485	0.4910					
X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	-0.7376424	1	5.829117	3.052	0.0891					
X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-0.9305903	1	17.64985	9.242	0.0044					
	whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	0.012153	0.006	0.9377					
	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.507536	0.785	0.3818					
	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.302058	0.154	0.6967					
X	whattypeenterprisepricing{0-1}	0.95375526	1	5.802359	3.038	0.0899					
X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.49754348	1	6.086739	3.187	0.0826					
X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-1.0324573	1	17.46322	9.145	0.0046					
X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.44558849	1	3.612591	1.892	0.1775					
	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.079447	0.040	0.8417					
X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.6845377	1	12.31559	6.449	0.0156					
	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.654793	0.863	0.3592					
	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.090482	0.046	0.8312					
	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.606468	0.312	0.5803					
	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.503721	0.258	0.6145					
	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.064179	0.033	0.8575					
	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.002951	0.002	0.9693					
	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.304139	0.156	0.6957					
	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.378606	0.194	0.6625					
	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.984983	0.509	0.4804					
	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.013459	0.007	0.9345					
	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	1.08586	0.562	0.4586					
	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.708652	0.365	0.5499					
	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	2.123857	1.116	0.2981					

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.0341	12.25472	0.1002	-12.97	2
2	whattypeenterprisepricing{0-1}	Entered	0.0872	7.489056	0.1614	-12.88	3
3	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0798	7.482582	0.2226	-12.78	4
4	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.1528	4.793857	0.2618	-12	5
5	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0817	6.833933	0.3177	-11.74	6
6	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1170	5.292407	0.3609	-11.09	7
7	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0933	5.80309	0.4084	-10.57	8
8	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1775	3.612591	0.4379	-9.489	9

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.437923
RSquare Adj	0.313017
Root Mean Square Error	1.38191
Mean of Response	3.355556
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	8	53.56284	6.69535	3.5060
Error	36	68.74827	1.90967	Prob > F
C. Total	44	122.31111		0.0043

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	15	35.057798	2.33719	1.4568
Pure Error	21	33.690476	1.60431	Prob > F
Total Error	36	68.748275		0.2094
				Max RSQ
				0.7246

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	2.6486457	0.372972	7.10	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	-0.919518	0.505878	-1.82	0.0774
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	1.4752848	0.844411	1.75	0.0891
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	1.8611806	0.612206	3.04	0.0044
whattypeenterprisepricing[1-0]	-1.907511	1.09432	-1.74	0.0899
whatprocessrequirements[1-0]	-0.995087	0.557376	-1.79	0.0826
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	2.0649145	0.682841	3.02	0.0046
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	-0.891177	0.647939	-1.38	0.1775
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	1.3690755	0.539113	2.54	0.0156

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	6.309406	3.3039	0.0774
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	5.829117	3.0524	0.0891
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	17.649854	9.2423	0.0044
whattypeenterprisepricing	1	1	5.802359	3.0384	0.0899
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	6.086739	3.1873	0.0826
whatprocessdesign	1	1	17.463218	9.1446	0.0046
whatprocesstesting	1	1	3.612591	1.8917	0.1775
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	12.315587	6.4491	0.0156

InhouseNonCore = 2.65 + sys-comm(-0.92) + comp-OS(1.48) + comp-dev(1.86) + ent-script(-1.91) + proc-req(-1.00) + proc-des(2.06) + proc-test(-0.89) + proc-reeng(1.37)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (InhouseTurnover)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	57.912676	34	1.703314	0.5111	0.3961	-10.1893	30.80266			
Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"				
X	Intercept	4.13724751	1	0	0.000	1.0000				
	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.000166	0.000	0.9923				
	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	1.543722	0.904	0.3487				
	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.454364	0.850	0.3632				
	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.459877	0.264	0.6107				
	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.394162	0.226	0.6375				
	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.05437	0.031	0.8613				
	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.405376	0.233	0.6328				
	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.000589	0.000	0.9855				
	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.019528	0.011	0.9166				
	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.869941	0.503	0.4830				
X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	-0.8695159	1	7.386944	4.337	0.0449				
X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-1.1051889	1	22.17177	13.017	0.0010				
	whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	0.193319	0.111	0.7416				
	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.009041	0.585	0.4497				
	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	1.184276	0.689	0.4125				
X	whattypeenterprisepricing{0-1}	0.82642342	1	4.283826	2.515	0.1220				
X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.52842467	1	6.477252	3.803	0.0595				
X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-1.2358544	1	20.95883	12.305	0.0013				
X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.44130819	1	3.48425	2.046	0.1618				
	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.21965	0.126	0.7253				
X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.5557235	1	8.417279	4.942	0.0330				
	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.015946	0.589	0.4482				
	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.020602	0.012	0.9144				
X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0.36214878	1	3.103879	1.822	0.1860				
	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.839887	0.486	0.4908				
	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.001083	0.001	0.9803				
	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.045667	0.026	0.8728				
	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.715542	0.413	0.5250				
	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.305319	0.175	0.6785				
	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.662922	0.382	0.5407				
	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.014433	0.008	0.9283				
	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	2.256711	1.338	0.2557				
	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.012959	0.007	0.9320				
	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.724134	0.418	0.5225				

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.0111	17.43809	0.1472	-13.16	2
2	whattypeenterprisepricing{0-1}	Entered	0.0471	9.590618	0.2282	-13.52	3
3	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0925	6.479512	0.2829	-13.27	4
4	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0937	6.132822	0.3346	-12.84	5
5	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0302	9.513617	0.4149	-13.27	6
6	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0857	5.532208	0.4616	-12.69	7
7	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.2165	2.761694	0.4849	-11.4	8
8	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.1860	3.103879	0.5111	-10.19	9

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.511142
RSquare Adj	0.396116
Root Mean Square Error	1.305111
Mean of Response	3.418605
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	43

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	8	60.55244	7.56906	4.4437
Error	34	57.91268	1.70331	Prob > F
C. Total	42	118.46512		0.0009

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	13	27.571009	2.12085	1.4679
Pure Error	21	30.341667	1.44484	Prob > F
Total Error	34	57.912676		0.2101
				Max RSq
				0.7439

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	2.5292699	0.363179	6.96	<.0001
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	1.7390318	0.835069	2.08	0.0449
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	2.2103778	0.612652	3.61	0.0010
whattypeenterprisepricing[1-0]	-1.652847	1.042231	-1.59	0.1220
whatprocessrequirements[1-0]	-1.056849	0.541957	-1.95	0.0595
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	2.4717088	0.70463	3.51	0.0013
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	-0.882616	0.617113	-1.43	0.1618
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	1.1114471	0.499977	2.22	0.0330
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	-0.724298	0.536552	-1.35	0.1860

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	7.386944	4.3368	0.0449
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	22.171768	13.0168	0.0010
whattypeenterprisepricing	1	1	4.283826	2.5150	0.1220
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	6.477252	3.8027	0.0595
whatprocessdesign	1	1	20.958829	12.3047	0.0013
whatprocesstesting	1	1	3.484250	2.0456	0.1618
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	8.417279	4.9417	0.0330
whatprocessspecification	1	1	3.103879	1.8223	0.1860

InhouseTurnover = 2.53 + comp-OS(1.74) + comp-dev(2.21) + ent-script(-1.65) + proc-req(-1.06) + proc-des(2.47) + proc-test(-0.88) + proc-reeng(1.11) + proc-spec(-0.72)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (LearningCurve)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DfE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
Lock	41.438313	34	1.2187739	0.5889	0.4680	-7.750854	18.28945		
Entered									
X	X	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
		Intercept	1.23539973	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0	1	0.000299	0.000	0.9878		
		whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	0	1	0.259381	0.208	0.6514		
		whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	1.366663	1.125	0.2964		
		whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	0	1	0.452377	0.364	0.5503		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.016396	0.013	0.9097		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	-0.7719827	1	6.343735	5.205	0.0289		
		whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	0.579157	0.468	0.4988		
		whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	1.362002	1.122	0.2973		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	1.86132029	1	21.98134	18.036	0.0002		
	X	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	0.94998532	1	7.770041	6.375	0.0164		
		whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	0	1	0.732961	0.594	0.4463		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	0	1	0.004251	0.003	0.9540		
		whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	0	1	0.428255	0.345	0.5612		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	0.086193	0.069	0.7947		
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	0.56870351	1	3.55341	2.916	0.0968		
		whattypeenterprise describing(0-1)	0	1	0.026351	0.021	0.8857		
		whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.180064	0.144	0.7067		
		whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0	1	0.727565	0.590	0.4480		
		whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.690856	0.560	0.4598		
		whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	0.151973	0.121	0.7297		
		whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0	1	0.535668	0.432	0.5155		
	X	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	-0.3219125	1	3.020342	2.478	0.1247		
	X	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	0.34924856	1	3.485787	2.860	0.1000		
		whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	0.559616	0.452	0.5062		
	X	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	-0.6474073	1	8.693202	7.133	0.0115		
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.654328	0.529	0.4720		
	X	whatprocessCM(0-1)	0.30777557	1	2.27584	1.867	0.1808		
		whatprocessstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.303821	0.244	0.6248		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	0	1	1.156005	0.947	0.3376		
	X	whatproductnone(0-1)	0.57478303	1	1.953073	1.602	0.2142		
		whatproducts custom(0-1)	0	1	1.291256	1.061	0.3104		
		whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	1.045496	0.854	0.3621		
	X	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	-0.9563475	1	17.95584	14.733	0.0005		
		whatproductsnone(0-1)	0	1	0.734908	0.596	0.4457		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.0351	10	0.0992	-7.586	2
2	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Entered	0.0268	10.12252	0.1996	-9.311	3
3	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	Entered	0.1058	5.046105	0.2497	-9.168	4
4	whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	Entered	0.1029	4.924839	0.2985	-8.98	5
5	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	Entered	0.0378	7.49027	0.3729	-9.737	6
6	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	Entered	0.0351	7.060514	0.4429	-10.33	7
7	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Removed	0.4083	1.032976	0.4327	-11.95	6
8	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.0305	6.711225	0.4992	-12.42	7
9	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	Entered	0.2038	2.184358	0.5209	-11.23	8
10	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	Entered	0.2406	1.83699	0.5391	-9.904	9
11	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.2133	2.039165	0.5594	-8.655	10
12	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Removed	0.3283	1.24708	0.5470	-10.2	9
13	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	Entered	0.2198	1.949916	0.5663	-8.913	10
14	whatprocessCM(0-1)	Entered	0.1808	2.27584	0.5889	-7.751	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.588906
RSquare Adj 0.467996
Root Mean Square Error 1.103981
Mean of Response 3.933333
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	59.36169	5.93617	4.8706
Error	34	41.43831	1.21877	Prob > F
C. Total	44	100.80000		0.0002

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	16	18.882758	1.18017	0.9418
Pure Error	18	22.555556	1.25309	Prob > F
Total Error	34	41.438313		0.5445
				Max RSq
				0.7762

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.1495661	0.46397	6.79	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.5439654	0.676747	2.28	0.0289
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-3.722641	0.876568	-4.25	0.0002
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-1.899971	0.752483	-2.52	0.0164
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	-1.137407	0.666124	-1.71	0.0968
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	0.6438249	0.408979	1.57	0.1247
whatprocesstraining[1-0]	-0.698497	0.413024	-1.69	0.1000
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	1.2948145	0.484819	2.67	0.0115
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-0.615551	0.450459	-1.37	0.1808
whatproductnone[1-0]	-1.149566	0.908105	-1.27	0.2142
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	1.9126951	0.498316	3.84	0.0005

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	6.343735	5.2050	0.0289
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	21.981339	18.0356	0.0002
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	7.770041	6.3753	0.0164
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	3.553410	2.9156	0.0968
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	3.020342	2.4782	0.1247
whatprocesstraining	1	1	3.485787	2.8601	0.1000
whatprocesscoding	1	1	8.693202	7.1327	0.0115
whatprocessCM	1	1	2.275840	1.8673	0.1808
whatproductnone	1	1	1.953073	1.6025	0.2142
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	17.955837	14.7327	0.0005

LearningCurve = 3.15 + shrink-util(1.54) + comp-CASE(-3.72) + comp-class(-1.90) + ent-pay(-1.14) + proc-appsup(0.64) + proc-train(-0.70) + proc-coding(1.29) + proc-CM(-0.62) + proc-none(-1.15) + prod-comcust(1.91)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (Risk)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	63.741188	39	1.6343894	0.3799	0.3005	-17.17227	27.66758			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X		Intercept	4.26591333	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.000668	0.000	0.9842			
	X	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	-0.506609	1	2.600154	1.591	0.2147			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.023497	0.014	0.9064			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.00048	0.000	0.9866			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.010745	0.006	0.9366			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.756609	1	5.799576	3.548	0.0671			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.400015	0.240	0.6270			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.112491	0.067	0.7969			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	1.198648	0.728	0.3988			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.952848	0.577	0.4523			
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.74284678	1	5.689865	3.481	0.0696			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.205341	0.123	0.7279			
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	1.843708	1.132	0.2941			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.169408	0.101	0.7521			
	X	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0.49502384	1	3.338614	2.043	0.1609			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	2.07651	1.280	0.2651			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.04932	0.029	0.8647			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.064219	0.038	0.8458			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.04498	0.027	0.8707			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.008015	0.005	0.9452			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	1.359713	0.828	0.3685			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.383683	0.230	0.6342			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.01775	0.011	0.9186			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.013787	0.008	0.9282			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.1595	0.095	0.7592			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.086778	0.052	0.8212			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.335666	0.201	0.6563			
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.024257	0.014	0.9049			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.282038	0.169	0.6834			
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	2.07651	1.280	0.2651			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.491787	0.295	0.5899			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	1.618142	0.990	0.3261			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.7581899	1	14.38397	8.801	0.0051			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	1.457479	0.889	0.3516			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0136	13.72857	0.1335	-18.88	2
2	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0281	9.765056	0.2285	-19.31	3
3	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0241	9.356104	0.3195	-19.63	4
4	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	Entered	0.1480	3.608927	0.3547	-18.53	5
5	whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.2147	2.600154	0.3799	-17.17	6

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.37995
RSquare Adj	0.300456
Root Mean Square Error	1.278432
Mean of Response	3.733333
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	5	39.05881	7.81176	4.7796
Error	39	63.74119	1.63439	Prob > F
C. Total	44	102.80000		0.0017

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	3	8.794098	2.93137	1.9206
Pure Error	36	54.947090	1.52631	Prob > F
Total Error	39	63.741188		0.1437
				Max RSq
				0.4655

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.4823761	0.240018	14.51	<.0001
whattypesystemembedded[1-0]	1.0132179	0.803306	1.26	0.2147
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.5132179	0.803306	1.88	0.0671
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-1.485694	0.796262	-1.87	0.0696
whattypeenterprisepayroll[1-0]	-0.990048	0.692709	-1.43	0.1609
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	1.5163798	0.511148	2.97	0.0051

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemembedded	1	1	2.600154	1.5909	0.2147
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	5.799576	3.5485	0.0671
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	5.689865	3.4813	0.0696
whattypeenterprisepayroll	1	1	3.338614	2.0427	0.1609
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	14.383974	8.8008	0.0051

Risk = 3.48 + sys-embed(1.01) + shrink-util(1.51) + comp-OS(-1.49) + ent-pay(-0.99) + prod-comcust(1.52)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (Quality)

Response:
Column 40

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 34.726132	DfE 34	MSE 1.0213568	RSquare 0.4774	RSquare Adj 0.3236	Cp -3.414153	AIC 10.33735		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	6.72871893	1	0.000	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.091289	0.087	0.7699		
	X	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0.63501439	1	3.517759	3.444	0.0722		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.37393	0.359	0.5530		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	-0.9145133	1	10.22455	10.011	0.0033		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.317767	0.305	0.5846		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.4471425	1	1.852111	1.813	0.1870		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.4337958	1	4.585903	4.490	0.0415		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.113248	0.108	0.7445		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	-0.7193332	1	3.05832	2.994	0.0926		
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.43836462	1	1.859963	1.821	0.1861		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.122281	0.117	0.7349		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.277549	0.266	0.6095		
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	0.586581	0.567	0.4568		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.230344	0.220	0.6419		
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.105161	0.100	0.7535		
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.912346	0.890	0.3522		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.471358	0.454	0.5051		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.647233	0.627	0.4342		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.166293	0.159	0.6928		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.021091	0.020	0.8882		
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.05039	0.048	0.8280		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.153121	0.146	0.7047		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.430868	0.415	0.5241		
	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	-0.4426799	1	6.209551	6.080	0.0189		
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0.66742175	1	10.1736	9.961	0.0033		
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.445555	0.429	0.5171		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.01652	0.016	0.9010		
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.199607	0.191	0.6651		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.239718	0.229	0.6351		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.000075	0.000	0.9933		
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	-0.5496736	1	6.77432	6.633	0.0145		
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.895292	0.873	0.3568		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.415275	0.399	0.5317		
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	-0.5332325	1	3.600719	3.525	0.0690		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0742	4.801587	0.0723	-6.233	2
2	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1257	3.386447	0.1232	-6.143	3
3	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1555	2.83092	0.1656	-5.74	4
4	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1411	2.956259	0.2103	-5.407	5
5	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.1315	3.009167	0.2556	-5.104	6
6	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.2250	1.90384	0.2843	-4.178	7
7	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1645	2.452342	0.3212	-3.561	8
8	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.1273	2.859126	0.3642	-3.174	9
9	whattypespecification{0-1}	Entered	0.0894	3.38787	0.4152	-3.084	10
10	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Removed	0.5261	0.455376	0.4083	-4.828	9
11	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.1153	2.726166	0.4494	-4.365	10
12	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.1861	1.859963	0.4774	-3.414	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.477366
RSquare Adj	0.32365
Root Mean Square Error	1.010622
Mean of Response	4.888889
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	31.718312	3.17183	3.1055
Error	34	34.726132	1.02136	Prob > F
C. Total	44	66.444444		0.0065

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	13	7.035656	0.54120	0.4104
Pure Error	21	27.690476	1.31859	Prob > F
Total Error	34	34.726132		0.9491
			Max RSq	0.5833

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.4291488	0.403271	10.98	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-1.270029	0.684336	-1.86	0.0722
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	1.8290266	0.578078	3.16	0.0033
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	0.894285	0.664097	1.35	0.1870
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	0.8675917	0.409441	2.12	0.0415
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	1.4386663	0.831395	1.73	0.0926
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-0.876729	0.649684	-1.35	0.1861
whattypespecification[1-0]	0.8853598	0.359069	2.47	0.0189
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	-1.334844	0.422943	-3.16	0.0033
whatproductscustom[1-0]	1.0993473	0.426865	2.58	0.0145
whatproductsnone[1-0]	1.066465	0.56799	1.88	0.0690

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
Whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	3.517759	3.4442	0.0722
Whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	10.224550	10.0108	0.0033
Whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	1.852111	1.8134	0.1870
Whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	4.585903	4.4900	0.0415
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	3.058320	2.9944	0.0926
Whattypecomponentclass	1	1	1.859963	1.8211	0.1861
Whatprocessspecification	1	1	6.209551	6.0797	0.0189
Whatprocesscoding	1	1	10.173597	9.9609	0.0033
Whatproductscustom	1	1	6.774320	6.6327	0.0145
Whatproductsnone	1	1	3.600719	3.5254	0.0690

Quality = 4.43 + sys-embed(-1.27) + sys-dev(1.83) + shrink-util(0.89) + shrink-int(0.87) + comp-CASE(1.44) + comp-class(-0.88) + proc-spec(0.89) + proc-coding(-1.33) + prod-cust(1.10) + prod-none(1.07)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (Rework)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	59.202975	37	1.6000804	0.3207	0.2106	-6.613906	27.05842			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	6.80604058	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	-0.8344756	1	5.06396	3.165	0.0835			
		whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	0	1	0.486053	0.298	0.5885			
		whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	0.828459	0.511	0.4794			
		whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	0	1	0.139145	0.085	0.7726			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.171494	0.105	0.7483			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	-0.9314213	1	8.929364	5.581	0.0235			
		whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	1.961322	1.233	0.2741			
		whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	0.038458	0.023	0.8793			
		whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	0.370039	0.226	0.6371			
		whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	0	1	1.020943	0.632	0.4319			
		whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	0	1	0.768703	0.474	0.4958			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	-0.3990426	1	3.452095	2.157	0.1503			
		whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	0	1	0.307692	0.188	0.6671			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	0.004374	0.003	0.9592			
		whattypeenterprisepayroll(0-1)	0	1	0.467742	0.287	0.5956			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting(0-1)	0	1	0.196379	0.120	0.7313			
		whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	1.124333	0.697	0.4093			
		whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0	1	0.348402	0.213	0.6471			
		whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.751482	0.463	0.5007			
		whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	0.196709	0.120	0.7310			
		whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0	1	0.072783	0.044	0.8345			
	X	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	-0.391033	1	4.43294	2.770	0.1045			
		whatprocesstraining(0-1)	0	1	0.007168	0.004	0.9477			
		whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	1.662861	1.040	0.3145			
		whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0	1	0.847672	0.523	0.4743			
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.168414	0.103	0.7505			
		whatprocessCM(0-1)	0	1	1.114467	0.691	0.4114			
		whatprocesstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.002086	0.001	0.9718			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	0.41545638	1	4.785149	2.991	0.0921			
	X	whatprocessnone(0-1)	-0.8344756	1	5.06396	3.165	0.0835			
		whatproductscustom(0-1)	0	1	0.00178	0.001	0.9739			
		whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	0.019466	0.012	0.9140			
		whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	0	1	0.061345	0.037	0.8479			
		whatproductsnone(0-1)	0	1	0.590495	0.363	0.5508			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.0646	6.882668	0.0790	-8.29	2
2	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.0690	6.294147	0.1512	-8.776	3
3	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	Entered	0.1627	3.560905	0.1920	-8.182	4
4	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	Entered	0.1564	3.579251	0.2331	-7.596	5
5	whatprocessnone(0-1)	Entered	0.1193	4.187049	0.2811	-7.25	6
6	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	Entered	0.1503	3.452095	0.3207	-6.614	7

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.320748
RSquare Adj	0.210599
Root Mean Square Error	1.264943
Mean of Response	4.204545
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	44

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	6	27.956115	4.65935	2.9119
Error	37	59.202975	1.60008	Prob > F
C. Total	43	87.159091		0.0199

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	5	11.932387	2.38648	1.6155
Pure Error	32	47.270588	1.47721	Prob > F
Total Error	37	59.202975		0.1842
				Max RSq
				0.4577

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.8310487	0.282973	13.54	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	1.6689513	0.938144	1.78	0.0835
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.8628427	0.788564	2.36	0.0235
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	0.7980853	0.543349	1.47	0.1503
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	0.7820659	0.46986	1.66	0.1045
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	-0.830913	0.480484	-1.73	0.0921
whatprocessnone[1-0]	1.6689513	0.938144	1.78	0.0835

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	5.0639599	3.1648	0.0835
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	8.9293641	5.5806	0.0235
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	3.4520953	2.1575	0.1503
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	4.4329402	2.7704	0.1045
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	4.7851490	2.9906	0.0921
whatprocessnone	1	1	5.0639599	3.1648	0.0835

Rework = 3.83 + sys-avia(1.67) + shrink-util(1.86) + comp-dev(0.80) + proc-appsup(0.78) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.83) + proc-none(1.67)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (Visibility)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Current Estimates


SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
10.075292		23	0.4380562	0.8702	0.7630	15.946415	-22.3979		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	2.8495261	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
	X	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0.37576496	1	0.660447	1.508	0.2319		
	X	whattypesystemseembedded(0-1)	-0.4488408	1	1.189113	2.715	0.1130		
	X	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	-0.7956194	1	9.364429	21.377	0.0001		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	-1.4740253	1	17.62745	40.240	0.0000		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.005004	0.011	0.9177		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	1.157259	1	5.663079	12.928	0.0015		
		whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	0.017191	0.038	0.8480		
		whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	0.217795	0.486	0.4930		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	0.56574922	1	0.747828	1.707	0.2043		
		whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	0	1	0.059492	0.131	0.7212		
	X	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	1.19102823	1	9.044565	20.647	0.0001		
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	-0.8669342	1	9.023453	20.599	0.0001		
		whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	0	1	0.015143	0.033	0.8573		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	0.14704	0.326	0.5739		
		whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	0	1	0.174212	0.387	0.5402		
	X	whattypeenterprisescripting(0-1)	0.65175764	1	2.443385	5.578	0.0270		
		whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.287073	0.645	0.4304		
		whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0	1	0.041276	0.091	0.7664		
	X	whatprocesstesting(0-1)	-0.5517514	1	5.247883	11.980	0.0021		
		whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	0.021089	0.046	0.8319		
	X	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0.68668548	1	8.36051	19.085	0.0002		
		whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.067557	0.149	0.7037		
		whatprocessstraining(0-1)	0	1	0.006691	0.015	0.9049		
	X	whatprocessspecification(0-1)	-0.4210337	1	3.679885	8.400	0.0081		
	X	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	1.13663035	1	15.40182	35.159	0.0000		
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.01035	0.023	0.8818		
	X	whatprocessCM(0-1)	0.66987347	1	3.521887	8.040	0.0094		
		whatprocesstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.101207	0.223	0.6412		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	-1.008367	1	6.462242	14.752	0.0008		
	X	whatprocessnone(0-1)	1.82147225	1	12.84536	29.324	0.0000		
	X	whatproductsustom(0-1)	-0.2029011	1	0.627774	1.433	0.2435		
	X	whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	0.236821	0.530	0.4745		
	X	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	0.29904591	1	1.1263	2.571	0.1225		
	X	whatproductsnone(0-1)	-1.5076248	1	14.298	32.640	0.0000		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	Entered	0.0289	8.631175	0.1112	90.747	2
2	whattypeenterprisescripting(0-1)	Entered	0.1388	3.722426	0.1591	85.747	3
3	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	Entered	0.0674	5.430911	0.2291	77.534	4
4	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	Entered	0.1032	4.089892	0.2818	71.844	5
5	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	Entered	0.1296	3.399955	0.3256	67.45	6
6	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.1880	2.494245	0.3577	64.76	7
7	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	Entered	0.1186	3.397585	0.4015	60.37	8
8	whatprocesstoolsupt(0-1)	Entered	0.1815	2.411337	0.4325	57.636	9
9	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	Entered	0.2307	1.904735	0.4571	56.254	10
10	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.2128	2.025781	0.4832	54.445	11
11	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	Removed	0.2774	1.53092	0.4635	55.324	10
12	whatprocesstesting(0-1)	Entered	0.1021	3.387171	0.5071	50.954	11
13	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	Entered	0.0984	3.27593	0.5493	46.794	12
14	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	Removed	0.2658	1.449624	0.5306	47.52	11
15	whatprocessnone(0-1)	Entered	0.0136	6.591409	0.6155	37.125	12
16	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Entered	0.0538	3.533347	0.6610	32.48	13
17	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.0927	2.483923	0.6930	29.809	14
18	whatprocessCM(0-1)	Entered	0.1040	2.183224	0.7212	27.704	15
19	whatproductsustom(0-1)	Entered	0.1143	1.943052	0.7462	26.05	16
20	whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	Removed	0.4063	0.519293	0.7395	25.026	15
21	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	Entered	0.0431	2.892784	0.7768	21.587	16
22	whatprocesstoolsupt(0-1)	Removed	0.2673	0.823332	0.7662	21.135	15
23	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.1094	1.672484	0.7877	19.99	16
24	whatprocessspecification(0-1)	Entered	0.0578	2.167999	0.8156	17.913	17
25	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	Removed	0.4404	0.337895	0.8113	16.548	16
26	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	Entered	0.0599	1.897838	0.8357	14.979	17
27	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	Entered	0.1454	1.056782	0.8493	14.992	18
28	whattypesystemseembedded(0-1)	Entered	0.1772	0.871866	0.8606	15.353	19
29	whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	Entered	0.2043	0.747828	0.8702	15.946	20

Response Column 59

Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.87021
RSquare Adj	0.762993
Root Mean Square Error	0.661858
Mean of Response	4.093023
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	43

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	19	67.552615	3.55540	8.1163
Error	23	10.075292	0.43806	Prob > F
C. Total	42	77.627907		<.0001

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1276949	0.344614	11.98	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-0.75153	0.612057	-1.23	0.2319
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.8976816	0.544848	1.65	0.1130
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	1.5912387	0.344159	4.62	0.0001
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	2.9480506	0.464735	6.34	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	-2.314518	0.643723	-3.60	0.0015
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-1.131498	0.866	-1.31	0.2043
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-2.382056	0.524231	-4.54	0.0001
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	1.7338685	0.362028	4.54	0.0001
whattypeenterprisescripting[1-0]	-1.303515	0.551931	-2.36	0.0270
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	1.1035028	0.318821	3.46	0.0021
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	-1.373731	0.314367	-4.37	0.0002
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	0.8420675	0.290532	2.90	0.0081
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	-2.273261	0.383379	-5.93	<.0001
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.339747	0.472498	-2.84	0.0094
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	2.0167339	0.525076	3.84	0.0008
whatprocessnone[1-0]	-3.642945	0.672735	-5.42	<.0001
whatproductsustom[1-0]	0.4058023	0.338983	1.20	0.2435
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	-0.598092	0.372997	-1.60	0.1225
whatproductsnone[1-0]	3.0152496	0.527777	5.71	<.0001

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	0.660447	1.5077	0.2319
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	1.189113	2.7145	0.1130
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	9.364429	21.3772	0.0001
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	17.627454	40.2402	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	5.663079	12.9277	0.0015
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	0.747828	1.7072	0.2043
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	9.044565	20.6470	0.0001
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	9.023453	20.5988	0.0001
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	2.443385	5.5778	0.0270
whatprocesstesting	1	1	5.247883	11.9799	0.0021
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	8.360510	19.0855	0.0002
whatprocessspecification	1	1	3.679885	8.4005	0.0081
whatprocesscoding	1	1	15.401819	35.1595	<.0001
whatprocessCM	1	1	3.521887	8.0398	0.0094
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	6.462242	14.7521	0.0008
whatprocessnone	1	1	12.845365	29.3236	<.0001
whatproductsustom	1	1	0.627774	1.4331	0.2435
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	1.126300	2.5711	0.1225
whatproductsnone	1	1	14.297998	32.6396	<.0001

Visibility = 4.13 + sys-avia(-0.75) + sys-embed(0.90) + sys-comm(1.59) + sys-dev(2.95) + shrink-util(-2.31) + comp-CASE(-1.13) + comp-OS(-2.38) + comp-dev(1.73) + ent-script(-1.30) + proc-test(1.10) + proc-reeng(-1.37) + proc-spec(0.84) + proc-coding(-2.27) + proc-CM(-1.34) + proc-SWEngSup(2.02) + proc-none(-3.64) + prod-cust(0.41) + prod-comcust(-0.60) + prod-none(3.02)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (ControlProduct)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	37.812636	38	0.9950694	0.4771	0.3945	-10.09682	6.169138			
Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"				
X	Intercept	4.4580914	1	0	0.000	1.0000				
	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.25488	0.251	0.6193				
	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.051053	0.050	0.8243				
	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.82343	0.824	0.3700				
	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.177164	0.174	0.6788				
	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.269405	0.266	0.6094				
	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.235669	1.250	0.2708				
	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.671233	0.669	0.4187				
	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.458799	0.454	0.5044				
	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.003958	0.004	0.9507				
	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.532813	0.529	0.4717				
	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.271947	0.268	0.6077				
	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.001461	0.001	0.9700				
	whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	0.121053	0.119	0.7323				
	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.036758	0.036	0.8505				
	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.00179	0.002	0.9668				
	whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	0.309581	0.305	0.5838				
X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	-0.6446867	1	10.75372	10.807	0.0022				
	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.147606	0.145	0.7055				
X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.25381386	1	2.176322	2.187	0.1474				
	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.109231	0.107	0.7452				
	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.422917	0.419	0.5217				
	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.191507	0.188	0.6668				
X	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	-0.251602	1	2.025214	2.035	0.1619				
	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.00596	0.006	0.9395				
	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.289823	0.286	0.5961				
X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	1.20324177	1	14.90044	14.974	0.0004				
	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.136947	0.134	0.7159				
	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.043319	0.042	0.8379				
X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.4738513	1	5.33075	5.357	0.0261				
	whatproductnone{0-1}	0	1	0.548686	0.545	0.4651				
	whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.063472	0.062	0.8044				
	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.613553	0.610	0.4397				
	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.011881	0.012	0.9147				
X	whatproductnone{0-1}	-0.8482748	1	10.47251	10.524	0.0025				

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0255	8.011542	0.1108	-5.455	2
2	whatproductnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0299	6.903736	0.2063	-7.271	3
3	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0081	9.132481	0.3326	-10.32	4
4	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0194	6.239641	0.4188	-11.77	5
5	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1515	2.185861	0.4491	-10.98	6
6	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Entered	0.1619	2.025214	0.4771	-10.1	7

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.477084
RSquare Adj	0.394518
Root Mean Square Error	0.997532
Mean of Response	4.244444
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	6	34.498475	5.74975	5.7782
Error	38	37.812636	0.99507	Prob > F
C. Total	44	72.311111		0.0002

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	10	10.667398	1.06674	1.1003
Pure Error	28	27.145238	0.96947	Prob > F
Total Error	38	37.812636		0.3955
				Max RSq
				0.6246

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.6967322	0.278474	13.27	<.0001
whatprocessrequirements{1-0}	1.2893735	0.392217	3.29	0.0022
whatprocesstesting{1-0}	-0.507628	0.34325	-1.48	0.1474
whatprocesstraining{1-0}	0.503204	0.352724	1.43	0.1619
whatprocessfielding{1-0}	-2.406484	0.621885	-3.87	0.0004
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	0.9477026	0.409454	2.31	0.0261
whatproductnone{1-0}	1.6965495	0.522959	3.24	0.0025

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	10.753721	10.8070	0.0022
whatprocesstesting	1	1	2.176322	2.1871	0.1474
whatprocesstraining	1	1	2.025214	2.0352	0.1619
whatprocessfielding	1	1	14.900445	14.9743	0.0004
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	5.330750	5.3572	0.0261
whatproductnone	1	1	10.472506	10.5244	0.0025

ControlProduct = 3.70 + proc-req(1.29) + proc-test(-0.51) + proc-train(0.50) + proc-field(-2.41) + proc-SWEngSup(0.95) + prod-none(1.70)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (ChangeCost)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	69.585674	38	1.831202	0.3630	0.2625	-13.14053	33.61533			
Lock	Entered	Parameter			Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"		"Prob>F"
X	X	Intercept			3.89054647	1	0	0.000		1.0000
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}			0	1	0.040887	0.022		0.8835
		whattypesystemsemded{0-1}			0	1	0.907083	0.489		0.4889
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}			0	1	0.489532	0.262		0.6117
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}			0	1	0.276763	0.148		0.7029
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}			0	1	0.037681	0.020		0.8882
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}			-0.6274136	1	4.234228	2.312		0.1366
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}			0	1	1.522923	0.828		0.3688
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}			0	1	1.287347	0.697		0.4090
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}			0	1	1.041879	0.562		0.4580
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}			1.13712109	1	12.74785	6.961		0.0120
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}			0	1	0.001035	0.001		0.9814
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}			0	1	0.608705	0.327		0.5712
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}			0	1	0.016719	0.009		0.9254
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}			0	1	0.598182	0.321		0.5745
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}			0	1	0.456885	0.245		0.6239
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}			0	1	0.557332	0.299		0.5880
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}			0	1	0.011286	0.006		0.9387
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}			0	1	0.144105	0.077		0.7832
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}			0	1	0.950362	0.512		0.4786
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}			0	1	1.062279	0.574		0.4536
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}			0	1	0.53588	0.287		0.5953
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}			0	1	1.81904	0.993		0.3254
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}			0	1	1.026726	0.554		0.4613
	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}			0.35740359	1	1.964361	1.075		0.3066
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}			0	1	3.752321	2.049		0.1605
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}			0	1	0.000325	0.000		0.9896
		whatprocessCM{0-1}			0	1	0.102754	0.055		0.8163
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}			0	1	0.003435	0.002		0.9661
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}			-0.9283976	1	1.141334	0.617		0.4372
		whatprocessnone{0-1}			0	1	3.85711	2.106		0.1549
		whatproductscustom{0-1}			0	1	0.076272	0.041		0.8414
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}			0	1	0.173983	0.093		0.7624
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}			-0.6468021	1	9.117309	4.979		0.0316
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}			1.03925303	1	11.6174	6.344		0.0161

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0948	6.944444	0.0636	-14.74	2
2	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.0514	8.942202	0.1454	-15.04	3
3	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0471	8.856957	0.2247	-15.26	4
4	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0605	7.224869	0.2908	-15.12	5
5	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1514	4.033188	0.3277	-14.15	6
6	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1549	3.85711	0.3630	-13.14	7

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.363028
RSquare Adj	0.262453
Root Mean Square Error	1.353219
Mean of Response	3.711111
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	6	39.65877	6.60980	3.6095
Error	38	69.58567	1.83120	Prob > F
C. Total	44	109.24444		0.0063

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	5	15.650892	3.13018	1.9152
Pure Error	33	53.934783	1.63439	Prob > F
Total Error	38	69.585674		0.1184
				Max RSq
				0.5063

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.2217108	0.485034	8.70	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.2548273	0.825211	1.52	0.1366
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-2.274242	0.861958	-2.64	0.0120
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	-0.714807	0.499352	-1.43	0.1605
whatprocessnone[1-0]	1.8567952	1.279385	1.45	0.1549
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	1.2936042	0.579744	2.23	0.0316
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-2.078506	0.825211	-2.52	0.0161

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	4.234228	2.3123	0.1366
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	12.747855	6.9615	0.0120
whatprocesscoding	1	1	3.752321	2.0491	0.1605
whatprocessnone	1	1	3.857110	2.1063	0.1549
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	9.117309	4.9789	0.0316
whatproductsnone	1	1	11.617399	6.3441	0.0161

ChangeCost = 4.22 + shrink-util(1.25) + comp-class(-2.27) + proc-coding(-0.71) + proc-none(1.86) + prod-comcust(1.29) + prod-none(-2.08)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (LangCult)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	22.10621	29	0.7622831	0.6052	0.4147	-0.405498	-0.28657			
Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"				
X	Intercept	4.32912166	1	0	0.000	1.0000				
	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0	1	0.16874	0.215	0.6462				
X	whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	-1.227754	1	10.0837	13.228	0.0011				
	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	0.109937	0.140	0.7112				
	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	0	1	0.026113	0.033	0.8569				
	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.041507	0.053	0.8201				
X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	0.83896766	1	5.061568	6.640	0.0153				
	whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	0.396095	0.511	0.4807				
X	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	-0.6498443	1	3.579982	4.696	0.0386				
	whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	0.432215	0.558	0.4611				
X	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	0.45953112	1	1.645464	2.159	0.1525				
X	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	1.07071857	1	9.566511	12.550	0.0014				
	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	0	1	0.062519	0.079	0.7802				
	whattypeenterpriseacctng(0-1)	0	1	0.225621	0.289	0.5953				
	whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	0.25625	0.328	0.5712				
X	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	-0.8745822	1	7.322478	9.606	0.0043				
	whattypeenterprise describing(0-1)	0	1	0.094514	0.120	0.7314				
	whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.051091	0.065	0.8008				
X	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0.78951074	1	12.30375	16.141	0.0004				
	whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.012155	0.015	0.9021				
	whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	0.528652	0.686	0.4145				
X	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0.41116451	1	3.115304	4.087	0.0525				
X	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	0.53615387	1	6.165648	8.088	0.0081				
	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	0	1	0.668773	0.874	0.3580				
X	whatprocessspecification(0-1)	-0.6586279	1	7.039915	9.235	0.0050				
	whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0	1	0.63947	0.834	0.3689				
X	whatprocessfielding(0-1)	-0.5010646	1	2.178171	2.857	0.1017				
X	whatprocessCM(0-1)	-0.4352561	1	3.562696	4.674	0.0390				
	whatprocessstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.0677	0.086	0.7715				
	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	0	1	0.54531	0.708	0.4072				
	whatproductnone(0-1)	0	1	0.308893	0.397	0.5339				
X	whatproducts custom(0-1)	0.31992256	1	1.99771	2.621	0.1163				
	whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	0.328891	0.423	0.5208				
	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	0	1	0.000054	0.000	0.9935				
X	whatproductsnone(0-1)	0.68658062	1	5.165632	6.777	0.0144				

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	Entered	0.0611	4.538947	0.0811	-8.353	2
2	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	Entered	0.1076	3.185832	0.1379	-8.313	3
3	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.1824	2.124874	0.1759	-7.619	4
4	whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	Entered	0.1673	2.230158	0.2157	-6.991	5
5	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Entered	0.1182	2.76754	0.2651	-6.693	6
6	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	Entered	0.0980	2.9736	0.3182	-6.521	7
7	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	Removed	0.3299	1.005952	0.3003	-7.903	6
8	whatprocessspecification(0-1)	Entered	0.1978	1.740741	0.3314	-6.973	7
9	whattypesystemseembedded(0-1)	Entered	0.1575	2.048578	0.3679	-6.233	8
10	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	Entered	0.2070	1.596211	0.3964	-5.215	9
11	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	Entered	0.1841	1.733516	0.4274	-4.281	10
12	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.0760	2.960754	0.4803	-4.101	11
13	whatprocessCM(0-1)	Entered	0.1559	1.802133	0.5124	-3.21	12
14	whatproducts custom(0-1)	Entered	0.1890	1.501058	0.5392	-2.133	13
15	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	Removed	0.2642	1.076403	0.5200	-3.471	12
16	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	Entered	0.1771	1.558419	0.5479	-2.429	13
17	whatprocessfielding(0-1)	Entered	0.1696	1.568319	0.5759	-1.394	14
18	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	Entered	0.1525	1.645464	0.6052	-0.405	15

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.605246
RSquare Adj	0.414675
Root Mean Square Error	0.873088
Mean of Response	4
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	44

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	33.893790	2.42098	3.1760
Error	29	22.106210	0.76228	Prob > F
C. Total	43	56.000000		0.0042

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	5.0945421	0.35379	14.40	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	2.455508	0.675133	3.64	0.0011
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	-1.677935	0.651165	-2.58	0.0153
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	1.2996886	0.599732	2.17	0.0386
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-0.919062	0.625545	-1.47	0.1525
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-2.141437	0.604487	-3.54	0.0014
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	1.7491645	0.564365	3.10	0.0043
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-1.579021	0.393032	-4.02	0.0004
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	-0.822329	0.406774	-2.02	0.0525
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	-1.072308	0.377041	-2.84	0.0081
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	1.3172559	0.433456	3.04	0.0050
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	1.0021292	0.592838	1.69	0.1017
whatprocessCM[1-0]	0.8705122	0.402665	2.16	0.0390
whatproducts custom[1-0]	-0.639845	0.395245	-1.62	0.1163
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.373161	0.527495	-2.60	0.0144

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	10.083700	13.2283	0.0011
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	5.061568	6.6400	0.0153
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	3.579982	4.6964	0.0386
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	1.645464	2.1586	0.1525
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	9.566511	12.5498	0.0014
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	7.322478	9.6060	0.0043
whatprocessdesign	1	1	12.303747	16.1407	0.0004
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	3.115304	4.0868	0.0525
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	6.165648	8.0884	0.0081
whatprocessspecification	1	1	7.039915	9.2353	0.0050
whatprocessfielding	1	1	2.178171	2.8574	0.1017
whatprocessCM	1	1	3.562696	4.6737	0.0390
whatproducts custom	1	1	1.997710	2.6207	0.1163
whatproductsnone	1	1	5.165632	6.7765	0.0144

LangCult = 5.09 + sys-embed(2.46) + shrink-util(-1.68) + comp-domain(1.30) + comp-class(-0.92) + comp-OS(-2.14) + ent-pay(1.75) + proc-des(-1.58) + proc-reeng(-0.82) + proc-appsup(-1.07) + proc-spec(1.32) + proc-field(1.00) + proc-CM(0.87) + prod-cust(-0.64) + prod-none(-1.37)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (TurfWar)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:

Current Estimates


	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	48.028323	35	1.3722378	0.4834	0.3506	-6.173772	22.93078		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	2.78177383	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0	1	0.095973	0.068	0.7957		
	X	whattypesystemsemded(0-1)	-0.716114	1	5.201008	3.790	0.0596		
		whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	0.007599	0.005	0.9420		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	0.67807578	1	5.137561	3.744	0.0611		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.076437	0.054	0.8173		
		whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	0	1	1.70838	1.254	0.2706		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0.36601421	1	3.322137	2.428	0.1282		
		whattypescomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	0.030299	0.021	0.8844		
		whattypescomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	0.13776	0.098	0.7564		
		whattypescomponentclass(0-1)	0	1	0.7849	0.565	0.4575		
		whattypescomponentOS(0-1)	0	1	1.116724	0.809	0.3746		
		whattypescomponentdevelopment(0-1)	0	1	1.253262	0.911	0.3466		
		whattypesenterpriseactng(0-1)	0	1	1.025431	0.742	0.3951		
		whattypesenterpriseamufact(0-1)	0	1	0.43564	0.311	0.5806		
		whattypesenterpriseapayroll(0-1)	0	1	0.486418	0.348	0.5592		
	X	whattypesenterpriseascripting(0-1)	0.9089169	1	5.577608	4.065	0.0515		
		whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.158059	0.112	0.7396		
	X	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0.65364789	1	10.92475	7.961	0.0078		
		whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	1.293867	0.941	0.3388		
		whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	0.073074	0.052	0.8213		
		whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0	1	0.565592	0.405	0.5287		
		whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.050432	0.036	0.8512		
		whatprocesstraining(0-1)	0	1	0.041659	0.030	0.8646		
		whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	1.004417	0.726	0.4001		
		whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0	1	0.17254	0.123	0.7284		
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.126291	0.090	0.7665		
	X	whatprocessCM(0-1)	-0.7383293	1	8.854045	6.452	0.0157		
		whatprocessstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.060059	0.043	0.8378		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	0.87281691	1	15.08296	10.992	0.0021		
		whatprocessnone(0-1)	0	1	0.092105	0.065	0.7998		
		whatproductscustom(0-1)	0	1	0.108546	0.077	0.7831		
		whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	0.124588	0.088	0.7680		
	X	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	-0.4229876	1	3.651643	2.661	0.1118		
	X	whatproductsnone(0-1)	0.72215469	1	7.357193	5.361	0.0266		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.0262	10.20134	0.1097	-8.553	2
2	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	Entered	0.0344	8.460391	0.2007	-9.869	3
3	whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	Entered	0.0383	7.472752	0.2811	-10.8	4
4	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.1373	3.633324	0.3202	-10.22	5
5	whatprocessCM(0-1)	Entered	0.1548	3.237583	0.3550	-9.492	6
6	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	Entered	0.1482	3.251326	0.3900	-8.766	7
7	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.1735	2.805935	0.4201	-7.866	8
8	whattypesenterpriseascripting(0-1)	Entered	0.1998	2.439374	0.4464	-6.822	9
9	whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	Entered	0.1771	2.647484	0.4748	-5.86	10
10	whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	Entered	0.1838	2.50833	0.5018	-4.843	11
11	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Removed	0.2706	1.70838	0.4834	-6.174	10

Response Column 59

Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.483443
RSquare Adj	0.350614
Root Mean Square Error	1.171426
Mean of Response	3.977778
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	44.949455	4.99438	3.6396
Error	35	48.028323	1.37224	Prob > F
C. Total	44	92.977778		0.0027

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	13	14.444990	1.11115	0.7279
Pure Error	22	33.583333	1.52652	Prob > F
Total Error	35	48.028323		0.7191
				Max RSq
				0.6388

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	5.1059692	0.423039	12.07	<.0001
whattypesystemsembedded[1-0]	1.4322279	0.73567	1.95	0.0596
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	-1.356152	0.700881	-1.93	0.0611
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	-0.732028	0.469766	-1.56	0.1282
whattypesenterpriseascripting[1-0]	-1.817834	0.901664	-2.02	0.0515
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-1.307296	0.463322	-2.82	0.0078
whatprocessCM[1-0]	1.4766587	0.581332	2.54	0.0157
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	-1.745634	0.526532	-3.32	0.0021
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.8459753	0.518595	1.63	0.1118
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.444309	0.623762	-2.32	0.0266

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsembedded	1	1	5.201008	3.7902	0.0596
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	5.137561	3.7439	0.0611
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	3.332137	2.4283	0.1282
whattypesenterpriseascripting	1	1	5.577608	4.0646	0.0515
whatprocessdesign	1	1	10.924751	7.9613	0.0078
whatprocessCM	1	1	8.854045	6.4523	0.0157
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	15.082964	10.9915	0.0021
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	3.651643	2.6611	0.1118
whatproductsnone	1	1	7.357193	5.3615	0.0266

TurfWar = 5.11 + sys-embed(1.43) + sys-dev(-1.36) + shrink-int(-0.73) + ent-script(-1.82) + proc-des(-1.31) + proc-CM(1.48) + proc-SWEngSup(-1.75) + prod-comcust(0.85) + prod-none(-1.44)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (FailLikely)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

Lock	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	22.536245	30	0.7512082	0.7548	0.6404	-1.351474	-1.11919		
Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	Intercept	3.1170444	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.960316	1.291	0.2652			
	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.054908	0.071	0.7920			
	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.171437	0.222	0.6408			
	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.141001	0.183	0.6723			
X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0.22845859	1	1.810994	2.411	0.1310			
X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-1.1537391	1	10.19188	13.567	0.0009			
	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.265902	0.346	0.5608			
	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.343736	0.449	0.5080			
	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.023415	0.030	0.8633			
X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	1.37944707	1	16.20785	21.576	0.0001			
	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.060774	0.078	0.7814			
	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.439882	0.577	0.4535			
X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0.64617145	1	4.989225	6.642	0.0151			
	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.194504	0.252	0.6191			
	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.12867	0.167	0.6862			
X	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	1.08913498	1	7.562117	10.067	0.0035			
X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	-0.3250263	1	2.275132	3.029	0.0921			
	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.000717	0.001	0.9760			
X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	-0.2974418	1	2.568616	3.419	0.0743			
X	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	-0.2170486	1	1.539893	2.050	0.1626			
X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.5392415	1	5.418224	7.213	0.0117			
	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.238358	0.310	0.5820			
	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.941234	1.264	0.2701			
	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.348658	0.456	0.5050			
	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.36637	0.479	0.4943			
X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	-1.0705623	1	7.4685	9.942	0.0037			
	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.021905	0.028	0.8678			
X	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0.60171302	1	4.465961	5.945	0.0209			
X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.79628808	1	9.425311	12.547	0.0013			
	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.07275	0.094	0.7614			
	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.000006	0.000	0.9979			
X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.37749312	1	3.021779	4.023	0.0540			
X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-1.0747237	1	19.06236	25.376	0.0000			
	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.037064	0.048	0.8285			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0055	15.24444	0.1659	5.4313	2
2	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0056	12.92896	0.3065	-0.399	3
3	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0456	5.987957	0.3717	-2.025	4
4	whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0297	6.510128	0.4425	-3.968	5
5	whattypesystemdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.1212	3.098888	0.4762	-3.845	6
6	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.1294	2.863368	0.5074	-3.579	7
7	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.1732	2.243077	0.5318	-2.937	8
8	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.1100	2.986383	0.5643	-2.746	9
9	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.1008	3.007251	0.5970	-2.567	10
10	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.1136	2.666641	0.6260	-2.182	11
11	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1662	1.968806	0.6474	-1.375	12
12	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1640	1.931969	0.6684	-0.545	13
13	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Removed	0.2858	1.122046	0.6562	-1.865	12
14	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0922	2.71893	0.6858	-1.512	13
15	whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	Removed	0.3106	0.957959	0.6754	-2.932	12
16	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0671	3.010756	0.7082	-2.755	13
17	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.1868	1.489446	0.7244	-1.657	14
18	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.1898	1.433663	0.7400	-0.525	15
19	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1954	1.364919	0.7548	0.6481	16
20	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Removed	0.9760	0.000717	0.7548	-1.351	15

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.754804
RSquare Adj 0.640379
Root Mean Square Error 0.866723
Mean of Response 3.844444
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	69.374866	4.95535	6.5965
Error	30	22.536245	0.75121	Prob > F
C. Total	44	91.911111		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	22	18.536245	0.842557	1.6851
Pure Error	8	4.000000	0.500000	Prob > F
Total Error	30	22.536245		0.2271
				Max RSq
				0.9565

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.5579673	0.285331	12.47	<.0001
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	-0.456917	0.294279	-1.55	0.1310
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	2.3074782	0.626456	3.68	0.0009
whattypecomponentclass{1-0}	-2.758894	0.593954	-4.64	<.0001
whattypeenterpriseacctng{1-0}	-1.292343	0.501466	-2.58	0.0151
whattypeenterprisescripting{1-0}	-2.17827	0.686547	-3.17	0.0035
whatprocessrequirements{1-0}	0.6500525	0.37353	1.74	0.0921
whatprocesstesting{1-0}	0.5948836	0.321708	1.85	0.0743
whatprocessmaintenance{1-0}	0.4340973	0.303195	1.43	0.1626
whatprocessreengineering{1-0}	1.078483	0.401573	2.69	0.0117
whatprocessfielding{1-0}	2.1411246	0.679056	3.15	0.0037
whatprocesstoolsupt{1-0}	-1.203426	0.493562	-2.44	0.0209
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	-1.592576	0.449606	-3.54	0.0013
whatproductsCOTS{1-0}	-0.754986	0.376433	-2.01	0.0540
whatproductscommoncust{1-0}	2.1494475	0.426696	5.04	<.0001

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	1.810994	2.4108	0.1310
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	10.191883	13.5673	0.0009
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	16.207850	21.5757	<.0001
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	4.989225	6.6416	0.0151
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	7.562117	10.0666	0.0035
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	2.275132	3.0286	0.0921
whatprocesstesting	1	1	2.568616	3.4193	0.0743
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	1.539893	2.0499	0.1626
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	5.418224	7.2127	0.0117
whatprocessfielding	1	1	7.468500	9.9420	0.0037
whatprocesstoolsupt	1	1	4.465961	5.9450	0.0209
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	9.425311	12.5469	0.0013
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	3.021779	4.0226	0.0540
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	19.062365	25.3756	<.0001

FailLikely = 3.56 + shrink-bus(-0.46) + shrink-util(2.31) + comp-class(-2.76) + ent-acct(-1.29) + ent-script(-2.18) + proc-req(0.65) + proc-test(0.59) + proc-maint(0.43) + proc-reeng(1.08) + proc-field(2.14) + proc-toolsupt(-1.20) + proc-SWEngSup(-1.59) + prod-COTS(-0.75) + prod-comcust(2.15)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (RespCust)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:

Current Estimates


	SSE 12.611507	DfE 27	MSE 0.4670928	RSquare 0.7992	RSquare Adj 0.6727	Cp 5.1267631	AIC -21.2424		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	5.08651969	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0	1	0.016113	0.033	0.8567		
		whattypesystemsembedded(0-1)	0	1	0.001794	0.004	0.9520		
		whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0	1	0.091147	0.189	0.6671		
		whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	0	1	0.022034	0.046	0.8327		
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0.39217631	1	4.416902	9.456	0.0048		
		whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	0	1	0.092277	0.192	0.6652		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	-0.2604858	1	1.268235	2.715	0.1110		
	X	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	-0.6828767	1	3.53688	7.572	0.0105		
		whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	0.037501	0.078	0.7829		
	X	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	1.0254731	1	7.242644	15.506	0.0005		
		whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	0	1	0.00563	0.012	0.9150		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	0	1	0.014271	0.029	0.8651		
	X	whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	-1.0407701	1	10.61653	22.729	0.0001		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	0.073591	0.153	0.6992		
		whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	0	1	0.016593	0.034	0.8546		
	X	whattypeenterprisescripting(0-1)	0.36852393	1	0.862362	1.846	0.1855		
	X	whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	-0.43038	1	3.023544	6.473	0.0170		
	X	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0.29930668	1	2.106273	4.509	0.0430		
		whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.167372	0.350	0.5594		
	X	whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0.25526518	1	1.782155	3.815	0.0612		
	X	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	0.23709166	1	1.248765	2.673	0.1136		
	X	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	0.48597345	1	4.347448	9.307	0.0051		
	X	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	-0.449339	1	4.392837	9.405	0.0049		
		whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	0.117749	0.245	0.6247		
		whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0	1	0.186928	0.391	0.5371		
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.005728	0.012	0.9143		
		whatprocessCM(0-1)	0	1	0.526168	1.132	0.2971		
		whatprocessstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.011487	0.024	0.8788		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	-0.4809166	1	4.857045	10.398	0.0033		
	X	whatprocessnone(0-1)	1.19203992	1	5.598886	11.987	0.0018		
	X	whatproductscustom(0-1)	-0.4367591	1	3.225526	6.906	0.0140		
		whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	0.243773	0.512	0.4805		
	X	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	-0.3363608	1	1.981869	4.243	0.0492		
	X	whatproductsnone(0-1)	-1.0517744	1	7.873346	16.856	0.0003		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.0179	7.754327	0.1235	20.659	2
2	whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	Entered	0.0198	6.749377	0.2310	15.099	3
3	whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	Entered	0.0050	8.527066	0.3667	7.5475	4
4	whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	Entered	0.0308	4.428321	0.4372	4.5871	5
5	whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	Entered	0.0798	2.707219	0.4804	3.5546	6
6	whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	Entered	0.1129	2.114896	0.5140	3.1856	7
7	whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	Entered	0.1403	1.76518	0.5421	3.2083	8
8	whatproductscustom(0-1)	Entered	0.2157	1.214735	0.5615	3.8476	9
9	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.1512	1.596394	0.5869	4.0594	10
10	whatprocessnone(0-1)	Entered	0.0599	2.601857	0.6283	3.145	11
11	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	Entered	0.1097	1.766843	0.6565	3.1658	12
12	whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	Entered	0.0694	2.143842	0.6906	2.7644	13
13	whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	Entered	0.1178	1.497459	0.7145	3.087	14
14	whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	Entered	0.1134	1.460493	0.7377	3.4511	15
15	whatprocessdesign(0-1)	Entered	0.1148	1.376176	0.7596	3.9096	16
16	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	Entered	0.0770	1.621947	0.7854	4.0927	17
17	whattypeenterprisescripting(0-1)	Entered	0.1855	0.862362	0.7992	5.1268	18

Response Column 59

Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.79918
RSquare Adj 0.672737
Root Mean Square Error 0.683442
Mean of Response 4.733333
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 45

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	17	50.188493	2.95226	6.3205
Error	27	12.611507	0.46709	Prob > F
C. Total	44	62.800000		<.0001

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1727073	0.310338	13.45	<.0001
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	-0.784353	0.255067	-3.08	0.0048
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	0.5209717	0.316166	1.65	0.1110
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	1.3657534	0.496322	2.75	0.0105
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-2.050946	0.520844	-3.94	0.0005
whattypeenterpriseactng[1-0]	2.0815401	0.436611	4.77	<.0001
whattypeenterprisescripting[1-0]	-0.737048	0.542441	-1.36	0.1855
whattypeenterprise requirements[1-0]	0.8607599	0.338318	2.54	0.0170
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-0.598613	0.281897	-2.12	0.0430
whatprocessmaintenance[1-0]	-0.51053	0.261367	-1.95	0.0612
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	-0.474183	0.290006	-1.64	0.1136
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	-0.971947	0.318586	-3.05	0.0051
whatprocesstraining[1-0]	0.8986779	0.293044	3.07	0.0049
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.9618333	0.298274	3.22	0.0033
whatprocessnone[1-0]	-2.38408	0.688607	-3.46	0.0018
whatproductscustom[1-0]	0.8735183	0.332409	2.63	0.0140
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.6727217	0.326588	2.06	0.0492
whatproductsnone[1-0]	2.1035489	0.512359	4.11	0.0003

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	4.416902	9.4562	0.0048
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	1.268235	2.7152	0.1110
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	3.536880	7.5721	0.0105
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	7.242644	15.5058	0.0005
whattypeenterpriseactng	1	1	10.616532	22.7290	<.0001
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	0.862362	1.8462	0.1855
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	3.023544	6.4731	0.0170
whatprocessdesign	1	1	2.106273	4.5093	0.0430
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	1.782155	3.8154	0.0612
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	1.248765	2.6735	0.1136
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	4.347448	9.3075	0.0051
whatprocesstraining	1	1	4.392837	9.4046	0.0049
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	4.857045	10.3985	0.0033
whatprocessnone	1	1	5.598886	11.9867	0.0018
whatproductscustom	1	1	3.225526	6.9055	0.0140
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	1.981869	4.2430	0.0492
whatproductsnone	1	1	7.873346	16.8561	0.0003

ResponCustomer = 4.17 + shrink-bus(-0.78) + shrink-int(0.52) + comp-domain(1.37) + comp-class(-2.05) + ent-actnt(2.08) + ent-script(-0.74) + proc-req(0.86) + proc-des(-0.60) + proc-maint(-0.51) + proc-reeng(-0.47) + procappsupt(-0.97) + proc-train(0.90) + proc-SWEngSup(0.96) + proc-none(-2.38) + prod-cust(0.87) + prod-comcust(0.67) + prod-none(2.10)

Stepwise Fit - New Survey Data - Consequences (ResponseOrg)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 32.235426	DfE 34	MSE 0.9481008	RSquare 0.5583	RSquare Adj 0.4414	Cp -2.784289	AIC 6.310562			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.09677906	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	1.236373	1.316	0.2595			
		whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.001524	0.002	0.9687			
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	-0.4425837	1	5.680939	5.992	0.0197			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.239672	0.247	0.6224			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.371016	0.384	0.5396			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0.84069034	1	6.396692	6.747	0.0138			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.007102	0.007	0.9326			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.015121	1.073	0.3078			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.04247	0.044	0.8360			
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.60792075	1	3.396528	3.582	0.0669			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.219886	0.227	0.6372			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.006482	0.007	0.9356			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.5096238	1	2.955505	3.117	0.0864			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.093486	0.096	0.7587			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.019466	0.020	0.8886			
		whattypeenterprise describing{0-1}	0	1	0.060385	0.062	0.8050			
	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.57268938	1	8.446155	8.908	0.0052			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.883425	0.930	0.3419			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.022992	0.024	0.8790			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.068038	0.070	0.7933			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.031853	0.033	0.8577			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.709158	0.742	0.3951			
	X	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	-0.3111697	1	2.729817	2.879	0.0989			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.043499	0.045	0.8341			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.107305	1.174	0.2865			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.76534892	1	5.501793	5.803	0.0216			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.511472	0.532	0.4709			
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.00073	0.001	0.9784			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-1.2563025	1	29.65929	31.283	0.0000			
		whatproductnone{0-1}	0	1	0.323764	0.335	0.5668			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.024324	0.025	0.8755			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	1.01834	1.077	0.3070			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.063211	0.065	0.8006			
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	-0.4398698	1	2.738963	2.889	0.0983			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0033	13.7068	0.1878	-0.991	2
2	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0484	5.433224	0.2623	-2.567	3
3	whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0961	3.64543	0.3122	-2.966	4
4	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.1714	2.380385	0.3448	-2.533	5
5	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.1209	2.970161	0.3855	-2.488	6
6	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.1578	2.384912	0.4182	-2.057	7
7	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1578	2.320327	0.4500	-1.585	8
8	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Removed	0.3242	1.114015	0.4348	-2.851	7
9	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0450	4.415578	0.4953	-3.757	8
10	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.1762	1.901692	0.5213	-3.009	9
11	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Entered	0.2294	1.47411	0.5415	-1.979	10
12	whatproductnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1643	1.932399	0.5680	-1.251	11
13	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Removed	0.3951	0.709158	0.5583	-2.784	10

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.558281
RSquare Adj 0.441356
Root Mean Square Error 0.973705
Mean of Response 4.522727
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 44

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	40.741846	4.52687	4.7747
Error	34	32.235426	0.94810	Prob > F
C. Total	43	72.977273		0.0004

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	12	20.243760	1.68698	3.0949
Pure Error	22	11.991667	0.54508	Prob > F
Total Error	34	32.235426		0.0105
			Max RSq	
			0.8357	

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.9238789	0.245094	16.01	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications{1-0}	0.8851673	0.361612	2.45	0.0197
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	-1.681381	0.647315	-2.60	0.0138
whattypecomponentclass{1-0}	-1.215841	0.642372	-1.89	0.0669
whattypeenterpriseacctng{1-0}	1.0192476	0.577286	1.77	0.0864
whatprocessrequirements{1-0}	-1.145379	0.383749	-2.98	0.0052
whatprocesstraining{1-0}	0.6223395	0.366765	1.70	0.0989
whatprocessfielding{1-0}	-1.530698	0.635425	-2.41	0.0216
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	2.512605	0.449232	5.59	<.0001
whatproductnone{1-0}	0.8797397	0.517593	1.70	0.0983

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	5.680939	5.9919	0.0197
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	6.396692	6.7468	0.0138
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	3.396528	3.5825	0.0669
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	2.955505	3.1173	0.0864
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	8.446155	8.9085	0.0052
whatprocesstraining	1	1	2.729817	2.8792	0.0989
whatprocessfielding	1	1	5.501793	5.8030	0.0216
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	29.659292	31.2828	<.0001
whatproductnone	1	1	2.738963	2.8889	0.0983

ResponseOrg = 3.92 + sys-comm(0.89) + shrink-util(-1.68) + comp-class(-1.22) + ent-acct(1.02) + proc-req(-1.15) + proc-train(0.62) + proc-field(-1.53) + proc-SWEngSup(2.51) + prod-none(0.88)

Appendix C - Old Survey Data Consequence Models

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (Cost)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 94.969149	DFE 69	MSE 1.3763645	RSquare 0.4358	RSquare Adj 0.3458	Cp 0.4149569	AIC 36.88734				
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"				
X	X	Intercept	5.09503937	1	0	0.000	1.0000				
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.193625	0.139	0.7105				
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0.25102501	1	2.134879	1.551	0.2172				
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0.23248605	1	2.345615	1.704	0.1961				
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	1.052806	0.762	0.3857				
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.195847	0.141	0.7089				
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.978239	0.708	0.4031				
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.557187	0.401	0.5285				
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.382287	1.004	0.3198				
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	1.30855546	1	18.08818	13.142	0.0005				
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.30438	0.219	0.6416				
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	-0.6791525	1	7.662275	5.567	0.0211				
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.157871	0.113	0.7375				
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.4615635	1	3.434004	2.495	0.1188				
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-2.1425555	1	16.09787	11.696	0.0011				
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.30438	0.219	0.6416				
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.76310751	1	4.005354	2.910	0.0925				
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.471245	0.339	0.5623				
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.115201	0.083	0.7747				
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.289193	0.208	0.6500				
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.935394	0.676	0.4137				
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.364407	0.262	0.6105				
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	1.697659	1.238	0.2698				
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.09262	0.066	0.7975				
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.38844	1.009	0.3187				
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	1.210716	0.878	0.3520				
	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	-0.3654913	1	6.0284	4.380	0.0400				
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.529411	0.381	0.5390				
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.00051	0.000	0.9848				
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.085342	0.061	0.8054				
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.42654828	1	7.57875	5.506	0.0218				
		whatprocesstoolssupt{0-1}	0	1	0.263119	0.189	0.6652				
		whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	0	1	0.611409	0.441	0.5091				
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	-0.5577229	1	16.44489	11.948	0.0009				
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.3022904	1	3.508213	2.549	0.1149				
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	7.2e-7	0.000	0.9994				
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.02895	0.021	0.8859				

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0037	17.1415	0.1018	14.398	2
2	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0054	14.38782	0.1873	7.6994	3
3	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.0124	10.74094	0.2511	3.2058	4
4	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1069	4.266343	0.2765	2.6265	5
5	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0736	5.120923	0.3069	1.5306	6
6	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0976	4.274577	0.3323	0.9463	7
7	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.0953	4.231291	0.3574	0.3882	8
8	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.1755	2.740924	0.3737	0.7312	9
9	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0405	6.083762	0.4099	-0.953	10
10	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.2102	2.218877	0.4231	-0.294	11
11	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.2172	2.134879	0.4358	0.415	12

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.435785
RSquare Adj	0.345838
Root Mean Square Error	1.173186
Mean of Response	4.345679
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	81

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	73.35184	6.66835	4.8449
Error	69	94.96915	1.37636	Prob > F
C. Total	80	168.32099		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	22	39.695340	1.80433	1.5342
Pure Error	47	55.273810	1.17604	Prob > F
Total Error	69	94.969149		0.1087
				Max RSq
				0.6716

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.5679856	0.295303	12.08	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded{1-0}	-0.50205	0.403113	-1.25	0.2172
whattypesystemscommunications{1-0}	-0.464972	0.356176	-1.31	0.1961
whattypecomponentCASE{1-0}	-2.617111	0.721924	-3.63	0.0005
whattypecomponentOS{1-0}	1.3583049	0.575685	2.36	0.0211
whattypeenterpriseacctng{1-0}	0.923127	0.584424	1.58	0.1188
whattypeenterprisemanufact{1-0}	4.2851109	1.252981	3.42	0.0011
whattypeenterpriseOES{1-0}	-1.526215	0.894668	-1.71	0.0925
whatprocessspecification{1-0}	0.7309825	0.349279	2.09	0.0400
whatprocessCM{1-0}	-0.853097	0.363552	-2.35	0.0218
whatproductscustom{1-0}	1.1154459	0.322701	3.46	0.0009
whatproductsCOTS{1-0}	0.6045809	0.378685	1.60	0.1149

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	2.134879	1.5511	0.2172
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	2.345615	1.7042	0.1961
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	18.088182	13.1420	0.0005
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	7.662275	5.5670	0.0211
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	3.434004	2.4950	0.1188
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	16.097871	11.6959	0.0011
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	4.005354	2.9101	0.0925
whatprocessspecification	1	1	6.028400	4.3799	0.0400
whatprocessCM	1	1	7.578750	5.5064	0.0218
whatproductscustom	1	1	16.444887	11.9481	0.0009
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	3.508213	2.5489	0.1149

Cost = 3.57 + (-.50)sys-embed + (-.46)sys-comm + (-2.62)comp-case + (1.36)comp-os + (.92)ent-acct + (4.29)ent-mnft + (-1.53)ent-oes + (.73)proc-spec + (-.85)proc-cm + (1.12)prod-cust + (.60)prod-cots

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (Sched)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 132.06128	DFE 69	MSE 1.9139316	RSquare 0.3376	RSquare Adj 0.2320	Cp -3.494273	AIC 63.59417			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
		Intercept	5.76088737	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.7850392	1	9.540614	4.985	0.0288			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	1.324173	0.689	0.4095			
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0.34792507	1	5.195854	2.715	0.1040			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.906236	0.470	0.4954			
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	-0.3395791	1	3.550993	1.855	0.1776			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.563745	0.815	0.3699			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	1.59107	0.829	0.3657			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.299425	0.155	0.6955			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.738799	0.383	0.5383			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.022533	0.012	0.9145			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.001029	0.001	0.9817			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	1.34129	0.698	0.4065			
X		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0.42626338	1	3.159379	1.651	0.2032			
X		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-1.3623693	1	6.404336	3.346	0.0717			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.022533	0.012	0.9145			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.969841	0.503	0.4806			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.990601	0.514	0.4759			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	2.239416	1.173	0.2826			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.03184	0.016	0.8985			
X		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.5159009	1	12.25879	6.405	0.0137			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.136139	0.070	0.7919			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	2.047242	1.071	0.3044			
X		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.4367876	1	7.713886	4.030	0.0486			
		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.226483	0.117	0.7335			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.827338	0.429	0.5148			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.007269	0.004	0.9514			
X		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0.4316149	1	6.45517	3.373	0.0706			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	2.094378	1.096	0.2989			
X		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	-0.7039892	1	13.32058	6.960	0.0103			
X		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.85920309	1	24.3518	12.723	0.0007			
		whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	0	1	2.428116	1.274	0.2630			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.854875	0.443	0.5079			
X		whatproductscustom{0-1}	-0.2651114	1	3.698955	1.933	0.1689			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.299977	0.155	0.6952			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	1.840536	0.961	0.3304			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.233932	0.121	0.7294			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0766	7.805393	0.0392	0.6091	2
2	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.0798	7.438212	0.0765	-0.405	3
3	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0882	6.864043	0.1109	-1.186	4
4	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.1476	4.85441	0.1352	-1.152	5
5	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1513	4.699276	0.1588	-1.056	6
6	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0850	6.634945	0.1921	-1.744	7
7	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.0812	6.613531	0.2253	-2.424	8
8	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0971	5.830852	0.2545	-2.786	9
9	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0973	5.684041	0.2830	-3.089	10
10	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.1254	4.748008	0.3068	-3.013	11
11	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1976	3.307965	0.3234	-2.353	12
12	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1845	3.473557	0.3409	-1.761	13
13	whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	Entered	0.2166	2.982357	0.3558	-0.969	14
14	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Removed	0.3361	1.799309	0.3468	-2.24	13
15	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.2072	3.078749	0.3622	-1.487	14
16	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Removed	0.2560	2.491168	0.3497	-2.478	13
17	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	Removed	0.2630	2.428116	0.3376	-3.494	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.337567
RSquare Adj 0.231962
Root Mean Square Error 1.383449
Mean of Response 4.395062
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 81

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	67.29675	6.11789	3.1965
Error	69	132.06128	1.91393	Prob > F
C. Total	80	199.35802		0.0015

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	32	67.84699	2.12022	1.2217
Pure Error	37	64.21429	1.73552	Prob > F
Total Error	69	132.06128		0.2771
				Max RSq
				0.6779

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.417117	0.38475	8.88	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	1.5700784	0.703228	2.23	0.0288
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	-0.69585	0.422329	-1.65	0.1040
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	0.6791582	0.498608	1.36	0.1776
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	-0.852527	0.663545	-1.28	0.2032
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	2.7247386	1.489536	1.83	0.0717
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	1.0318019	0.407695	2.53	0.0137
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.8735753	0.435138	2.01	0.0486
whatprocessdocumentation[1-0]	-0.86323	0.470041	-1.84	0.0706
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	1.4079785	0.533701	2.64	0.0103
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.718406	0.481752	-3.57	0.0007
whatproductscustom[1-0]	0.5302227	0.381401	1.39	0.1689

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	9.540614	4.9848	0.0288
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	5.195854	2.7148	0.1040
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	3.550993	1.8553	0.1776
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	3.159379	1.6507	0.2032
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	6.404336	3.3462	0.0717
whatprocessdesign	1	1	12.258794	6.4050	0.0137
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	7.713886	4.0304	0.0486
whatprocessdocumentation	1	1	6.455170	3.3727	0.0706
whatprocessfielding	1	1	13.320581	6.9598	0.0103
whatprocessCM	1	1	24.351798	12.7234	0.0007
whatproductscustom	1	1	3.698955	1.9326	0.1689

Sched = 3.42 + (1.57)sys-avia + (-.70)sys-comm + (-.68)shrink-bus + (-.85)ent-acct + (2.72)ent-mnft + (1.03)proc-des + (.87)proc-reeng + (-.86)proc-doc + (1.41)proc-field + (-1.72)proc-cm + (.53)prod-cust

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (IntelCapital)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	30.867642	64	0.4823069	0.6174	0.5337	0.380703	-44.2394			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.85966053	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.085086	0.174	0.6779			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.03452	0.071	0.7914			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.25992	0.535	0.4672			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.035419	0.072	0.7888			
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	-0.5474613	1	8.887617	18.427	0.0001			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0.49462323	1	1.624533	3.368	0.0711			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.087749	0.180	0.6732			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	-0.6837601	1	7.348932	15.237	0.0002			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.82830633	1	6.232985	12.923	0.0006			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.079747	0.163	0.6876			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.007463	0.015	0.9022			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0.32724112	1	4.304229	8.924	0.0040			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.011283	0.023	0.8798			
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.701835	1	1.562465	3.240	0.0766			
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.079747	0.163	0.6876			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.214318	0.440	0.5093			
	X	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	-0.336725	1	1.50839	3.127	0.0817			
		whattypeenterprisesweb{0-1}	0	1	0.120047	0.246	0.6217			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.000857	0.002	0.9668			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.017324	0.035	0.8514			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.468761	0.971	0.3281			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.006668	0.014	0.9075			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.2544066	1	1.844106	3.824	0.0549			
	X	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	-0.2971724	1	1.781561	3.694	0.0591			
	X	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	-0.4768208	1	6.336608	13.138	0.0006			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.172396	0.354	0.5541			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.01511	0.031	0.8611			
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0.22224395	1	1.685393	3.494	0.0662			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.83925955	1	17.94046	37.197	0.0000			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.378987	0.783	0.3796			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.121866	0.250	0.6190			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.29495325	1	3.919188	8.126	0.0059			
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0.14679207	1	1.176843	2.440	0.1232			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.37651	0.778	0.3811			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.573181	1.192	0.2791			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.557566	1.159	0.2858			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemsfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0004	12.08328	0.1498	34.744	2
2	whattypesystemsretraining{0-1}	Entered	0.0105	5.699798	0.2204	27.625	3
3	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.0258	4.06017	0.2707	23.13	4
4	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0032	6.565	0.3521	14.628	5
5	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.0346	3.121486	0.3908	11.634	6
6	whattypeproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0370	2.902028	0.4268	8.9916	7
7	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0598	2.267616	0.4549	7.364	8
8	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0835	1.855673	0.4779	6.3953	9
9	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1067	1.570788	0.4973	5.8824	10
10	whattypesystemsreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0760	1.848725	0.5202	4.9249	11
11	whattypesystemsSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0463	2.244364	0.5481	3.3345	12
12	whattypesystemsappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0287	2.569127	0.5799	1.2245	13
13	whattypesystemsenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.0854	1.519463	0.5987	0.7938	14
14	whattypesystemsenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.0817	1.50839	0.6174	0.3807	15

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.617423
RSquare Adj	0.533735
Root Mean Square Error	0.694483
Mean of Response	4.063291
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	79

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	49.815903	3.55828	7.3776
Error	64	30.867642	0.48231	Prob > F
C. Total	78	80.683544		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	31	26.034308	0.839816	5.7339
Pure Error	33	4.833333	0.146465	Prob > F
Total Error	64	30.867642		<.0001
			Max RSq	0.9401

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.7148988	0.24903	18.93	<.0001
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	1.0949227	0.255066	4.29	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	-0.989246	0.539016	-1.84	0.0711
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	1.3675202	0.350335	3.90	0.0002
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-1.656613	0.460824	-3.59	0.0006
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	-0.654482	0.219085	-2.99	0.0040
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	1.40367	0.779869	1.80	0.0766
whattypeenterprisescripting[1-0]	0.67345	0.380812	1.77	0.0817
whattypesystemsreengineering[1-0]	0.5088132	0.260212	1.96	0.0549
whattypesystemsappsupt[1-0]	0.5943447	0.309243	1.92	0.0591
whattypesystemstraining[1-0]	0.9536417	0.263099	3.62	0.0006
whattypesystemscoding[1-0]	-0.444488	0.237778	-1.87	0.0662
whattypesystemsfiling[1-0]	-1.678519	0.275214	-6.10	<.0001
whattypesystemsSWEngSuppt[1-0]	-0.589907	0.206941	-2.85	0.0059
whattypesystemscustom[1-0]	-0.293584	0.187947	-1.56	0.1232

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	8.887617	18.4273	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	1.624533	3.3683	0.0711
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	7.348932	15.2370	0.0002
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	6.232985	12.9233	0.0006
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	4.304229	8.9243	0.0040
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	1.562465	3.2396	0.0766
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	1.508390	3.1274	0.0817
whattypesystemsreengineering	1	1	1.844106	3.8235	0.0549
whattypesystemsappsupt	1	1	1.781561	3.6938	0.0591
whattypesystemstraining	1	1	6.336608	13.1381	0.0006
whattypesystemscoding	1	1	1.685393	3.4944	0.0662
whattypesystemsfiling	1	1	17.940456	37.1972	<.0001
whattypesystemsSWEngSuppt	1	1	3.919188	8.1259	0.0059
whattypesystemscustom	1	1	1.176843	2.4400	0.1232

IntelCap = 4.71 + (1.09)shrink-bus + (-.99)shrink-util + (1.37)comp-domain + (-1.67)comp-case + (-.65)comp-dev + (1.40)ent-mnft + (.67)ent-script + (.51)proc-reeng + (.59)proc-appsup + (.95)proc-train + (-.44)proc-coding + (-1.68)proc-field + (-.59)proc-swengsup + (-.29)prod-cust

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (SchedFlex)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	109.55497	70	1.5650711	0.3352	0.2498	-7.411039	45.15199			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	3.4152258	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0.67585057	1	8.171748	5.221	0.0253			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.525227	0.332	0.5661			
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	-0.5311669	1	12.28546	7.850	0.0066			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.002158	0.001	0.9707			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.216543	0.137	0.7128			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.747146	0.474	0.4936			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.556425	0.352	0.5548			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.97971	1.270	0.2637			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.76677462	1	6.282651	4.014	0.0490			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.005051	0.003	0.9552			
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.45179531	1	3.711625	2.372	0.1281			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.139061	0.088	0.7680			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.7581915	1	9.800447	6.262	0.0147			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.147458	0.093	0.7613			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.005051	0.003	0.9552			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	1.248898	0.796	0.3755			
		whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	0.034714	0.022	0.8829			
		whattypeenterprise web{0-1}	0	1	1.214833	0.774	0.3821			
	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.57159557	1	12.89219	8.237	0.0054			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.047718	0.030	0.8628			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.082181	0.052	0.8206			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.004937	0.003	0.9557			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.3797237	1	5.612145	3.586	0.0624			
		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.621101	0.393	0.5326			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.993241	0.631	0.4296			
	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	-0.4325519	1	7.589665	4.849	0.0310			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.014942	0.026	0.8713			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.935249	1.241	0.2692			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.41524402	1	6.795611	4.342	0.0408			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.548536	0.989	0.3234			
		whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.127274	0.080	0.7778			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.770412	0.489	0.4869			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	2.062971	1.324	0.2538			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.402375	0.254	0.6156			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.213559	0.135	0.7147			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.19748	0.125	0.7252			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0242	10.45333	0.0634	-1.91	2
2	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0683	6.560952	0.1032	-3.059	3
3	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0615	6.688278	0.1438	-4.27	4
4	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.1273	4.334386	0.1701	-4.351	5
5	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0719	5.896956	0.2059	-5.181	6
6	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1382	3.907936	0.2296	-5.057	7
7	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0582	6.213503	0.2673	-6.04	8
8	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.0337	7.478056	0.3127	-7.629	9
9	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1281	3.711625	0.3352	-7.411	10

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.335225
RSquare Adj	0.249754
Root Mean Square Error	1.251028
Mean of Response	4.2
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	55.24503	6.13834	3.9221
Error	70	109.55497	1.56507	Prob > F
C. Total	79	164.80000		0.0004

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	21	30.05497	1.43119	0.8821
Pure Error	49	79.50000	1.62245	Prob > F
Total Error	70	109.55497		0.6122
				Max RSq
				0.5176

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1948518	0.211127	19.87	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-1.351701	0.591548	-2.29	0.0253
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	1.0623337	0.379168	2.80	0.0066
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-1.533549	0.765409	-2.00	0.0490
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.903591	0.586755	-1.54	0.1281
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	1.5163831	0.605973	2.50	0.0147
whatprocessrequirements[1-0]	-1.143191	0.398311	-2.87	0.0054
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.7594474	0.401052	1.89	0.0624
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	0.8651039	0.392847	2.20	0.0310
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.830488	0.398553	-2.08	0.0408

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	8.171748	5.2213	0.0253
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	12.285464	7.8498	0.0066
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	6.282651	4.0143	0.0490
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	3.711625	2.3715	0.1281
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	9.800447	6.2620	0.0147
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	12.892188	8.2374	0.0054
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	5.612145	3.5859	0.0624
whatprocessspecification	1	1	7.589665	4.8494	0.0310
whatprocessfielding	1	1	6.795611	4.3420	0.0408

SchedFlex = 4.19 + sys-avia(-1.35) + sys-comm(1.06) + comp-CASE(-1.53) + comp-OS(-0.90) + ent-acct(1.52) + proc-req(-1.14) + proc-reeng(0.76) + proc-spec(0.87) + proc-field(-0.83)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (AdminOverhead)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	74.991596	68	1.1028176	0.4314	0.3394	-5.033458	18.82795			
Lock	X	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
			Intercept	7.4199209	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
			whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-1.1546067	1	16.37701	14.850	0.0003		
			whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.007068	0.006	0.9369		
			whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.461255	0.415	0.5218		
			whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.100753	0.090	0.7649		
			whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.08897	0.080	0.7787		
	X		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-1.3081713	1	11.61315	10.530	0.0018		
	X		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.6296412	1	6.765115	6.134	0.0158		
	X		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.7359386	1	6.749429	6.120	0.0159		
			whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.176749	0.158	0.6920		
			whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.761108	0.687	0.4101		
			whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.031519	0.028	0.8672		
			whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.313561	0.281	0.5976		
			whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.245723	0.220	0.6404		
	X		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-1.4334054	1	6.860332	6.221	0.0151		
			whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.761108	0.687	0.4101		
	X		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.63003481	1	2.917298	2.645	0.1085		
			whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.283114	0.254	0.6160		
			whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.503607	0.453	0.5032		
			whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.285685	0.256	0.6144		
			whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.712849	0.643	0.4255		
			whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.695275	0.627	0.4313		
			whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.10211	0.091	0.7634		
			whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.17891	0.160	0.6902		
	X		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	-0.4927943	1	6.878601	6.237	0.0149		
			whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.684827	0.617	0.4348		
			whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.688505	0.621	0.4335		
	X		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0.53416734	1	10.29449	9.335	0.0032		
			whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.031657	0.028	0.8669		
	X		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	-0.2599681	1	1.669572	1.514	0.2228		
	X		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.57812141	1	11.54136	10.465	0.0019		
			whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.969921	0.878	0.3521		
			whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	0	1	0.888755	0.804	0.3732		
			whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.024013	0.021	0.8840		
			whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.030527	0.027	0.8693		
	X		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.2326459	1	2.443065	2.215	0.1413		
			whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.150536	0.135	0.7147		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	Entered	0.0161	9.500054	0.0720	7.1782	2
2	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.0057	11.62637	0.1602	1.2766	3
3	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0235	7.280303	0.2154	-1.671	4
4	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0892	3.935502	0.2452	-2.346	5
5	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1499	2.769161	0.2662	-2.228	6
6	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.1181	3.205208	0.2905	-2.406	7
7	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0321	5.824319	0.3347	-4.365	8
8	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.0428	4.963109	0.3723	-5.738	9
9	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0874	3.408153	0.3982	-6.054	10
10	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1226	2.71415	0.4187	-5.899	11
11	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.2228	1.669572	0.4314	-5.033	12

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.431397
RSquare Adj	0.339417
Root Mean Square Error	1.050151
Mean of Response	4.4625
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	56.89590	5.17235	4.6901
Error	68	74.99160	1.10282	Prob > F
C. Total	79	131.88750		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	19	28.389513	1.49418	1.5711
Pure Error	49	46.602083	0.95106	Prob > F
Total Error	68	74.991596		0.1030
				Max RSq
				0.6467

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.3869501	0.163375	26.85	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	2.3092134	0.599237	3.85	0.0003
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	2.6163426	0.806253	3.25	0.0018
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	1.2592825	0.508437	2.48	0.0158
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-1.471877	0.594963	-2.47	0.0159
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	2.8668109	1.149419	2.49	0.0151
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	-1.26007	0.77474	-1.63	0.1085
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	0.9855886	0.394637	2.50	0.0149
whatprocessdocumentation[1-0]	-1.068335	0.349669	-3.06	0.0032
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	0.5199362	0.422571	1.23	0.2228
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.156243	0.357415	-3.24	0.0019
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.4652918	0.312615	1.49	0.1413

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	16.377014	14.8502	0.0003
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	11.613151	10.5304	0.0018
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	6.765115	6.1344	0.0158
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	6.749429	6.1202	0.0159
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	6.860332	6.2207	0.0151
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	2.917298	2.6453	0.1085
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	6.878601	6.2373	0.0149
whatprocessdocumentation	1	1	10.294488	9.3347	0.0032
whatprocessfielding	1	1	1.669572	1.5139	0.2228
whatprocessCM	1	1	11.541363	10.4653	0.0019
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	2.443065	2.2153	0.1413

AdminOverhead = 4.39 + sys-avia(2.31) + shrink-util(2.62) + shrink-int(1.26) + comp-domain(-1.47) + ent-mnft(2.87) + ent-OES(-1.26) + proc-appsup(.99) + proc-doc(-1.07) + proc-field(0.52) + proc-CM(-1.16) + prod-comcust(0.47)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (ControlProcess)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	115.04467	70	1.6434952	0.3678	0.2866	-8.705161	49.0635			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.03142772	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	2.074114	1.267	0.2643			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.166172	0.100	0.7530			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.006024	0.004	0.9522			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.107994	0.065	0.7998			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.01269	0.008	0.9307			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.9435264	1	5.266053	3.204	0.0778			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.31135	0.187	0.6666			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.6251688	1	6.437607	3.917	0.0517			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.260637	0.157	0.6935			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.216523	0.130	0.7194			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.525894	0.317	0.5753			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0.34640918	1	5.126021	3.119	0.0817			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.094156	0.057	0.8128			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.047465	0.028	0.8665			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.216523	0.130	0.7194			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.318245	0.191	0.6631			
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.960608	0.581	0.4485			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.071601	0.043	0.8364			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.830574	0.502	0.4811			
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0.6918918	1	20.57616	12.520	0.0007			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	1.967108	1.200	0.2771			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	1.28478	0.779	0.3804			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.7477925	1	20.08407	12.220	0.0008			
		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	1.847033	1.126	0.2924			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.600308	0.362	0.5494			
	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	-0.2610422	1	3.014046	1.834	0.1800			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.289843	0.174	0.6776			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.656468	1.008	0.3189			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	1.311587	0.796	0.3755			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.107612	0.671	0.4156			
	X	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	0.33341554	1	4.539314	2.762	0.1010			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.416103	0.250	0.6183			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.181642	0.109	0.7422			
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.40698632	1	5.855804	3.563	0.0632			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0.23074774	1	2.398779	1.460	0.2311			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.489627	0.295	0.5888			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0032	19.33694	0.1063	-3.479	2
2	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0025	18.34199	0.2070	-9.657	3
3	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0395	7.880786	0.2503	-11.17	4
4	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1523	3.701568	0.2707	-10.82	5
5	whatprocess toolsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1863	3.116936	0.2878	-10.21	6
6	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1904	3.028647	0.3045	-9.562	7
7	whatprocess specification{0-1}	Entered	0.1685	3.313473	0.3227	-9.039	8
8	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.1908	2.956437	0.3389	-8.357	9
9	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0778	5.266053	0.3678	-8.705	10

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.367843
RSquare Adj	0.286566
Root Mean Square Error	1.281989
Mean of Response	3.4875
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	66.94283	7.43809	4.5258
Error	70	115.04467	1.64350	Prob > F
C. Total	79	181.98750		0.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	24	53.62800	2.23450	1.6736
Pure Error	46	61.41667	1.33514	Prob > F
Total Error	70	115.04467		0.0662
				Max RSq
				0.6625

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.7136861	0.362359	13.01	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.8870527	1.054206	1.79	0.0778
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-1.250338	0.631756	-1.98	0.0517
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	-0.692818	0.392296	-1.77	0.0817
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-1.383784	0.391084	-3.54	0.0007
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	1.4955849	0.427828	3.50	0.0008
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	0.5220845	0.385523	1.35	0.1800
whatprocess toolsuppt[1-0]	-0.666831	0.401241	-1.66	0.1010
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	-0.813973	0.431222	-1.89	0.0632
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	-0.461495	0.381994	-1.21	0.2311

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	5.266053	3.2042	0.0778
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	6.437607	3.9170	0.0517
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	5.126021	3.1190	0.0817
whatprocessdesign	1	1	20.576158	12.5198	0.0007
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	20.084070	12.2203	0.0008
whatprocessspecification	1	1	3.014046	1.8339	0.1800
whatprocess toolsuppt	1	1	4.539314	2.7620	0.1010
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	5.855804	3.5630	0.0632
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	2.398779	1.4596	0.2311

ControlProcess = 4.71 + shrink-util(1.89) + comp-domain(-1.25) + comp-dev(-0.69) + proc-des(-1.38) + proc-reeng(1.50) + proc-spec(0.52) + proc-toolsup(-0.67) + prod-COTS(-0.81) + prod-comcust(-0.46)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (InhouseNonCore)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 76.23804	DFE 67	MSE 1.1378812	RSquare 0.3996	RSquare Adj 0.3100	Cp -4.042264	AIC 20.21783			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.05266848	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0.60304818	1	5.955562	5.234	0.0253			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	1.112126	0.977	0.3265			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.094749	0.082	0.7753			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.129358	0.112	0.7387			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.77388	0.677	0.4136			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.395702	1.231	0.2713			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.751067	0.657	0.4206			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.69316	0.606	0.4392			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.075683	0.066	0.7987			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.000966	0.001	0.9770			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.050639	0.044	0.8347			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-0.2397377	1	2.287103	2.010	0.1609			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.4283596	1	2.999612	2.636	0.1092			
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-1.1718055	1	5.048142	4.436	0.0389			
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.000966	0.001	0.9770			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.90718493	1	5.577901	4.902	0.0302			
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.411367	0.358	0.5516			
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	-0.3081043	1	3.008214	2.644	0.1087			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.002677	0.002	0.9617			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.292839	0.254	0.6156			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.579725	0.506	0.4795			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.009492	0.008	0.9280			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.00165	0.001	0.9700			
		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.594047	0.518	0.4741			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.777955	0.680	0.4124			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.251669	0.219	0.6417			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.048766	0.042	0.8378			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.127047	0.110	0.7410			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	1.263076	1.112	0.2955			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.161346	0.140	0.7095			
	X	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	0.41502599	1	6.432741	5.653	0.0203			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.4251425	1	8.94256	7.859	0.0066			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.460933	0.401	0.5285			
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.3367	1	4.988808	4.384	0.0401			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	1.234165	1.086	0.3012			
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0.56807799	1	2.427014	2.133	0.1488			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.0121	10.15385	0.0800	5.6242	2
2	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0256	7.554217	0.1394	2.4759	3
3	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.0501	5.558983	0.1832	0.6873	4
4	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0716	4.540449	0.2190	-0.407	5
5	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0743	4.322517	0.2530	-1.353	6
6	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0448	5.264054	0.2945	-2.941	7
7	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0544	4.645265	0.3311	-4.106	8
8	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1157	3.014268	0.3548	-4.161	9
9	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1774	2.178614	0.3719	-3.645	10
10	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.1442	2.51728	0.3918	-3.361	11
11	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Removed	0.2944	1.287458	0.3816	-4.484	10
12	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1609	2.287103	0.3996	-4.042	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.39964
RSquare Adj	0.310034
Root Mean Square Error	1.066715
Mean of Response	3.987179
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	78

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	50.74914	5.07491	4.4600
Error	67	76.23804	1.13788	Prob > F
C. Total	77	126.98718		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	16	20.952326	1.30952	1.2080
Pure Error	51	55.285714	1.08403	Prob > F
Total Error	67	76.238040		0.2944
				Max RSq
				0.5646

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.636156	0.190425	19.09	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-1.206096	0.527192	-2.29	0.0253
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	0.4794754	0.338199	1.42	0.1609
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	0.8567193	0.52766	1.62	0.1092
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	2.343611	1.112675	2.11	0.0389
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	-1.81437	0.819481	-2.21	0.0302
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	0.6162086	0.378985	1.63	0.1087
whatprocesstoolsuppt[1-0]	-0.830052	0.349105	-2.38	0.0203
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.850285	0.303307	2.80	0.0066
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.6733999	0.321605	2.09	0.0401
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.136156	0.777947	-1.46	0.1488

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	5.9555625	5.2339	0.0253
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	2.2871033	2.0100	0.1609
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	2.9996120	2.6361	0.1092
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	5.0481421	4.4364	0.0389
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	5.5779009	4.9020	0.0302
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	3.0082137	2.6437	0.1087
whatprocesstoolsuppt	1	1	6.4327412	5.6533	0.0203
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	8.9425598	7.8590	0.0066
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	4.9888077	4.3843	0.0401
whatproductsnone	1	1	2.4270141	2.1329	0.1488

InhouseNonCore = 3.64 + sys-avia(-1.21) + comp-dev(0.48) + ent-acct(0.86) + ent-mnft(2.34) + ent-OES(-1.81) + ent-web(0.62) + proc-toolsup(-0.83) + proc-SWEngSup(0.85) + prod-COTS(0.67) + prod-none(-1.14)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (InhouseTurnover)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
20.108654		67	0.3001292	0.4236	0.3290	-1.917523	-84.0955		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	2.95393134	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0.22717178	1	0.84964	2.831	0.0971		
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.105511	0.348	0.5572		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.096503	0.318	0.5746		
X		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0.21799118	1	0.68082	2.268	0.1367		
X		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0.26796463	1	2.111955	7.037	0.0100		
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.076623	0.252	0.6170		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.001559	0.005	0.9432		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.045673	0.150	0.6995		
X		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.44251331	1	1.705531	5.683	0.0200		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.001236	0.004	0.9494		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.003064	0.010	0.9204		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.223144	0.741	0.3926		
X		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.3015485	1	1.518858	5.061	0.0278		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.165526	0.548	0.4618		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.001236	0.004	0.9494		
X		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.32671654	1	0.733246	2.443	0.1228		
X		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0.21714431	1	0.616033	2.053	0.1566		
		whattypeenterprisesweb{0-1}	0	1	0.02785	0.092	0.7632		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.107489	0.355	0.5535		
X		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0.10946224	1	0.548418	1.827	0.1810		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.161196	0.533	0.4678		
X		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0.17301282	1	1.621516	5.403	0.0231		
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.030023	0.099	0.7544		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.371469	1.242	0.2691		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.147712	0.488	0.4871		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.036901	0.121	0.7287		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.058968	0.194	0.6610		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.127897	0.422	0.5180		
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.16686	0.552	0.4600		
X		whatprocessCM{0-1}	-0.1637265	1	0.970396	3.233	0.0767		
		whatprocessoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.053137	0.175	0.6772		
X		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.1579166	1	1.360082	4.532	0.0370		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.017059	0.056	0.8136		
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.011916	0.039	0.8438		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.054486	0.179	0.6733		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.308644	1.029	0.3141		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0002	5.864146	0.1681	1.6116	2
2	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0491	1.450896	0.2097	-0.218	3
3	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0530	1.351052	0.2484	-1.785	4
4	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.0674	1.166644	0.2819	-2.865	5
5	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0485	1.30977	0.3194	-4.322	6
6	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.1051	0.856237	0.3439	-4.582	7
7	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.1746	0.590655	0.3609	-4.142	8
8	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.2280	0.461396	0.3741	-3.36	9
9	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1689	0.595006	0.3912	-2.93	10
10	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1704	0.583203	0.4079	-2.47	11
11	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.1810	0.548418	0.4236	-1.918	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.423591
RSquare Adj 0.328956
Root Mean Square Error 0.54784
Mean of Response 4.037975
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 79

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	14.777422	1.34340	4.4761
Error	67	20.108654	0.30013	Prob > F
C. Total	78	34.886076		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	21	9.998130	0.476149	2.1666
Pure Error	46	10.109524	0.219772	Prob > F
Total Error	67	20.108654		0.0145
				Max RSq
				0.7102

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.3127166	0.146456	29.45	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics{1-0}	-0.454344	0.270036	-1.68	0.0971
whattypesystemsdevice{1-0}	-0.435982	0.289472	-1.51	0.1367
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	-0.535929	0.202032	-2.65	0.0100
whattypecomponentCASE{1-0}	-0.885027	0.371262	-2.38	0.0200
whattypeenterpriseacctng{1-0}	0.603097	0.268091	2.25	0.0278
whattypeenterpriseOES{1-0}	-0.653433	0.418052	-1.56	0.1228
whattypeenterprisescripting{1-0}	-0.434289	0.303131	-1.43	0.1566
whatprocessdesign{1-0}	-0.218924	0.161954	-1.35	0.1810
whatprocessmaintenance{1-0}	-0.346026	0.148868	-2.32	0.0231
whatprocessCM{1-0}	0.3274531	0.182108	1.80	0.0767
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	0.3158332	0.148364	2.13	0.0370

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	0.8496399	2.8309	0.0971
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	0.6808203	2.2684	0.1367
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	2.1119545	7.0368	0.0100
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	1.7055312	5.6827	0.0200
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	1.5188578	5.0607	0.0278
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	0.7332455	2.4431	0.1228
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	0.6160329	2.0526	0.1566
whatprocessdesign	1	1	0.5484179	1.8273	0.1810
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	1.6215155	5.4027	0.0231
whatprocessCM	1	1	0.9703965	3.2333	0.0767
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	1.3600824	4.5317	0.0370

InhouseTurnover = 4.31 + sys-avia(-0.45) + sys-dev(-0.44) + shrink-bus(-0.54) + comp-CASE(-0.89) + ent-acct(0.60) + ent-OES(-0.65) + ent-script(-0.43) + proc-des(-0.22) + proc-maint(-0.35) + proc-CM(0.33) + proc-SWEngSup(0.32)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (LearningCurve)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 80.893033	DFE 72	MSE 1.1235143	RSquare 0.2032	RSquare Adj 0.1368	Cp -12.97511	AIC 15.87071			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	2.71713895	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.00014	0.000	0.9912			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.061453	0.054	0.8169			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.010547	0.009	0.9236			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.046311	0.041	0.8408			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.38614	0.341	0.5614			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.273315	0.241	0.6252			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.048634	0.043	0.8369			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.259912	0.229	0.6338			
X	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.77915246	1	6.426484	5.720	0.0194			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.7420407	1	3.142977	2.797	0.0988			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.725277	0.642	0.4255			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.239404	0.211	0.6476			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	1.445996	1.292	0.2595			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.223971	0.197	0.6584			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	0	0	.	.			
X		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.56033792	1	1.841381	1.639	0.2046			
X		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	-0.4359535	1	2.614876	2.327	0.1315			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.004971	0.004	0.9475			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.06517	0.057	0.8116			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.790721	0.701	0.4053			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.003366	0.003	0.9568			
X		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0.18170279	1	2.200086	1.958	0.1660			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.455925	0.402	0.5279			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.035675	0.031	0.8600			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.008131	0.007	0.9329			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.588197	0.520	0.4732			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.178102	0.157	0.6934			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.747153	0.662	0.4186			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.049553	0.044	0.8353			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.048057	0.042	0.8378			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.00153	0.001	0.9709			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.024241	0.021	0.8844			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	1.179177	1.050	0.3089			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.369487	0.326	0.5700			
X		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.2767501	1	4.097259	3.647	0.0602			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	1.245628	1.110	0.2956			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0343	5.772234	0.0569	-13.42	2
2	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0525	4.652159	0.1027	-14.41	3
3	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1175	2.946976	0.1317	-14.31	4
4	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.1551	2.391469	0.1553	-13.85	5
5	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1640	2.260892	0.1775	-13.3	6
6	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.2405	1.593321	0.1932	-12.33	7
7	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Removed	0.3951	0.832478	0.1850	-13.79	6
8	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.2046	1.841381	0.2032	-12.98	7

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.203173
RSquare Adj	0.136771
Root Mean Square Error	1.05996
Mean of Response	4.177215
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	79

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	6	20.62595	3.43766	3.0597
Error	72	80.89303	1.12351	Prob > F
C. Total	78	101.51899		0.0101

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	3	0.839604	0.27987	0.2412
Pure Error	69	80.053429	1.16019	Prob > F
Total Error	72	80.893033		0.8673
				Max RSq
				0.2114

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.2676693	0.173822	24.55	<.0001
whattypecomponentCASE{1-0}	-1.558305	0.651561	-2.39	0.0194
whattypecomponentclass{1-0}	-1.484081	0.887312	-1.67	0.0988
whattypeenterpriseOES{1-0}	-1.120676	0.875382	-1.28	0.2046
whattypeenterprisescripting{1-0}	0.871907	0.571523	1.53	0.1315
whatprocessmaintenance{1-0}	-0.363406	0.259693	-1.40	0.1660
whatproductscommoncust{1-0}	0.5535001	0.289841	1.91	0.0602

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	6.4264844	5.7200	0.0194
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	3.1429766	2.7975	0.0988
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	1.8413814	1.6389	0.2046
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	2.6148756	2.3274	0.1315
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	2.2000860	1.9582	0.1660
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	4.0972593	3.6468	0.0602

LearningCurve = 4.27 + comp-CASE(-1.56) + comp-class(-1.48) + ent-OES(-1.12) + ent-script(0.87) + proc-maint(-0.36) + prod-comcus(0.55)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (Risk)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	133.27569	72	1.8510512	0.3065	0.2391	-5.483647	56.83146			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	2.42730174	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.420308	0.225	0.6370			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.714094	0.382	0.5383			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0.50306595	1	11.67243	6.306	0.0143			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.707423	0.379	0.5402			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.429136	0.229	0.6335			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.016441	0.546	0.4625			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.001256	0.001	0.9794			
		whattypescomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.056183	0.030	0.8631			
		whattypescomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	2.26576	1.228	0.2716			
		whattypescomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.258155	0.138	0.7116			
		whattypescomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.003651	0.002	0.9649			
		whattypescomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.937601	0.503	0.4805			
		whattypesenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.808722	0.433	0.5124			
		whattypesenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.667474	0.900	0.3461			
		whattypesenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.258155	0.138	0.7116			
X		whattypesenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.81973707	1	5.073979	2.741	0.1021			
X		whattypesenterprisescripting{0-1}	0.63294739	1	5.777588	3.121	0.0815			
X		whattypesenterprisesweb{0-1}	0.26732438	1	2.901482	1.567	0.2146			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.117853	0.063	0.8028			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.567151	0.303	0.5835			
		whatprocessstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.389428	0.208	0.6497			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.001993	0.001	0.9741			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.215168	0.115	0.7357			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.755874	0.405	0.5266			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	1.214825	0.653	0.4217			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.061565	0.033	0.8568			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	1.253806	0.674	0.4143			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.266222	0.142	0.7073			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.01904	0.010	0.9201			
X		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.69310296	1	23.06004	12.458	0.0007			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.3125	0.706	0.4035			
X		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.3151494	1	6.071526	3.280	0.0743			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	1.992454	1.078	0.3028			
X		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.5109024	1	11.76121	6.354	0.0139			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.997793	0.536	0.4667			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	1.479037	0.797	0.3751			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0242	12.1875	0.0634	3.0312	2
2	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0088	15.42722	0.1437	-1.742	3
3	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0164	12.07871	0.2065	-5.046	4
4	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0579	7.187571	0.2439	-6.201	5
5	whattypesenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.1181	4.748486	0.2686	-6.286	6
6	whattypesenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1297	4.380843	0.2914	-6.21	7
7	whattypesenterprisesweb{0-1}	Entered	0.2146	2.901482	0.3065	-5.484	8

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.306533
RSquare Adj	0.239113
Root Mean Square Error	1.360533
Mean of Response	4.1875
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	7	58.91181	8.41597	4.5466
Error	72	133.27569	1.85105	Prob > F
C. Total	79	192.18750		0.0003

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	14	24.99235	1.78517	0.9562
Pure Error	58	108.28333	1.86695	Prob > F
Total Error	72	133.27569		0.5075
				Max RSq
				0.4366

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.5174278	0.23955	18.86	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	-1.006132	0.400667	-2.51	0.0143
whattypesenterpriseOES[1-0]	-1.639474	0.990238	-1.66	0.1021
whattypesenterprisescripting[1-0]	-1.265895	0.716529	-1.77	0.0815
whattypesenterprisesweb[1-0]	-0.534649	0.427039	-1.25	0.2146
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.386206	0.392742	-3.53	0.0007
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.6302987	0.348022	1.81	0.0743
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	1.0218048	0.40537	2.52	0.0139

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	11.672429	6.3058	0.0143
whattypesenterpriseOES	1	1	5.073979	2.7411	0.1021
whattypesenterprisescripting	1	1	5.777588	3.1212	0.0815
whattypesenterprisesweb	1	1	2.901482	1.5675	0.2146
whatprocessCM	1	1	23.060036	12.4578	0.0007
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	6.071526	3.2800	0.0743
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	11.761207	6.3538	0.0139

Risk = 4.52 + sys-comm(-1.01) + ent-OES(-1.64) + ent-script(-1.27) + ent-web(-0.53) + proc-CM(-1.39) + proc-SWEngSup(0.63) + prod-COTS(1.02)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (Quality)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	138.55831	75	1.8474441	0.1918	0.1595	-16.09204	52.38563			
Lock X	Entered X	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
		Intercept	4.20996284	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.804632	0.432	0.5129			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.072328	0.039	0.8447			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.249862	0.674	0.4144			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.428972	0.230	0.6331			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	1.318692	0.711	0.4018			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.521273	0.279	0.5986			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.617671	0.331	0.5666			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.823718	0.443	0.5080			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.331022	0.177	0.6750			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.006299	0.003	0.9539			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	2.120124	1.150	0.2871			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.037316	0.020	0.8881			
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	1.390717	0.750	0.3892			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.228873	0.662	0.4184			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.006299	0.003	0.9539			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.993111	0.534	0.4671			
		whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	0.867781	0.466	0.4968			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.095182	0.051	0.8222			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.019064	0.010	0.9199			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.046973	0.025	0.8746			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.004928	0.003	0.9592			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.30243	0.162	0.6886			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.5762659	1	14.18207	7.677	0.0070			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	3.399e-8	0.000	0.9999			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.533073	0.286	0.5945			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.240311	0.129	0.7209			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.827112	0.444	0.5071			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.202728	0.108	0.7429			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	2.288202	1.243	0.2686			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.105642	0.056	0.8128			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.037728	0.558	0.4573			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.31679381	1	6.392409	3.460	0.0668			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.101684	0.054	0.8163			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.6043975	1	17.4637	9.453	0.0029			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	2.188209	1.187	0.2794			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.414216	0.222	0.6390			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0062	15.98366	0.0932	-13.39	2
2	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0215	10.50866	0.1545	-15.56	3
3	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0668	6.392409	0.1918	-16.09	4

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.191811
RSquare Adj	0.159484
Root Mean Square Error	1.359207
Mean of Response	4.329114
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	79

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	3	32.88473	10.9616	5.9334
Error	75	138.55831	1.8474	Prob > F
C. Total	78	171.44304		0.0011

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	4	4.63583	1.15896	0.6144
Pure Error	71	133.92247	1.88623	Prob > F
Total Error	75	138.55831		0.6536
				Max RSq
				0.2189

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.5548882	0.20017	22.76	<.0001
whatprocessreengineering{1-0}	1.1525318	0.415977	2.77	0.0070
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	-0.633588	0.340612	-1.86	0.0668
whatproductsCOTS{1-0}	-1.208795	0.393161	-3.07	0.0029

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	14.182067	7.6766	0.0070
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	6.392409	3.4601	0.0668
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	17.463697	9.4529	0.0029

Quality = 4.55 + proc-reeng(1.15) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.63) + prod-COTS(-1.21)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (Rework)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 100.79083	DFE 70	MSE 1.439869	RSquare 0.2441	RSquare Adj 0.1686	Cp -12.48343	AIC 35.99441		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
		Intercept	4.97318561	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.038871	0.027	0.8709		
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.075269	0.052	0.8210		
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0.21887821	1	2.219017	1.541	0.2186		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	-0.6822697	1	7.071239	4.911	0.0299		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.000786	0.001	0.9816		
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.159745	0.110	0.7417		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.5654568	1	5.173431	3.593	0.0622		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.819588	1.269	0.2639		
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.344054	0.236	0.6284		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.689274	0.475	0.4930		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	1.363959	0.947	0.3340		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.940153	0.650	0.4230		
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.292859	0.201	0.6553		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.22654	0.155	0.6946		
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.689274	0.475	0.4930		
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	1.213401	0.841	0.3624		
	X	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0.40105105	1	2.234162	1.552	0.2170		
		whattypeenterprisesweb{0-1}	0	1	0.71698	0.494	0.4844		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.01982	0.014	0.9076		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.171311	0.117	0.7328		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.90994	0.629	0.4306		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.023267	0.016	0.8999		
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0.51804707	1	9.241571	6.418	0.0135		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.000642	0.000	0.9833		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.002987	0.002	0.9641		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.238758	0.164	0.6869		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.301258	0.207	0.6507		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.877211	1.310	0.2564		
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.053837	0.037	0.8483		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.288677	0.894	0.3478		
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.283252	0.194	0.6606		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.1955687	1	2.241367	1.557	0.2163		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.534378	0.368	0.5462		
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.5974604	1	16.34597	11.352	0.0012		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.19777	0.136	0.7138		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.010501	0.007	0.9327		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0040	13.86679	0.1040	-15.3	2
2	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1330	3.565351	0.1307	-15.05	3
3	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1428	3.337927	0.1558	-14.69	4
4	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1807	2.747747	0.1764	-14.04	5
5	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1712	2.8385	0.1977	-13.44	6
6	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Removed	0.2548	1.957808	0.1830	-14.48	5
7	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1178	3.663619	0.2104	-14.28	6
8	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.2147	2.274184	0.2275	-13.39	7
9	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.2186	2.219017	0.2441	-12.48	8

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.244141
RSquare Adj	0.168556
Root Mean Square Error	1.199945
Mean of Response	4.269231
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	78

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	7	32.55532	4.65076	3.2300
Error	70	100.79083	1.43987	Prob > F
C. Total	77	133.34615		0.0050

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	13	21.29083	1.63776	1.1742
Pure Error	57	79.50000	1.39474	Prob > F
Total Error	70	100.79083		0.3214
				Max RSq
				0.4038

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.0704064	0.200654	20.29	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	-0.437756	0.352626	-1.24	0.2186
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	1.3645393	0.615743	2.22	0.0299
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	1.1309135	0.596625	1.90	0.0622
whattypeenterprisescripting[1-0]	-0.802102	0.643923	-1.25	0.2170
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	-1.036094	0.408967	-2.53	0.0135
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.3911375	0.313498	1.25	0.2163
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	1.1949208	0.354646	3.37	0.0012

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	2.219017	1.5411	0.2186
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	7.071239	4.9110	0.0299
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	5.173431	3.5930	0.0622
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	2.234162	1.5516	0.2170
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	9.241571	6.4183	0.0135
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	2.241367	1.5566	0.2163
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	16.345966	11.3524	0.0012

Rework = 4.07 + sys-comm(-0.44) + sys-dev(1.36) + shrink-int(1.13) + ent-script(-0.80) + proc-reeng(-1.04) + proc-SWEngSup(0.39) + prod-COTS(1.19)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (Visibility)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 80.322548	DFE 67	MSE 1.198844	RSquare 0.4229	RSquare Adj 0.3196	Cp -0.634968	AIC 26.3219			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	5.98677311	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.518286	0.429	0.5149			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.602672	0.499	0.4824			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	-0.3455468	1	5.183555	4.324	0.0414			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.001077	0.001	0.9764			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.213281	0.176	0.6764			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.367963	0.304	0.5834			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.299066	0.247	0.6211			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.701401	0.581	0.4485			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.438187	0.362	0.5494			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.094628	0.078	0.7811			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.852281	0.708	0.4032			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0.356298	1	4.779899	3.987	0.0499			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.476471	0.394	0.5324			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.151067	0.124	0.7255			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.094628	0.078	0.7811			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.9907837	1	6.935252	5.785	0.0189			
	X	whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	-0.6244449	1	5.375618	4.484	0.0379			
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0.24081165	1	1.688966	1.409	0.2394			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.172193	0.142	0.7077			
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0.27918704	1	3.685938	3.075	0.0841			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.320998	0.265	0.6085			
	X	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	-0.338678	1	6.758902	5.638	0.0204			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.7537735	1	17.07158	14.240	0.0003			
		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.50352	0.416	0.5210			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.231205	0.191	0.6639			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.329009	0.271	0.6041			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.008766	0.007	0.9326			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.347492	0.287	0.5941			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.4390628	1	6.55602	5.469	0.0224			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.201871	0.166	0.6847			
		whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.002945	0.002	0.9609			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.19014744	1	2.001007	1.669	0.2008			
	X	whatproducts custom{0-1}	-0.4082429	1	8.168385	6.814	0.0112			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.036239	0.030	0.8635			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.981731	0.817	0.3694			
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	-1.2483768	1	11.04777	9.215	0.0034			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0044	13.80005	0.0991	7.3054	2
2	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0324	7.280303	0.1515	4.4685	3
3	whatproducts custom{0-1}	Entered	0.0445	6.148685	0.1956	2.3834	4
4	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.0698	4.834524	0.2304	1.1714	5
5	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0563	5.179103	0.2676	-0.269	6
6	whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	Entered	0.0720	4.449566	0.2995	-1.226	7
7	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1234	3.183774	0.3224	-1.341	8
8	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.1257	3.085155	0.3446	-1.391	9
9	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.1318	2.932973	0.3657	-1.339	10
10	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1419	2.737541	0.3853	-1.158	11
11	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.1373	2.752772	0.4051	-0.987	12
12	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Removed	0.3797	0.951842	0.3983	-2.355	11
13	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.2334	1.743379	0.4108	-1.513	12
14	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.2394	1.688966	0.4229	-0.635	13

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.422918
RSquare Adj 0.31956
Root Mean Square Error 1.094917
Mean of Response 3.3125
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	12	58.86495	4.90541	4.0918
Error	67	80.32255	1.19884	Prob > F
C. Total	79	139.18750		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	35	41.289214	1.17969	0.9671
Pure Error	32	39.033333	1.21979	Prob > F
Total Error	67	80.322548		0.5403
			Max RSq	0.7196

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	2.7824335	0.321509	8.65	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	0.6910937	0.332357	2.08	0.0414
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	-0.712596	0.356874	-2.00	0.0499
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.9815674	0.823871	2.41	0.0189
whattypeenterprisescrpting[1-0]	1.2488897	0.589782	2.12	0.0379
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	-0.481623	0.405769	-1.19	0.2394
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-0.558374	0.318444	-1.75	0.0841
whatprocessmaintenance[1-0]	0.677356	0.285275	2.37	0.0204
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	1.507547	0.399499	3.77	0.0003
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.878126	0.375507	-2.34	0.0224
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	-0.380295	0.294359	-1.29	0.2008
whatproducts custom[1-0]	0.8164858	0.312796	2.61	0.0112
whatproductsnone[1-0]	2.4967535	0.822469	3.04	0.0034

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	5.183555	4.3238	0.0414
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	4.779899	3.9871	0.0499
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	6.935252	5.7849	0.0189
whattypeenterprisescrpting	1	1	5.375618	4.4840	0.0379
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	1.688966	1.4088	0.2394
whatprocessdesign	1	1	3.685938	3.0746	0.0841
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	6.758802	5.6378	0.0204
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	17.071582	14.2400	0.0003
whatprocessfielding	1	1	6.556020	5.4686	0.0224
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	2.001007	1.6691	0.2008
whatproducts custom	1	1	8.168385	6.8136	0.0112
whatproductsnone	1	1	11.047775	9.2154	0.0034

Visibility = 2.78 + sys-comm(0.69) + comp-dev(-0.71) + ent-OES(1.98) + ent-script(1.25) + ent-web(-0.48) + proc-des(-0.56) + proc-maint(0.68) + proc-reeng(1.51) + roc-field(-0.88) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.38) + prod-cust(0.82) + prod-none(2.50)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (ControlProduct)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 82.519081	DFE 69	MSE 1.1959287	RSquare 0.3860	RSquare Adj 0.2970	Cp -2.38735	AIC 24.48023			
Lock X	Entered X	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
		Intercept	3.56042654	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.030868	0.025	0.8737			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.175785	0.145	0.7044			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.037494	0.031	0.8610			
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0.54209815	1	4.280597	3.579	0.0627			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.149815	0.124	0.7262			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.8827025	1	4.723598	3.950	0.0508			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.005012	0.004	0.9489			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.42847915	1	2.908912	2.432	0.1234			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.14849	0.123	0.7273			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.001096	0.001	0.9761			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.908058	0.757	0.3875			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.574318	0.477	0.4923			
		whattypeenterpriseacntg{0-1}	0	1	1.540991	1.294	0.2593			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.263658	0.218	0.6421			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.001096	0.001	0.9761			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.304817	0.252	0.6172			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.918888	0.766	0.3846			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.783535	0.652	0.4223			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.79934	0.665	0.4176			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.198203	0.164	0.6870			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.20355	0.168	0.6830			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.860112	0.716	0.4003			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.3056548	1	2.976387	2.489	0.1192			
	X	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	-0.9057526	1	13.38189	11.190	0.0013			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.3948	0.327	0.5694			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.452618	0.375	0.5423			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.987322	0.823	0.3674			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.150195	0.124	0.7258			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.32812655	1	3.220936	2.693	0.1053			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.11788	0.097	0.7561			
	X	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0.3812332	1	4.993909	4.176	0.0448			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.2297158	1	2.205656	1.844	0.1789			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.413515	0.342	0.5603			
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.4831796	1	8.525724	7.129	0.0095			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0.33076121	1	4.96574	4.152	0.0454			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	1.388063	1.163	0.2846			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0056	12.6498	0.0941	6.0435	2
2	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.0329	7.033841	0.1465	3.3032	3
3	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0562	5.408824	0.1867	1.658	4
4	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0388	6.088748	0.2320	-0.445	5
5	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0661	4.635403	0.2665	-1.569	6
6	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.1085	3.440173	0.2921	-1.888	7
7	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1337	2.946144	0.3140	-1.873	8
8	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1476	2.701419	0.3341	-1.694	9
9	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1641	2.457849	0.3524	-1.35	10
10	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1326	2.826315	0.3735	-1.255	11
11	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Removed	0.3063	1.29648	0.3638	-2.381	10
12	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1192	2.976387	0.3860	-2.387	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.385962
RSquare Adj	0.296971
Root Mean Square Error	1.093585
Mean of Response	3.7125
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	51.86842	5.18684	4.3371
Error	69	82.51908	1.19593	Prob > F
C. Total	79	134.38750		0.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	21	30.635747	1.45885	1.3497
Pure Error	48	51.883333	1.08090	Prob > F
Total Error	69	82.519081		0.1929
				Max RSq
				0.6139

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1899103	0.180433	23.22	<.0001
whattypesystemsdevice{1-0}	-1.084196	0.573071	-1.89	0.0627
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	1.765405	0.888302	1.99	0.0508
whattypecomponentdomain{1-0}	-0.856958	0.549474	-1.56	0.1234
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	0.6113096	0.387498	1.58	0.1192
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	1.8115051	0.541544	3.35	0.0013
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	-0.656253	0.399863	-1.64	0.1053
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	-0.762466	0.373124	-2.04	0.0448
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	-0.459432	0.338302	-1.36	0.1789
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	-0.966359	0.361931	-2.67	0.0095
whattypeshrinkbusiness{1-0}	-0.661522	0.324642	-2.04	0.0454

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	4.280597	3.5793	0.0627
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	4.723598	3.9497	0.0508
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	2.908912	2.4323	0.1234
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	2.976387	2.4888	0.1192
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	13.381887	11.1895	0.0013
Whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	3.220936	2.6933	0.1053
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	4.993909	4.1758	0.0448
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	2.205656	1.8443	0.1789
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	8.525724	7.1290	0.0095
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	4.965740	4.1522	0.0454

ControlProduct = 4.19 + sys-dev(-1.08) + shrink-util(1.77) + comp-domain(-0.86) + proc-reeng(0.61) + proc-appsup(1.81)
+ proc-field(-0.66) + proc-toolsup(-0.76) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.46) + prod-COTS(-0.97) + prod-comcust(-0.66)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (ChangeCost)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

		SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
		80.997432	69	1.1738758	0.3453	0.2599	-7.160605	21.9726		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
	X	Intercept	6.56466218	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.4290094	1	3.160353	2.692	0.1054			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.049415	0.042	0.8392			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.113881	0.948	0.3336			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.030806	0.026	0.8727			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.456482	0.385	0.5368			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.553773	0.468	0.4962			
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.6955694	1	6.987774	5.953	0.0173			
		whattypecomponentchain{0-1}	0	1	0.578532	0.489	0.4867			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.017193	0.014	0.9047			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.167294	0.141	0.7087			
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	-0.801777	1	10.96923	9.344	0.0032			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.088069	0.074	0.7864			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.6708692	1	7.416831	6.318	0.0143			
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.7388432	1	2.056883	1.752	0.1900			
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.167294	0.141	0.7087			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.98388367	1	6.844512	5.831	0.0184			
		whattypeenterprisescrptng{0-1}	0	1	0.467375	0.395	0.5320			
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0.44158039	1	5.728142	4.880	0.0305			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.020758	0.017	0.8954			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.477487	0.403	0.5276			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.264923	0.223	0.6382			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.031899	0.027	0.8705			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.1531	0.129	0.7208			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.158275	0.133	0.7163			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.039953	0.034	0.8552			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.013598	0.011	0.9152			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.939663	0.798	0.3748			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.011639	0.010	0.9215			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.574795	0.486	0.4881			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.457047	1.246	0.2683			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.016326	0.014	0.9071			
	X	whattypesystemSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.2254156	1	3.136669	2.672	0.1067			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.219892	0.185	0.6684			
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.3571599	1	5.603729	4.774	0.0323			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.310219	0.261	0.6108			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.69321	0.587	0.4462			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0467	6.237735	0.0504	0.1911	2
2	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0511	5.775309	0.0971	-1.505	3
3	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.0675	4.900137	0.1367	-2.641	4
4	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0577	5.108657	0.1780	-3.911	5
5	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.0317	6.268299	0.2287	-5.923	6
6	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0926	3.701944	0.2586	-6.292	7
7	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.2020	2.093894	0.2755	-5.632	8
8	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.2150	1.961383	0.2914	-4.887	9
9	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.1017	3.361312	0.3185	-5.039	10
10	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.1811	2.204849	0.3363	-4.45	11
11	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Removed	0.3457	1.088921	0.3275	-5.753	10
12	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1771	2.215816	0.3455	-5.171	11
13	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	Removed	0.9071	0.016326	0.3453	-7.161	10

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.345325
RSquare Adj	0.259932
Root Mean Square Error	1.083456
Mean of Response	4.518987
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	79

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	42.72409	4.74712	4.0440
Error	69	80.99743	1.17388	Prob > F
C. Total	78	123.72152		0.0003

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	9	10.049922	1.11666	0.9444
Pure Error	60	70.947510	1.18246	Prob > F
Total Error	69	80.997432		0.4943
				Max RSq
				0.4266

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.0714825	0.18409	22.12	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	0.8580188	0.522926	1.64	0.1054
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	1.3911389	0.57018	2.44	0.0173
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	1.603554	0.524574	3.06	0.0032
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	1.3417385	0.533789	2.51	0.0143
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	1.4776863	1.11632	1.32	0.1900
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	-1.967767	0.814917	-2.41	0.0184
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	-0.883161	0.399801	-2.21	0.0305
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.4508311	0.275798	1.63	0.1067
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.7143198	0.326938	2.18	0.0323

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	3.160353	2.6922	0.1054
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	6.987774	5.9527	0.0173
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	10.969235	9.3445	0.0032
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	7.416831	6.3182	0.0143
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	2.056883	1.7522	0.1900
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	6.844512	5.8307	0.0184
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	5.728142	4.8797	0.0305
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	3.136669	2.6721	0.1067
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	5.603729	4.7737	0.0323

ChangeCost = 4.07 + sys-avia(0.86) + shrink-int(1.39) + comp-OS(1.60) + ent-acct(1.34) + ent-mnft(1.48) + ent-OES(-1.97) + ent-web(-0.88) + proc-SWEngSup(0.45) + prod-COTS(0.71)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (LangCulture)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
25.650194		66	0.3886393	0.4599	0.3698	-4.602552	-62.7483		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	5.13982864	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.2610471	1	1.154913	2.972	0.0894		
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.418222	1.077	0.3031		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.187069	0.478	0.4920		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.0602	0.153	0.6970		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.046931	0.119	0.7311		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.7499191	1	4.174295	10.741	0.0017		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.001682	0.004	0.9482		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.121123	0.308	0.5806		
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.178824	0.456	0.5017		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.147903	0.377	0.5414		
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.17512387	1	0.531482	1.368	0.2464		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.431405	1.112	0.2956		
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.4041835	1	2.636964	6.785	0.0113		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.035927	0.091	0.7637		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.147903	0.377	0.5414		
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.30398637	1	0.622565	1.602	0.2101		
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.149021	0.380	0.5398		
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.245273	0.628	0.4311		
	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.22733546	1	2.097215	5.396	0.0233		
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.3613794	1	5.826266	14.991	0.0003		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.105452	0.268	0.6062		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.276994	0.710	0.4027		
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.001122	0.003	0.9576		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.000081	0.000	0.9886		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.058085	0.148	0.7022		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.109741	0.279	0.5990		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.259248	0.664	0.4182		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.004854	0.012	0.9120		
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.29637258	1	2.729608	7.024	0.0101		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.07496	0.191	0.6639		
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.075144	0.191	0.6636		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.2480822	1	2.71569	6.988	0.0102		
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0.18625596	1	1.687473	4.342	0.0411		
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.013608	0.035	0.8532		
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.2388453	1	2.40028	6.176	0.0155		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.012225	0.031	0.8608		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0050	4.697706	0.0989	8.4045	2
2	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0558	2.050847	0.1421	6.4549	3
3	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0545	1.99847	0.1842	4.6063	4
4	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0646	1.782643	0.2217	3.1732	5
5	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0320	2.301455	0.2702	0.741	6
6	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0145	2.816809	0.3295	-2.684	7
7	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1075	1.16504	0.3541	-2.927	8
8	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.1212	1.056626	0.3763	-2.962	9
9	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0414	1.770243	0.4136	-4.371	10
10	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0491	1.574582	0.4467	-5.404	11
11	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.2101	0.622565	0.4599	-4.603	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.45985
RSquare Adj 0.369825
Root Mean Square Error 0.623409
Mean of Response 4.487179
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 78

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	21.836986	1.98518	5.1080
Error	66	25.650194	0.38864	Prob > F
C. Total	77	47.487179		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	25	14.804739	0.592190	2.2387
Pure Error	41	10.845455	0.264523	Prob > F
Total Error	66	25.650194		0.0107
				Max RSq
				0.7716

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.0654463	0.189091	21.50	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	0.5220941	0.302864	1.72	0.0894
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.4998382	0.457642	3.28	0.0017
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.350248	0.299505	-1.17	0.2464
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	0.808367	0.310334	2.60	0.0113
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	-0.607973	0.480358	-1.27	0.2101
whatprocessrequirements[1-0]	-0.454671	0.195726	-2.32	0.0233
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	0.7227588	0.186669	3.87	0.0003
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.592745	0.223661	-2.65	0.0101
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.4961645	0.187698	2.64	0.0102
whatproductscustom[1-0]	-0.372512	0.17877	-2.08	0.0411
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.4776907	0.192216	2.49	0.0155

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	1.1549131	2.9717	0.0894
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	4.1742952	10.7408	0.0017
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	0.5314815	1.3675	0.2464
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	2.6369638	6.7851	0.0113
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	0.6225647	1.6019	0.2101
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	2.0972151	5.3963	0.0233
whatprocessdesign	1	1	5.8262655	14.9914	0.0003
whatprocessfielding	1	1	2.7296085	7.0235	0.0101
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	2.7156902	6.9877	0.0102
whatproductscustom	1	1	1.6874726	4.3420	0.0411
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	2.4002796	6.1761	0.0155

LangCult = 4.07 + sys-avia(0.52) + shrink-util(1.50) + comp-OS(-0.35) + ent-acct(0.81) + ent-OES(-0.61) + proc-req(-0.45) + proc-des(0.72) + proc-field(-0.59) + proc-SWEngSup(0.50) + prod-cust(-0.37) + prod-comcust(0.48)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (TurfWar)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	46.900052	63	0.7444453	0.5670	0.4776	0.5035653	-10.1756			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	5.53402614	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0.31559089	1	1.637139	2.199	0.1431			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.797578	1.073	0.3044			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.384485	0.512	0.4768			
X	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	-0.6437914	1	5.720934	7.685	0.0073			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.165339	0.219	0.6412			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.801746	1.078	0.3031			
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.6609301	1	4.686187	6.295	0.0147			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.092164	0.122	0.7280			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.240955	0.320	0.5735			
X	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.41165857	1	1.085066	1.458	0.2318			
X	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.38193024	1	2.359945	3.170	0.0798			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.023116	0.031	0.8618			
X	X	whattypeenterpriseacntng{0-1}	-0.4355382	1	2.889767	3.882	0.0532			
X	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.7723433	1	1.841513	2.474	0.1208			
		whattypeenterpriseapayroll{0-1}	0	0	0	.	.			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.108468	0.144	0.7059			
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.382585	0.510	0.4779			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.87859	1.184	0.2808			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.471544	0.630	0.4305			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.862389	1.161	0.2854			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.001193	0.002	0.9685			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.201201	0.267	0.6071			
X	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0.44378108	1	4.671428	6.275	0.0148			
X	X	whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0.99328021	1	14.60499	19.619	0.0000			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.547117	0.732	0.3956			
X	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0.26504064	1	2.308251	3.101	0.0831			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.077768	0.103	0.7494			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.277806	0.369	0.5455			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.271972	0.362	0.5498			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.054212	0.072	0.7897			
X	X	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	-0.6037973	1	10.92175	14.671	0.0003			
X	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.4751488	1	8.936858	12.005	0.0010			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.407721	0.544	0.4637			
X	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.469777	1	8.933564	12.000	0.0010			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.007618	0.010	0.9204			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.09953	0.132	0.7178			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0134	8.543966	0.0789	32.306	2
2	whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0000	20.66413	0.2697	12.495	3
3	whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0145	6.260439	0.3275	7.8868	4
4	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0204	5.274857	0.3762	4.3191	5
5	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.0322	4.254521	0.4154	1.8284	6
6	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0478	3.470346	0.4475	0.1655	7
7	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0873	2.500749	0.4706	-0.474	8
8	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1104	2.124813	0.4902	-0.717	9
9	whattypeenterpriseacntng{0-1}	Entered	0.0968	2.242833	0.5109	-1.084	10
10	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1425	1.711251	0.5267	-0.89	11
11	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.1361	1.735637	0.5427	-0.722	12
12	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.1563	1.543031	0.5570	-0.351	13
13	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.2318	1.085066	0.5670	0.5036	14

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.56699
RSquare Adj	0.477639
Root Mean Square Error	0.862812
Mean of Response	4.61039
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	77

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	13	61.41164	4.72397	6.3456
Error	63	46.90005	0.74445	Prob > F
C. Total	76	108.31169		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	23	19.28467	0.838464	1.2145
Pure Error	40	27.615385	0.690385	Prob > F
Total Error	63	46.900052		0.2883
				Max RSq
				0.7450

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.2839816	0.152293	28.13	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-0.631182	0.425626	-1.48	0.1431
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	1.2875828	0.46447	2.77	0.0073
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	1.3218603	0.526856	2.51	0.0147
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-0.823317	0.681955	-1.21	0.2318
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.76386	0.429022	-1.78	0.0798
whattypeenterpriseacntng[1-0]	0.8710764	0.442121	1.97	0.0532
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	1.5446865	0.982131	1.57	0.1208
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	-0.887562	0.354316	-2.51	0.0148
whatprocessappsuppt[1-0]	-1.98656	0.448505	-4.43	<.0001
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	-0.530081	0.301035	-1.76	0.0831
whatprocesstoolsuppt[1-0]	1.2075947	0.315276	3.83	0.0003
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.9502976	0.274273	3.46	0.0010
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.939554	0.271223	3.46	0.0010

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	1.637139	2.1991	0.1431
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	5.720934	7.6848	0.0073
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	4.686187	6.2949	0.0147
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	1.085066	1.4575	0.2318
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	2.359945	3.1701	0.0798
whattypeenterpriseacntng	1	1	2.889767	3.8818	0.0532
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	1.841513	2.4737	0.1208
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	4.671428	6.2750	0.0148
whatprocessappsuppt	1	1	14.604993	19.6186	<.0001
whatprocessspecification	1	1	2.308251	3.1006	0.0831
whatprocesstoolsuppt	1	1	10.921755	14.6710	0.0003
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	8.936858	12.0047	0.0010
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	8.933564	12.0003	0.0010

TurfWar = 4.28 + sys-avia(-0.63) + sys-dev(1.29) + shrink-int(1.32) + comp-class(-0.82) + comp-OS(-0.76) + ent-acct(0.87) + ent-mnft(1.54) + proc-reeng(-0.89) + proc-appsup(-1.99) + proc-spec(-0.53) + proc-toolsup(1.21) + proc-SWEngSup(0.95) + prod-COTS(0.94)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (FailLikely)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
95.835942		70	1.3690849	0.3647	0.2921	-6.494822	33.26201		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	5.40906375	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.000212	0.000	0.9902		
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.576873	0.418	0.5202		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.313122	0.226	0.6359		
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	-0.5178269	1	3.722764	2.719	0.1036		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.573727	0.416	0.5213		
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.215409	0.155	0.6946		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.7893818	1	8.579286	6.266	0.0146		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.3406	0.246	0.6214		
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.624582	0.453	0.5033		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.705971	0.512	0.4767		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.086229	0.062	0.8039		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.782647	0.568	0.4536		
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.976331	0.710	0.4023		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.865661	0.629	0.4305		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.705971	0.512	0.4767		
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	1.040914	0.758	0.3871		
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.219048	0.158	0.6922		
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.420508	0.304	0.5831		
	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.34959664	1	4.172481	3.048	0.0852		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.14806	0.107	0.7448		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.630976	0.457	0.5011		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.638896	0.463	0.4985		
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0.44994513	1	6.723505	4.911	0.0299		
		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.005849	0.004	0.9484		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.764498	0.555	0.4589		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.001768	0.001	0.9716		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	1.125733	0.820	0.3683		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.66914	0.485	0.4884		
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	1.819789	1.336	0.2518		
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.54582382	1	10.29045	7.516	0.0078		
	X	whatprocesstoolssuppt{0-1}	-0.711711	1	15.76179	11.513	0.0011		
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.4748514	1	8.622342	6.298	0.0144		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.677889	0.492	0.4856		
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.4108839	1	7.571181	5.530	0.0215		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.874191	0.635	0.4282		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.203204	0.147	0.7030		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocesstoolssuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0085	13.06474	0.0866	3.3693	2
2	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0035	14.67609	0.1839	-2.977	3
3	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0490	6.242145	0.2253	-4.528	4
4	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.1072	4.053617	0.2521	-4.833	5
5	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Entered	0.0660	5.137712	0.2862	-5.755	6
6	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1502	3.073144	0.3066	-5.503	7
7	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.1247	3.440048	0.3294	-5.459	8
8	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.1149	3.554579	0.3529	-5.481	9
9	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1793	2.536763	0.3697	-4.924	10
10	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Removed	0.2713	1.694851	0.3585	-5.96	9
11	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1591	2.760612	0.3768	-5.53	10
12	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Removed	0.2518	1.819789	0.3647	-6.495	9

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.364739
RSquare Adj	0.292138
Root Mean Square Error	1.170079
Mean of Response	4.164557
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	79

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	8	55.02482	6.87810	5.0239
Error	70	95.83594	1.36908	Prob > F
C. Total	78	150.86076		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	17	27.390540	1.61121	1.2476
Pure Error	53	68.445402	1.29142	Prob > F
Total Error	70	95.835942		0.2628
				Max RSq
				0.5463

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.8497742	0.183944	20.93	<.0001
whattypesystemsdevice{1-0}	1.0356539	0.628054	1.65	0.1036
whattypeshrinkinternet{1-0}	1.5787637	0.630677	2.50	0.0146
whatprocessrequirements{1-0}	-0.699193	0.400512	-1.75	0.0852
whatprocessreengineering{1-0}	-0.89989	0.406076	-2.22	0.0299
whatprocessCM{1-0}	-1.091648	0.398181	-2.74	0.0078
whatprocesstoolssuppt{1-0}	1.4234221	0.419514	3.39	0.0011
whatprocessSWEngSuppt{1-0}	0.9497029	0.378434	2.51	0.0144
whatproductsCOTS{1-0}	0.8217679	0.349448	2.35	0.0215

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	3.722764	2.7192	0.1036
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	8.579286	6.2664	0.0146
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	4.172481	3.0476	0.0852
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	6.723505	4.9109	0.0299
whatprocessCM	1	1	10.290453	7.5163	0.0078
whatprocesstoolssuppt	1	1	15.761794	11.5126	0.0011
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	8.622342	6.2979	0.0144
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	7.571181	5.5301	0.0215

FailLikely = 3.85 + sys-dev(1.04) + shrink-int(1.58) + proc-req(-0.70) + proc-reeng(-0.90) + proc-CM(-1.09) + proc-toolsup(1.42) + proc-SWEngSup(0.95) + prod-COTS(0.82)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (RespCust)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	112.51421	73	1.5412905	0.2159	0.1514	-13.2317	41.28423			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.14377034	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.030685	0.020	0.8889			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.03554	0.023	0.8805			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.853077	0.550	0.4607			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.070901	0.045	0.8319			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.038755	0.025	0.8753			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.018881	0.658	0.4200			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	1.04921	0.678	0.4131			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.43479846	1	3.385631	2.197	0.1426			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.714462	0.460	0.4997			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.000259	0.000	0.9898			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.048652	0.031	0.8604			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.198655	0.127	0.7222			
		whattypeenterpriseacntg{0-1}	0	1	1.376875	0.892	0.3481			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.01516	0.010	0.9218			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.000259	0.000	0.9898			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.9214312	1	6.368249	4.132	0.0457			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	1.983895	1.292	0.2594			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.002705	0.002	0.9669			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.686152	0.442	0.5084			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.001957	0.001	0.9719			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	1.400097	0.907	0.3440			
	X	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	-0.1980136	1	2.151545	1.396	0.2412			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.438128	0.281	0.5974			
	X	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0.60987965	1	10.60416	6.880	0.0106			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	1.05205	0.680	0.4125			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.013479	0.009	0.9263			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.130216	0.083	0.7735			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.56503	0.363	0.5485			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.07733	0.050	0.8245			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.719331	0.463	0.4983			
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.021224	0.014	0.9075			
		whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	0	1	1.38844	0.900	0.3461			
	X	whatproducts custom{0-1}	0.26185915	1	3.960955	2.570	0.1132			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.115988	0.074	0.7860			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0.39251674	1	7.232801	4.693	0.0336			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.175587	0.113	0.7382			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0090	12.10431	0.0844	-14.38	2
2	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.0957	4.680478	0.1170	-14.58	3
3	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0664	5.531956	0.1555	-15.17	4
4	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.1908	2.751942	0.1747	-14.46	5
5	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1689	3.01066	0.1957	-13.87	6
6	whatproducts custom{0-1}	Entered	0.2292	2.27908	0.2116	-12.94	7
7	whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	Removed	0.3226	1.536676	0.2009	-14.22	6
8	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.2412	2.151545	0.2159	-13.23	7

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.215861
RSquare Adj	0.151411
Root Mean Square Error	1.241487
Mean of Response	4.1375
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	80

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	6	30.97329	5.16222	3.3493
Error	73	112.51421	1.54129	Prob > F
C. Total	79	143.48750		0.0057

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	10	17.23224	1.72322	1.1394
Pure Error	63	95.28196	1.51241	Prob > F
Total Error	73	112.51421		0.3483
				Max RSq
				0.3360

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.7233795	0.31459	15.01	<.0001
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-0.869597	0.586733	-1.48	0.1426
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.8428624	0.90662	2.03	0.0457
whatprocessmaintenance[1-0]	0.3960273	0.335191	1.18	0.2412
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	-1.219759	0.465027	-2.62	0.0106
Whatproducts custom[1-0]	-0.523718	0.326693	-1.60	0.1132
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	-0.785033	0.362391	-2.17	0.0336

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	3.385631	2.1966	0.1426
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	6.368249	4.1318	0.0457
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	2.151545	1.3959	0.2412
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	10.604163	6.8801	0.0106
Whatproducts custom	1	1	3.960955	2.5699	0.1132
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	7.232801	4.6927	0.0336

ResponseCustomer = 4.72 + comp-domain(-0.87) + ent-OES(1.84) + proc-maint(0.40) + proc-appsup(-1.22) + prod-cust(-0.52) + prod-comcust(-0.79)

Stepwise Fit - Old Survey Data - Consequences (ResponseOrg)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	150.46514	75	2.0062019	0.2090	0.1563	-11.77099	62.16187			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.25908726	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.864092	0.427	0.5153			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.204138	0.101	0.7521			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.796818	0.394	0.5322			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	1.042423	0.516	0.4747			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.263623	0.130	0.7196			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.205052	0.101	0.7515			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	1.56774	0.779	0.3803			
		whattypescomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.32839	0.659	0.4195			
		whattypescomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	2.153906	1.075	0.3033			
		whattypescomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	1.54323	0.767	0.3840			
		whattypescomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.066461	0.033	0.8570			
		whattypescomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	2.159639	1.078	0.3026			
		whattypesenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	1.844384	0.918	0.3410			
		whattypesenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.153936	0.572	0.4519			
		whattypesenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	1.54323	0.767	0.3840			
X		whattypesenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.912338	1	6.288016	3.134	0.0807			
		whattypesenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	2.05496	1.025	0.3147			
		whattypesenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.425712	0.210	0.6481			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.033119	0.016	0.8988			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.114257	0.056	0.8132			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	1.733468	0.862	0.3561			
X		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	-0.3700264	1	7.874845	3.925	0.0512			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.409686	0.202	0.6544			
X		whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	0.63692046	1	9.852647	4.911	0.0297			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.0035	0.002	0.9670			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.042193	0.021	0.8858			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.406443	0.200	0.6557			
X		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	-0.3285747	1	4.040448	2.014	0.1600			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	1.354446	0.672	0.4149			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.452662	0.721	0.3984			
		whatprocesstoolsuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.88543	0.438	0.5101			
X		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0.3835856	1	8.178324	4.077	0.0471			
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.604958	0.299	0.5863			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.851032	0.421	0.5185			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.80964	0.400	0.5289			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.000017	0.000	0.9977			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0051	18.05159	0.0949	-11.52	2
2	whattypesystemcoding{0-1}	Entered	0.1157	5.411658	0.1233	-11.57	3
3	whattypesenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1599	4.250523	0.1457	-11.19	4
4	whattypesystemappsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.1613	4.168463	0.1676	-10.78	5
5	whattypesystemmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.0512	7.874845	0.2090	-11.77	6

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.209003
RSquare Adj	0.15627
Root Mean Square Error	1.416405
Mean of Response	4.148148
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	81

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	5	39.75708	7.95142	3.9634
Error	75	150.46514	2.00620	Prob > F
C. Total	80	190.22222		0.0030

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	6	16.70106	2.78351	1.4358
Pure Error	69	133.76408	1.93861	Prob > F
Total Error	75	150.46514		0.2136
				Max RSq
				0.2968

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.6686542	0.444772	8.25	<.0001
whattypesenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.8246761	1.030662	1.77	0.0807
whattypesystemmaintenance[1-0]	0.7400527	0.373533	1.98	0.0512
whattypesystemappsuppt[1-0]	-1.273841	0.574812	-2.22	0.0297
whattypesystemcoding[1-0]	0.6571494	0.463059	1.42	0.1600
whattypesystemSWEngSuppt[1-0]	-0.767171	0.379968	-2.02	0.0471

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesenterpriseOES	1	1	6.2880156	3.1343	0.0807
whattypesystemmaintenance	1	1	7.8748445	3.9253	0.0512
whattypesystemappsuppt	1	1	9.8526472	4.9111	0.0297
whattypesystemcoding	1	1	4.0404484	2.0140	0.1600
whattypesystemSWEngSuppt	1	1	8.1783235	4.0765	0.0471

ResponseOrg = 3.67 + ent-OES(1.82) + proc-maint(0.74) + proc-appsup(-1.27) + proc-coding(0.66) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.77)

Appendix D - Combined Survey Data Consequence Models

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (Cost)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC				
	247.07064	112	2.2059879	0.2862	0.1970	0.7879503	114.5169				
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"				
X	X	Intercept	2.76944412	1	0	0.000	1.0000				
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	2.000107	0.906	0.3433				
		whattypesystemsembedded{0-1}	0	1	1.220181	0.551	0.4595				
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.14392	0.065	0.7997				
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.222457	0.100	0.7524				
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0.26900525	1	5.654029	2.563	0.1122				
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.724546	0.326	0.5689				
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0.43864757	1	8.338643	3.780	0.0544				
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.014324	0.006	0.9362				
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	1.37368619	1	30.66285	13.900	0.0003				
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.80781	0.364	0.5475				
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	2.12537	0.963	0.3285				
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.014941	0.007	0.9348				
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.56201	0.253	0.6159				
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.7585012	1	7.867534	3.566	0.0615				
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0.93677846	1	17.76188	8.052	0.0054				
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.11023	0.050	0.8243				
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	1.272751	0.575	0.4500				
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	-0.6638339	1	17.36173	7.870	0.0059				
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.096404	0.043	0.8355				
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.2663608	1	4.293094	1.946	0.1658				
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.38056655	1	10.58379	4.798	0.0306				
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0.25611918	1	6.324151	2.867	0.0932				
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	1.606231	0.726	0.3959				
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.132083	0.059	0.8079				
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.976284	0.440	0.5083				
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	-0.3856916	1	10.33005	4.683	0.0326				
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.539967	0.243	0.6229				
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.482103	0.217	0.6422				
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	1.658614	0.750	0.3883				
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.38521091	1	8.603814	3.900	0.0507				
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.124385	0.056	0.8135				
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.2840337	1	6.291083	2.852	0.0941				
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.118856	0.053	0.8176				
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.966159	0.436	0.5105				
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.2081899	1	3.120533	1.415	0.2368				
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.2070226	1	3.270184	1.482	0.2260				
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.045916	0.021	0.8860				

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0044	21.88207	0.0632	5.3448	2
2	whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	Entered	0.0119	16.17656	0.1099	0.9423	3
3	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.0934	6.997021	0.1302	0.1729	4
4	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.2201	3.704105	0.1409	0.7069	5
5	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1426	5.258663	0.1561	0.6256	6
6	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.2045	3.908781	0.1673	1.0785	7
7	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0697	7.893483	0.1901	-0.046	8
8	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.1094	6.048723	0.2076	-0.44	9
9	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1230	5.544293	0.2236	-0.634	10
10	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0850	6.813147	0.2433	-1.331	11
11	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.1550	4.585196	0.2566	-1.145	12
12	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.2035	3.640248	0.2671	-0.586	13
13	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.2204	3.364367	0.2768	0.0823	14
14	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.2260	3.270184	0.2862	0.788	15

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.286248
RSquare Adj 0.197029
Root Mean Square Error 1.485257
Mean of Response 3.850394
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 127

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	99.08684	7.07763	3.2084
Error	112	247.07064	2.20599	Prob > F
C. Total	126	346.15748		0.0003

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	72	201.15397	2.79381	2.4338
Pure Error	40	45.91667	1.14792	Prob > F
Total Error	112	247.07064		0.0014
				Max RSq
				0.8674

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.0358244	0.325364	12.40	<.0001
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	-0.538011	0.336057	-1.60	0.1122
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	-0.877295	0.451232	-1.94	0.0544
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-2.747372	0.736907	-3.73	0.0003
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	1.5170024	0.803283	1.89	0.0615
whattypeenterprisepayroll[1-0]	-1.873557	0.660274	-2.84	0.0054
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	1.3276678	0.473254	2.81	0.0059
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	0.5327216	0.381871	1.40	0.1658
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	-0.761133	0.347489	-2.19	0.0306
whatprocessmaintenance[1-0]	-0.512238	0.302533	-1.69	0.0932
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	0.7713833	0.356468	2.16	0.0326
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-0.770422	0.390108	-1.97	0.0507
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.5680674	0.336387	1.69	0.0941
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.4163799	0.350088	1.19	0.2368
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.4140452	0.340066	1.22	0.2260

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	5.654029	2.5630	0.1122
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	8.338643	3.7800	0.0544
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	30.662847	13.8998	0.0003
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	7.867534	3.5664	0.0615
whattypeenterprisepayroll	1	1	17.761882	8.0517	0.0054
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	17.361732	7.8703	0.0059
whatprocessdesign	1	1	4.293094	1.9461	0.1658
whatprocesstesting	1	1	10.583792	4.7978	0.0306
whatprocessmaintenance	1	1	6.324151	2.8668	0.0932
whatprocessspecification	1	1	10.330046	4.6827	0.0326
whatprocessCM	1	1	8.603814	3.9002	0.0507
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	6.291083	2.8518	0.0941
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	3.120533	1.4146	0.2368
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	3.270184	1.4824	0.2260

Cost = 4.04 + (-.54)shrink-bus + (-.88)shrink-int + (-2.75)comp-case + (1.52)ent-mnft + (-1.87)ent-pay + (1.33)ent-web + (.53)proc-design + (-.76)proc-test + (-.51)proc-maint + (.77)proc-spec + (-.77)proc-cm + (.57)proc-swengsup + (.42)prod-cots + (.41)prod-comcust

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (Sched)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
212.52433		112	1.8975386	0.3073	0.2207	-1.359694	95.38841		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	4.64369106	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.5854713	1	7.788231	4.104	0.0451		
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	-0.3376822	1	5.134244	2.706	0.1028		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.393926	0.206	0.6507		
X	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0.43635426	1	4.886104	2.575	0.1114		
X	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	-0.3042691	1	6.741254	3.553	0.0620		
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.058719	0.031	0.8613		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.897267	0.471	0.4941		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.799475	0.419	0.5187		
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	1.442429	0.759	0.3857		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.530359	0.278	0.5993		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.00018	0.000	0.9923		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	1.356874	0.713	0.4002		
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	1.305325	0.686	0.4093		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.000904	0.000	0.9827		
X	X	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0.40849613	1	3.354843	1.768	0.1863		
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.251672	0.132	0.7175		
X	X	whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	-0.5260352	1	10.68002	5.628	0.0194		
X	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.40987844	1	10.73831	5.659	0.0191		
X	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.5674255	1	22.81655	12.024	0.0007		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.070548	0.037	0.8481		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.703141	0.368	0.5451		
X	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.408045	1	9.497281	5.005	0.0273		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.11362	0.059	0.8079		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.372171	0.195	0.6599		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.030108	0.016	0.9004		
X	X	whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0.27611673	1	3.002598	1.582	0.2110		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.67431	0.353	0.5535		
X	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	-0.5713509	1	13.03802	6.871	0.0100		
X	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.72374226	1	29.67625	15.639	0.0001		
		whatprocessoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.113074	0.059	0.8084		
X	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.2900281	1	5.670811	2.989	0.0866		
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.905168	0.475	0.4922		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.031603	0.017	0.8980		
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.99783	0.524	0.4708		
X	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.2550195	1	4.647021	2.449	0.1204		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.285312	0.149	0.7000		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0301	11.37862	0.0371	9.9471	2
2	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0315	10.86486	0.0725	7.0577	3
3	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0048	17.89577	0.1308	1.0042	4
4	whattypeenterprise web{0-1}	Entered	0.0291	10.24738	0.1642	-1.607	5
5	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.1177	5.155383	0.1810	-1.927	6
6	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.1151	5.167206	0.1979	-2.253	7
7	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1088	5.283874	0.2151	-2.631	8
8	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1413	4.394829	0.2294	-2.608	9
9	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.0592	7.11394	0.2526	-3.81	10
10	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.2083	3.121599	0.2628	-3.214	11
11	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.1655	3.767646	0.2751	-2.91	12
12	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.1765	3.551512	0.2866	-2.508	13
13	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.1888	3.333608	0.2975	-2.008	14
14	whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	Entered	0.2110	3.002598	0.3073	-1.36	15

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.307294
RSquare Adj	0.220706
Root Mean Square Error	1.377512
Mean of Response	4.03937
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	127

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	94.27882	6.73420	3.5489
Error	112	212.52433	1.89754	Prob > F
C. Total	126	306.80315		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	64	129.87909	2.02936	1.1786
Pure Error	48	82.64524	1.72178	Prob > F
Total Error	112	212.52433		0.2775
				Max RSq
				0.7306

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.0529519	0.293744	10.39	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	1.1709425	0.577978	2.03	0.0451
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.6753645	0.410578	1.64	0.1028
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	-0.872709	0.543855	-1.60	0.1114
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	0.6085381	0.322859	1.88	0.0620
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	-0.816992	0.614437	-1.33	0.1863
whattypeenterprise web[1-0]	1.0520704	0.44346	2.37	0.0194
whatprocessrequirements[1-0]	-0.819757	0.344598	-2.38	0.0191
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	1.134851	0.327272	3.47	0.0007
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.8160901	0.364782	2.24	0.0273
whatprocessdocumentation[1-0]	-0.552233	0.439005	-1.26	0.2110
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	1.1427018	0.435936	2.62	0.0100
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.447485	0.36602	-3.95	0.0001
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.5800562	0.335539	1.73	0.0866
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.5100391	0.32592	1.56	0.1204

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	7.788231	4.1044	0.0451
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	5.134244	2.7057	0.1028
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	4.886104	2.5750	0.1114
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	6.741254	3.5526	0.0620
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	3.354843	1.7680	0.1863
whattypeenterprise web	1	1	10.680021	5.6284	0.0194
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	10.738307	5.6591	0.0191
whatprocessdesign	1	1	22.816553	12.0243	0.0007
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	9.497281	5.0051	0.0273
whatprocessdocumentation	1	1	3.002598	1.5824	0.2110
whatprocessfielding	1	1	13.038015	6.8710	0.0100
whatprocessCM	1	1	29.676252	15.6393	0.0001
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	5.670811	2.9885	0.0866
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	4.647021	2.4490	0.1204

Sched = 3.05 + (1.17)sys-avia + (.68)sys-embed + (-.87)sys-dev + (.61)shrink-bus + (-.82)ent-pay + (1.05)ent-web + (-.82)proc-req + (1.13)proc-design + (.82)proc-reeng + (-.55)proc-doc + (1.14)proc-field + (-1.45)proc-cm + (.58)proc-swengsup + (.51)prod-comcust

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (IntelCapital)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
94.202467		110	0.8563861	0.3778	0.2986	-1.163116	-5.35842			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.05178398	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.237842	0.276	0.6005			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.733042	0.855	0.3572			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.012341	0.014	0.9051			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.286251	0.332	0.5655			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	1.085852	1.271	0.2620			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.16679	0.193	0.6610			
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.3137522	1	4.087482	4.773	0.0310			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	-0.5406269	1	8.089787	9.446	0.0027			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.152044	0.176	0.6755			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.000981	0.001	0.9732			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.923137	1.079	0.3013			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0.25366082	1	4.198426	4.902	0.0289			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.050445	0.058	0.8095			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.031476	0.036	0.8490			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	1.091217	1.277	0.2609			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.4502	0.523	0.4709			
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.304586	0.354	0.5533			
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0.27963514	1	2.655465	3.101	0.0810			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.196858	0.228	0.6338			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.074975	0.087	0.7688			
	X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.18111677	1	2.765219	3.229	0.0751			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.143675	0.166	0.6840			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.2966347	1	5.425516	6.335	0.0133			
	X	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	-0.3369586	1	6.544399	7.642	0.0067			
	X	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	-0.4060855	1	9.045147	10.562	0.0015			
	X	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0.23032763	1	3.81829	4.459	0.0370			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.000102	0.000	0.9913			
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	-0.183479	1	1.911902	2.233	0.1380			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.50022519	1	9.883859	11.541	0.0009			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.158983	0.184	0.6686			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.173466	0.201	0.6547			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.153386	0.178	0.6741			
	X	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0.51766013	1	1.923734	2.246	0.1368			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.136109	0.158	0.6920			
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.27459974	1	5.020974	5.863	0.0171			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.176152	1	2.31433	2.702	0.1031			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.02695	0.031	0.8601			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Entered	0.0041	9.831898	0.0649	20.011	2
2	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0029	9.967993	0.1308	12.081	3
3	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.0107	6.918704	0.1765	7.1896	4
4	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0407	4.292872	0.2048	4.9134	5
5	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.0675	3.34841	0.2270	3.5779	6
6	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0786	3.040774	0.2470	2.549	7
7	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.1037	2.56198	0.2640	1.9969	8
8	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1444	2.036393	0.2774	1.9684	9
9	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1010	2.539941	0.2942	1.4384	10
10	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.0834	2.784603	0.3126	0.6646	11
11	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.0843	2.720306	0.3306	-0.045	12
12	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.0634	3.085385	0.3509	-1.119	13
13	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1181	2.148373	0.3651	-1.259	14
14	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.1380	1.911902	0.3778	-1.163	15

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.377758
RSquare Adj	0.298564
Root Mean Square Error	0.925411
Mean of Response	4.192
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	125

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	57.18953	4.08497	4.7700
Error	110	94.20247	0.85639	Prob > F
C. Total	124	151.39200		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	62	57.271154	0.923728	1.2006
Pure Error	48	36.931313	0.769402	Prob > F
Total Error	110	94.202467		0.2563
				Max RSq
				0.7561

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.0353203	0.221309	18.23	<.0001
whattypeshrinkinternet{1-0}	0.6275045	0.287226	2.18	0.0310
whattypecomponentdomain{1-0}	1.0812539	0.351798	3.07	0.0027
whattypecomponentdevelopment{1-0}	-0.507322	0.229126	-2.21	0.0289
whattypeenterpriseweb{1-0}	-0.55927	0.317604	-1.76	0.0810
whatprocesstesting{1-0}	-0.362234	0.201585	-1.80	0.0751
whatprocessreengineering{1-0}	0.5932694	0.235704	2.52	0.0133
whatprocessappsupt{1-0}	0.6739173	0.243785	2.76	0.0067
whatprocesstraining{1-0}	0.8121711	0.249905	3.25	0.0015
whatprocessspecification{1-0}	-0.460655	0.218161	-2.11	0.0370
whatprocesscoding{1-0}	0.3669581	0.245594	1.49	0.1380
whatprocessfielding{1-0}	-1.00045	0.294488	-3.40	0.0009
whatprocessnone{1-0}	-1.03532	0.690776	-1.50	0.1368
whatproductsCOTS{1-0}	-0.549199	0.226815	-2.42	0.0171
whatproductscommoncust{1-0}	0.3523041	0.214309	1.64	0.1031

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	4.0874823	4.7729	0.0310
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	8.0897873	9.4464	0.0027
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	4.1984259	4.9025	0.0289
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	2.6554655	3.1008	0.0810
whatprocesstesting	1	1	2.7652186	3.2289	0.0751
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	5.4255160	6.3354	0.0133
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	6.5443987	7.6419	0.0067
whatprocesstraining	1	1	9.0451466	10.5620	0.0015
whatprocessspecification	1	1	3.8182902	4.4586	0.0370
whatprocesscoding	1	1	1.9119024	2.2325	0.1380
whatprocessfielding	1	1	9.8838592	11.5414	0.0009
whatprocessnone	1	1	1.9237345	2.2463	0.1368
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	5.0209744	5.8630	0.0171
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	2.3143301	2.7024	0.1031

IntelCap = 4.04 + (.63)shrink-int + (1.08)comp-domain + (-.51)comp-dev + (-.56)ent-web + (-.36)proc-test + (.59)proc-reeng + (.67)proc-appsup + (.81)proc-train + (-.46)proc-spec + (.37)proc-coding + (-1.00)proc-field + (-1.04)proc-none + (-.55)prod-cots + (.35)prod-comcust

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (SchedFlex)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	222.71682	115	1.936668	0.2128	0.1444	-1.768193	93.77202		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	2.57729711	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0.50174885	1	5.921546	3.058	0.0830		
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0.46735013	1	10.15151	5.242	0.0239		
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	-0.3280729	1	8.231976	4.251	0.0415		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.047589	0.024	0.8762		
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0.21223729	1	3.451627	1.782	0.1845		
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.240597	0.639	0.4259		
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.2741296	1	3.595605	1.857	0.1757		
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.40947514	1	4.282942	2.212	0.1397		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.57154378	1	5.769236	2.979	0.0870		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	1.676531	0.865	0.3544		
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.33339491	1	3.06607	1.583	0.2109		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	1.54347	0.796	0.3743		
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.331847	1	3.833803	1.980	0.1621		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.690629	0.355	0.5527		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.926397	0.476	0.4916		
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	2.336194	1.208	0.2739		
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	1.286342	0.662	0.4175		
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.162797	0.083	0.7733		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.419883	0.215	0.6435		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.000094	0.000	0.9945		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	1.728722	0.892	0.3470		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.06462	0.033	0.8560		
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.180816	0.093	0.7614		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.420659	0.216	0.6432		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.176785	0.091	0.7640		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.692242	0.355	0.5522		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	1.08393	0.558	0.4568		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.009188	0.519	0.4728		
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.43332207	1	10.14757	5.240	0.0239		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.015701	0.008	0.9287		
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.310249	0.159	0.6908		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.936591	0.481	0.4892		
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.270829	0.139	0.7102		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.727528	0.374	0.5423		
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.004639	0.002	0.9612		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.941994	0.484	0.4879		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	2.256109	1.167	0.2824		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0378	9.71645	0.0343	3.4102	2
2	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0326	9.999263	0.0697	0.8204	3
3	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0905	6.135493	0.0914	0.004	4
4	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0907	6.032095	0.1127	-0.765	5
5	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0986	5.666724	0.1327	-1.366	6
6	whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	Removed	0.2944	2.267766	0.1247	-2.325	5
7	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.1014	5.498391	0.1441	-2.849	6
8	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.1190	4.916622	0.1615	-3.106	7
9	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.1172	4.904046	0.1788	-3.357	8
10	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1716	3.696445	0.1919	-3.054	9
11	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.2289	2.847915	0.2020	-2.361	10
12	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.2109	3.06607	0.2128	-1.768	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.212816
RSquare Adj	0.144365
Root Mean Square Error	1.391642
Mean of Response	4.309524
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	126

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	60.21175	6.02117	3.1090
Error	115	222.71682	1.93667	Prob > F
C. Total	125	282.92857		0.0015

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	25	49.49456	1.97978	1.0286
Pure Error	90	173.22226	1.92469	Prob > F
Total Error	115	222.71682		0.4410
				Max RSq
				0.3878

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.5723198	0.20312	22.51	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-1.003498	0.573887	-1.75	0.0830
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.9347	0.408258	-2.29	0.0239
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	0.6561458	0.318256	2.06	0.0415
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	-0.424475	0.317956	-1.34	0.1845
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	0.5482592	0.402372	1.36	0.1757
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-0.81895	0.550699	-1.49	0.1397
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-1.143088	0.66229	-1.73	0.0870
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.66679	0.529939	-1.26	0.2109
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	0.6636939	0.471716	1.41	0.1621
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.866644	0.378606	-2.29	0.0239

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	5.921546	3.0576	0.0830
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	10.151508	5.2417	0.0239
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	8.231976	4.2506	0.0415
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	3.451627	1.7823	0.1845
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	3.595605	1.8566	0.1757
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	4.282942	2.2115	0.1397
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	5.769236	2.9789	0.0870
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	3.066070	1.5832	0.2109
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	3.833803	1.9796	0.1621
whatprocessfielding	1	1	10.147570	5.2397	0.0239

SchedFlex = 4.57 + sys-avia(-1.00) + sys-embed(-0.93) + sys-comm (0.66) + shrink-bus(-0.42) + shrink-int(0.55) + comp-domain(-0.82) + comp-CASE(-1.14) + comp-OS(-0.67) + ent-acct(0.66) + proc-field(-0.87)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (AdminOverhead)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	202.49599	115	1.7608347	0.3116	0.2517	-6.073093	81.77921		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	2.90816156	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.5780364	1	8.103662	4.602	0.0340		
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.101448	0.057	0.8115		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.751293	0.425	0.5160		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.727113	0.411	0.5228		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.200264	0.113	0.7375		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.4503626	1	3.823846	2.172	0.1433		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	1.489453	0.845	0.3600		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.918166	1.090	0.2986		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.64085321	1	7.087136	4.025	0.0472		
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.87068312	1	13.66001	7.758	0.0063		
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.47669297	1	6.510401	3.697	0.0570		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.588073	0.332	0.5656		
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.011775	0.007	0.9352		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.06238	0.035	0.8517		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.017523	0.010	0.9211		
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.745357	0.421	0.5177		
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.585938	0.331	0.5663		
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	-0.4150102	1	6.8019	3.863	0.0518		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.042485	0.024	0.8774		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.003608	0.002	0.9641		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.062216	0.035	0.8519		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.026595	0.015	0.9028		
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.004232	0.002	0.9612		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.742402	0.989	0.3220		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.964662	0.546	0.4616		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	1.358536	0.770	0.3821		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.667851	0.377	0.5403		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.456539	0.258	0.6128		
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.377745	0.213	0.6453		
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.55046902	1	16.86878	9.580	0.0025		
	X	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	-0.4831141	1	11.48985	6.525	0.0119		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.630917	0.356	0.5518		
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	1.478767	0.839	0.3617		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.017478	0.010	0.9212		
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.538713	0.304	0.5824		
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.3110571	1	7.264591	4.126	0.0445		
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0.99251455	1	24.315	13.809	0.0003		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0000	38.99206	0.1326	1.3869	2
2	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0401	8.62782	0.1619	-0.786	3
3	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0810	6.101291	0.1826	-1.736	4
4	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1063	5.149513	0.2001	-2.226	5
5	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0935	5.473953	0.2188	-2.874	6
6	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1052	5.033623	0.2359	-3.308	7
7	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0660	6.372138	0.2575	-4.389	8
8	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0748	5.86815	0.2775	-5.227	9
9	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.0645	6.196537	0.2986	-6.224	10
10	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1433	3.823846	0.3116	-6.073	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.311554
RSquare Adj	0.251689
Root Mean Square Error	1.326964
Mean of Response	4.150794
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	126

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	91.63893	9.16389	5.2043
Error	115	202.49599	1.76083	Prob > F
C. Total	125	294.13492		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	24	44.45551	1.85231	1.0666
Pure Error	91	158.04048	1.73671	Prob > F
Total Error	115	202.49599		0.3967
				Max RSq
				0.4627

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.201794	0.17116	24.55	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	1.1560728	0.538895	2.15	0.0340
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	0.9007251	0.611225	1.47	0.1433
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-1.281706	0.63887	-2.01	0.0472
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-1.741366	0.625207	-2.79	0.0063
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.953386	0.49582	-1.92	0.0570
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	0.8300205	0.422312	1.97	0.0518
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.100938	0.355697	-3.10	0.0025
whatprocessstoolsupt[1-0]	0.9662282	0.378252	2.55	0.0119
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.6221143	0.306284	2.03	0.0445
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.985029	0.534182	-3.72	0.0003

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	8.103662	4.6022	0.0340
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	3.823846	2.1716	0.1433
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	7.087136	4.0249	0.0472
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	13.660013	7.7577	0.0063
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	6.510401	3.6973	0.0570
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	6.801900	3.8629	0.0518
whatprocessCM	1	1	16.868779	9.5800	0.0025
whatprocessstoolsupt	1	1	11.489854	6.5252	0.0119
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	7.264591	4.1257	0.0445
whatproductsnone	1	1	24.315003	13.8088	0.0003

AdminOverhead = 4.20 + sys-avia(1.16) + shrink-util(0.90) + comp-CASE(-1.28) + comp-class(-1.74) + comp-OS(-0.95) + ent-web(0.83) + proc-CM(-1.10) + proc-toolsup(0.97) + prod-comcust(0.62) + prod-none(-1.99)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (ControlProcess)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	193.74602	114	1.6995265	0.3534	0.2911	-4.824553	78.21354			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	1.87213301	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.315133	0.184	0.6687			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.019332	0.011	0.9156			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.460231	0.858	0.3562			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.004125	0.002	0.9610			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	1.815157	1.069	0.3035			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.23027	0.722	0.3972			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.012254	0.007	0.9328			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.36869086	1	3.943878	2.321	0.1304			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.099536	0.058	0.8100			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.846624	0.496	0.4827			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	1.62914	0.958	0.3297			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.162198	0.095	0.7589			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.3859681	1	5.287453	3.111	0.0804			
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0.60103641	1	5.284862	3.110	0.0805			
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0.85388172	1	14.99363	8.822	0.0036			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	1.561557	0.918	0.3400			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.057367	0.033	0.8552			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.03425	0.020	0.8878			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.047585	0.028	0.8680			
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0.67690242	1	35.6875	20.998	0.0000			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	1.372171	0.806	0.3712			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.125405	0.073	0.7872			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.3985334	1	11.10006	6.531	0.0119			
	X	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	-0.4309694	1	11.6104	6.832	0.0102			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.096731	0.056	0.8126			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.006109	0.004	0.9525			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.085356	0.050	0.8238			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.000086	0.000	0.9944			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.60922	1	16.95242	9.975	0.0020			
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	-0.2144393	1	3.005997	1.769	0.1862			
		whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.294476	0.760	0.3852			
		whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	0	1	0.654743	0.383	0.5372			
	X	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0.84344195	1	5.176113	3.046	0.0836			
	X	whatproductsustom{0-1}	-0.2085123	1	4.043738	2.379	0.1257			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.82184	0.481	0.4892			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.017826	0.010	0.9190			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.113113	0.066	0.7977			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0033	20.23061	0.0675	18.15	2
2	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.0027	19.78295	0.1335	10.228	3
3	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.0217	11.01457	0.1703	6.7034	4
4	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.0199	10.9431	0.2068	3.2148	5
5	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0362	8.565152	0.2354	0.9188	6
6	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0094	12.679	0.2777	-3.44	7
7	whatproductsustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0537	6.750676	0.3002	-4.826	8
8	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.1156	4.408897	0.3149	-5.038	9
9	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1127	4.423842	0.3297	-5.256	10
10	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1240	4.107921	0.3434	-5.317	11
11	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1862	3.005997	0.3534	-4.825	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.353444
RSquare Adj	0.291057
Root Mean Square Error	1.303659
Mean of Response	3.674603
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	126

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	105.91271	9.62843	5.6654
Error	114	193.74602	1.69953	Prob > F
C. Total	125	299.65873		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	37	57.22221	1.54655	0.8723
Pure Error	77	136.52381	1.77304	Prob > F
Total Error	114	193.74602		0.6714
				Max RSq
				0.5444

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1868839	0.290782	14.40	<.0001
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-0.737382	0.484055	-1.52	0.1304
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	0.7719362	0.437645	1.76	0.0804
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	-1.202073	0.681676	-1.76	0.0805
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	-1.707763	0.574961	-2.97	0.0036
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	-1.353805	0.295435	-4.58	<.0001
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.7970667	0.311886	2.56	0.0119
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	0.8619389	0.329774	2.61	0.0102
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-1.21844	0.385791	-3.16	0.0020
whatprocessCM[1-0]	0.4288786	0.322481	1.33	0.1862
whatprocessnone[1-0]	-1.686884	0.966601	-1.75	0.0836
whatproductsustom[1-0]	0.4170245	0.270355	1.54	0.1257

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	3.943878	2.3206	0.1304
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	5.287453	3.1111	0.0804
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	5.284862	3.1096	0.0805
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	14.993628	8.8222	0.0036
whatprocessdesign	1	1	35.687500	20.9985	<.0001
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	11.100056	6.5313	0.0119
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	11.610399	6.8315	0.0102
whatprocessfielding	1	1	16.952423	9.9748	0.0020
whatprocessCM	1	1	3.005997	1.7687	0.1862
whatprocessnone	1	1	5.176113	3.0456	0.0836
whatproductsustom	1	1	4.043738	2.3793	0.1257

ControlProcess = 4.19 + comp-domain(-0.74) + ent-acct(0.77) + ent-mnft(-1.20) + ent-pay(-1.71) + proc-des(-1.35) + proc-reeng(0.80) + proc-appsup(0.86) + proc-field(-1.22) + proc-CM(0.43) + proc-none(-1.69) + prod-cust(0.42)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (InhouseNonCore)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 177.4713	DfE 111	MSE 1.5988405	RSquare 0.3192	RSquare Adj 0.2517	Cp -7.24594	AIC 69.09482			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
		Intercept	1.30681216	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0.76636033	1	14.77664	9.242	0.0030			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.976616	0.609	0.4370			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.77829	1.113	0.2937			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.035784	0.022	0.8819			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.002858	0.002	0.9665			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.915975	0.571	0.4516			
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0.50519839	1	11.54484	7.221	0.0083			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.258895	0.161	0.6893			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.03722	0.023	0.8795			
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.96542307	1	11.42311	7.145	0.0087			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.005453	0.003	0.9537			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-0.4635845	1	12.72151	7.957	0.0057			
	X	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.4036303	1	4.732332	2.960	0.0881			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.071863	0.668	0.4154			
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	-0.5810824	1	5.15367	3.223	0.0753			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.87705647	1	5.197706	3.251	0.0741			
	X	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0.64992729	1	9.174103	5.738	0.0183			
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	-0.4279849	1	6.694961	4.187	0.0431			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.191404	0.119	0.7310			
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.1586783	1	2.290248	1.432	0.2339			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.053223	0.033	0.8562			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.383084	0.238	0.6267			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.144334	0.090	0.7653			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.009056	0.006	0.9404			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.071521	0.044	0.8336			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.841749	0.524	0.4706			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.613843	0.382	0.5379			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.045271	0.028	0.8673			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.113927	0.071	0.7909			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.115151	0.071	0.7898			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.217301	0.135	0.7142			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	1.230072	0.768	0.3828			
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.611462	0.380	0.5387			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.871021	0.543	0.4630			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.639741	0.398	0.5295			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.14805	0.092	0.7624			
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	0.57674319	1	7.923065	4.956	0.0280			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.0067	15.43067	0.0592	7.7973	2
2	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0398	8.525146	0.0919	5.3898	3
3	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0255	9.755579	0.1293	2.3461	4
4	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0467	7.513245	0.1581	0.4617	5
5	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.0379	7.969779	0.1887	-1.659	6
6	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.0197	9.721023	0.2260	-4.685	7
7	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.0132	10.53184	0.2664	-8.13	8
8	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.1515	3.435105	0.2796	-7.906	9
9	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1338	3.716006	0.2938	-7.827	10
10	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.1036	4.322979	0.3104	-8.062	11
11	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.2339	2.290248	0.3192	-7.246	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.319206
RSquare Adj	0.25174
Root Mean Square Error	1.264453
Mean of Response	3.756098
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	123

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	83.21163	7.56469	4.7314
Error	111	177.47130	1.59884	Prob > F
C. Total	122	260.68293		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	20	34.55701	1.72785	1.1002
Pure Error	91	142.91429	1.57049	Prob > F
Total Error	111	177.47130		0.3634
				Max RSq
				0.4518

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.6125605	0.25271	14.30	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-1.532721	0.504171	-3.04	0.0030
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	-1.010397	0.376011	-2.69	0.0083
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-1.930846	0.722367	-2.67	0.0087
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	0.927169	0.328694	2.82	0.0057
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	0.8072607	0.469222	1.72	0.0881
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	1.1621648	0.647309	1.80	0.0753
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	-1.754113	0.972869	-1.80	0.0741
whattypeenterprisescripting[1-0]	-1.299855	0.542645	-2.40	0.0183
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	0.8559698	0.418299	2.05	0.0431
whatprocessdesign[1-0]	0.3173567	0.265161	1.20	0.2339
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.153486	0.518165	-2.23	0.0280

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	14.776638	9.2421	0.0030
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	11.544839	7.2208	0.0083
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	11.423112	7.1446	0.0087
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	12.721511	7.9567	0.0057
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	4.732332	2.9599	0.0881
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	5.153670	3.2234	0.0753
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	5.197706	3.2509	0.0741
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	9.174103	5.7380	0.0183
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	6.694961	4.1874	0.0431
whatprocessdesign	1	1	2.290248	1.4324	0.2339
whatproductsnone	1	1	7.923065	4.9555	0.0280

InhouseNonCore = 3.61 + sys-avia(-1.53) + shrink-int(-1.01) + comp-class(-1.93) + comp-dev(0.93) + ent-acct(0.81) + ent-pay(1.16) + ent-OES(-1.75) + ent-script(-1.30) + ent-web(0.86) + proc-des(0.32) + prod-none(-1.15)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (InhouseTurnover)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 74.658386	DFE 113	MSE 0.6606937	RSquare 0.2671	RSquare Adj 0.2152	Cp -7.47883	AIC -41.914			
Lock X	Entered X	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
		Intercept	2.58039773	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.00014	0.000	0.9885			
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	-0.2095914	1	2.115388	3.202	0.0762			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.180836	0.272	0.6031			
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0.26185638	1	2.103914	3.184	0.0770			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.000093	0.000	0.9906			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.128705	0.193	0.6609			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.01089	0.016	0.8985			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.692642	1.049	0.3080			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.2931694	1	1.597295	2.418	0.1228			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.562394	0.850	0.3585			
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.36309644	1	3.555997	5.382	0.0221			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.187154	0.281	0.5968			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.294737	0.444	0.5066			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.019694	0.030	0.8638			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.075741	0.114	0.7366			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.241936	0.364	0.5474			
		whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	0.323474	0.487	0.4865			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.639809	0.968	0.3273			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.080945	0.122	0.7280			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.527686	0.797	0.3738			
	X	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.18154188	1	3.329363	5.039	0.0267			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.271989	0.410	0.5235			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.441306	0.666	0.4162			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.044103	0.066	0.7974			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.203274	0.306	0.5814			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.271118	0.408	0.5242			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.087154	0.131	0.7182			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.133614	0.201	0.6549			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.665279	1.007	0.3178			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.00029	0.000	0.9834			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.476032	0.719	0.3984			
	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.2941107	1	7.426122	11.240	0.0011			
	X	whatprocessnone{0-1}	1.05340931	1	8.37996	12.684	0.0005			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.331963	0.500	0.4809			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.043984	0.066	0.7977			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.1229504	1	1.202459	1.820	0.1800			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.132374	0.199	0.6564			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0013	8.402186	0.0825	2.8372	2
2	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0112	4.936752	0.1309	-1.545	3
3	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0250	3.704532	0.1673	-4.335	4
4	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.0585	2.567374	0.1925	-5.654	5
5	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0568	2.543933	0.2175	-6.943	6
6	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0760	2.161457	0.2387	-7.737	7
7	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.1136	1.691773	0.2553	-7.924	8
8	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1800	1.202459	0.2671	-7.479	9

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.267113
RSquare Adj	0.215227
Root Mean Square Error	0.812831
Mean of Response	4.032787
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	122

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	8	27.21047	3.40131	5.1481
Error	113	74.65839	0.66069	Prob > F
C. Total	121	101.86885		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	19	24.099700	1.26841	2.3583
Pure Error	94	50.558686	0.53786	Prob > F
Total Error	113	74.658386		0.0035
				Max RSq
				0.5037

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1068186	0.14003	29.33	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.4191828	0.234266	1.79	0.0762
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	-0.523713	0.29348	-1.78	0.0770
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-0.586339	0.3771	-1.55	0.1228
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.726193	0.313019	-2.32	0.0221
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	-0.363084	0.161743	-2.24	0.0267
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.5882214	0.175453	3.35	0.0011
whatprocessnone[1-0]	-2.106819	0.59157	-3.56	0.0005
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.2459008	0.182274	1.35	0.1800

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	2.1153881	3.2018	0.0762
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	2.1039141	3.1844	0.0770
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	1.5972955	2.4176	0.1228
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	3.5559969	5.3822	0.0221
whatprocesstesting	1	1	3.3293628	5.0392	0.0267
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	7.4261224	11.2399	0.0011
whatprocessnone	1	1	8.3799604	12.6836	0.0005
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	1.2024595	1.8200	0.1800

InhouseTurnover = 4.11 + sys-embed(0.42) + sys-dev(-0.52) + comp-CASE(-0.59) + comp-OS(-0.73) + proc-test(-0.36) + proc-SWEngSup(0.59) + proc-none(-2.11) + prod-comcust(0.25)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (LearningCurve)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 144.44252	DFE 114	MSE 1.2670396	RSquare 0.2920	RSquare Adj 0.2361	Cp -6.229559	AIC 38.92241			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	2.01355221	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.617392	0.485	0.4876			
		whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.284588	0.223	0.6376			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.059213	0.046	0.8299			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.047803	0.037	0.8470			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.761823	0.599	0.4405			
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.3512776	1	2.31897	1.830	0.1788			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.777335	0.611	0.4359			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.525151	0.412	0.5221			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.89590772	1	14.84715	11.718	0.0009			
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.46863596	1	2.815723	2.222	0.1388			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.351262	0.275	0.6007			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.116196	0.091	0.7635			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.280248	0.220	0.6402			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.155142	0.122	0.7281			
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0.6426483	1	6.569375	5.185	0.0247			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.947336	0.746	0.3896			
	X	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	-0.331167	1	2.40121	1.895	0.1713			
		whattypeenterprisesweb{0-1}	0	1	0.218624	0.171	0.6798			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.000174	0.000	0.9907			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.589305	0.463	0.4977			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	1.434034	1.133	0.2894			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	1.251476	0.988	0.3225			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.130633	0.102	0.7497			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.027837	0.022	0.8829			
	X	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0.20237974	1	3.024678	2.387	0.1251			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.085991	0.067	0.7958			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.276354	0.217	0.6425			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.079029	0.062	0.8040			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.118675	0.093	0.7611			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.842109	0.663	0.4173			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.078755	0.062	0.8044			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.415265	0.326	0.5693			
	X	whatprocessnone{0-1}	0.9144863	1	6.219786	4.909	0.0287			
	X	whatproductsustom{0-1}	-0.2248735	1	4.776427	3.770	0.0547			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	0.030534	0.024	0.8774			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.4013195	1	12.00463	9.475	0.0026			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.001171	0.001	0.9759			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.0017	15.91402	0.0780	7.3283	2
2	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0035	12.8615	0.1410	0.6226	3
3	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0074	10.20633	0.1911	-4.286	4
4	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0287	6.532937	0.2231	-6.708	5
5	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.1166	3.287834	0.2392	-6.933	6
6	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0922	3.732736	0.2575	-7.46	7
7	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Entered	0.1639	2.519874	0.2698	-7.166	8
8	whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	Entered	0.1911	2.207473	0.2807	-6.66	9
9	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1788	2.31897	0.2920	-6.23	10

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.292032
RSquare Adj	0.23614
Root Mean Square Error	1.125629
Mean of Response	4.08871
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	124

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	9	59.58167	6.62019	5.2249
Error	114	144.44252	1.26704	Prob > F
C. Total	123	204.02419		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	17	30.53235	1.79602	1.5294
Pure Error	97	113.91017	1.17433	Prob > F
Total Error	114	144.44252		0.1004
				Max RSq
				0.4417

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.8289726	0.218912	17.49	<.0001
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	0.7025552	0.519312	1.35	0.1788
whattypecomponentCASE{1-0}	-1.791815	0.52344	-3.42	0.0009
whattypecomponentclass{1-0}	-0.937272	0.628732	-1.49	0.1388
whattypeenterprise payroll{1-0}	-1.285297	0.564464	-2.28	0.0247
whattypeenterprisescripting{1-0}	0.662334	0.481124	1.38	0.1713
whatprocesstraining{1-0}	-0.404759	0.261971	-1.55	0.1251
whatprocessnone{1-0}	-1.828973	0.825495	-2.22	0.0287
whatproductsustom{1-0}	0.4497471	0.231639	1.94	0.0547
whatproductscommoncust{1-0}	0.802639	0.26076	3.08	0.0026

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	2.318970	1.8302	0.1788
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	14.847153	11.7180	0.0009
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	2.815723	2.2223	0.1388
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	6.569375	5.1848	0.0247
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	2.401210	1.8951	0.1713
whatprocesstraining	1	1	3.024678	2.3872	0.1251
whatprocessnone	1	1	6.219786	4.9089	0.0287
whatproductsustom	1	1	4.776427	3.7698	0.0547
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	12.004625	9.4745	0.0026

LearningCurve = 3.83 + shrink-util(0.70) + comp-CASE(-1.79) + comp-class(-0.94) + ent-pay(-1.29) + ent-script(0.66) + proc-train(-0.40) + proc-none(-1.83) + prod-cust(0.45) + prod-comcust(0.80)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (Risk)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
210.83322		110	1.9166656	0.2994	0.2102	0.8635043	95.34421		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	0.87331128	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
	X	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	0.4455735	1	4.622714	2.412	0.1233		
		whattypesystemseembedded(0-1)	0	1	1.109257	0.577	0.4493		
X	X	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	0.39961107	1	11.85474	6.185	0.0144		
		whattypesystemsdevice(0-1)	0	1	2.018904	1.054	0.3069		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness(0-1)	0	1	0.062988	0.033	0.8571		
X	X	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	-0.8343679	1	12.01854	6.271	0.0137		
		whattypeshrinkinternet(0-1)	0	1	0.00562	0.003	0.9571		
		whattypecomponentdomain(0-1)	0	1	1.869075	0.975	0.3256		
		whattypecomponentCASE(0-1)	0	1	1.196465	0.622	0.4320		
		whattypecomponentclass(0-1)	0	1	0.008436	0.004	0.9475		
X	X	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	0.5994816	1	10.08205	5.260	0.0237		
X	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	-0.2998499	1	5.700889	2.974	0.0874		
		whattypeenterpriseactng(0-1)	0	1	0.544451	0.282	0.5963		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact(0-1)	0	1	0.33328	0.173	0.6786		
		whattypeenterprise payroll(0-1)	0	1	2.509847	1.313	0.2543		
X	X	whattypeenterpriseOES(0-1)	1.23929262	1	11.14129	5.813	0.0176		
X	X	whattypeenterprisescripting(0-1)	0.86899438	1	16.41125	8.562	0.0042		
X	X	whattypeenterpriseweb(0-1)	0.49917581	1	9.228481	4.815	0.0303		
		whatprocessrequirements(0-1)	0	1	0.285006	0.148	0.7016		
		whatprocessdesign(0-1)	0	1	0.003152	0.002	0.9679		
		whatprocesstesting(0-1)	0	1	0.527154	0.273	0.6022		
		whatprocessmaintenance(0-1)	0	1	1.807967	0.943	0.3337		
X	X	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	-0.2168184	1	2.829951	1.476	0.2269		
		whatprocessappsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.089672	0.046	0.8299		
X	X	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	0.32223359	1	6.657614	3.474	0.0650		
		whatprocessspecification(0-1)	0	1	0.026817	0.014	0.9065		
X	X	whatprocessdocumentation(0-1)	-0.4366682	1	8.244435	4.301	0.0404		
		whatprocesscoding(0-1)	0	1	0.107028	0.055	0.8144		
		whatprocessfielding(0-1)	0	1	0.002879	0.001	0.9693		
X	X	whatprocessCM(0-1)	0.26897488	1	4.71844	2.462	0.1195		
		whatprocesstoolsupt(0-1)	0	1	0.021683	0.011	0.9159		
X	X	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	-0.1988861	1	3.108055	1.622	0.2056		
		whatprocessnone(0-1)	0	1	0.058609	0.030	0.8621		
		whatproductsustom(0-1)	0	1	0.080829	0.042	0.8384		
		whatproductsCOTS(0-1)	0	1	1.105936	0.575	0.4500		
		whatproductscommoncust(0-1)	0	1	0.786251	0.408	0.5243		
X	X	whatproductsnone(0-1)	0.88751286	1	18.89502	9.858	0.0022		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypeshrinkutilities(0-1)	Entered	0.0203	12.93633	0.0430	9.9466	2
2	whatproductsnone(0-1)	Entered	0.0493	9.01417	0.0729	7.8479	3
3	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Entered	0.0459	9.072735	0.1031	5.7227	4
4	whattypeenterprisescripting(0-1)	Entered	0.0312	10.28701	0.1373	3.0453	5
5	whattypesystemscommunications(0-1)	Entered	0.0585	7.723081	0.1629	1.5337	6
6	whattypeenterpriseOES(0-1)	Entered	0.0749	6.708421	0.1852	0.4834	7
7	whattypecomponentOS(0-1)	Entered	0.1256	4.889272	0.2015	0.2603	8
8	whatprocessdocumentation(0-1)	Entered	0.0869	6.02228	0.2215	-0.478	9
9	whatprocessSWEngSuppt(0-1)	Entered	0.2150	3.124689	0.2319	0.1013	10
10	whatprocesstraining(0-1)	Entered	0.1974	3.358734	0.2430	0.5741	11
11	whattypesystemsavionics(0-1)	Entered	0.1881	3.48031	0.2546	0.9917	12
12	whattypeenterpriseweb(0-1)	Entered	0.1608	3.921542	0.2676	1.2086	13
13	whattypecomponentdevelopment(0-1)	Entered	0.0642	6.726251	0.2900	0.1503	14
14	whatprocessreengineering(0-1)	Entered	0.2269	2.829951	0.2994	0.8635	15

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.29939
RSquare Adj	0.210221
Root Mean Square Error	1.384437
Mean of Response	4.024
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	125

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	90.09478	6.43534	3.3576
Error	110	210.83322	1.91667	Prob > F
C. Total	124	300.92800		0.0002

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	51	121.46941	2.38175	1.5725
Pure Error	59	89.36381	1.51464	Prob > F
Total Error	110	210.83322		0.0470
				Max RSq
				0.7030

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.4175711	0.201521	21.92	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	-0.891147	0.573818	-1.55	0.1233
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	-0.799222	0.321362	-2.49	0.0144
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.6687358	0.6664	2.50	0.0137
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-1.198963	0.522763	-2.29	0.0237
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	0.5996998	0.347725	1.72	0.0874
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	-2.478585	1.028038	-2.41	0.0176
whattypeenterprisescripting[1-0]	-1.737989	0.593949	-2.93	0.0042
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	-0.998352	0.454979	-2.19	0.0303
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.4336368	0.35687	1.22	0.2269
whatprocesstraining[1-0]	-0.644467	0.345792	-1.86	0.0650
whatprocessdocumentation[1-0]	0.8733364	0.421089	2.07	0.0404
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-0.53795	0.342859	-1.57	0.1195
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.3977722	0.312366	1.27	0.2056
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.775026	0.565333	-3.14	0.0022

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	4.622714	2.4119	0.1233
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	11.854745	6.1851	0.0144
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	12.018542	6.2705	0.0137
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	10.082045	5.2602	0.0237
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	5.700889	2.9744	0.0874
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	11.141294	5.8129	0.0176
whattypeenterprisescripting	1	1	16.411254	8.5624	0.0042
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	9.228481	4.8149	0.0303
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	2.829951	1.4765	0.2269
whatprocesstraining	1	1	6.657614	3.4735	0.0650
whatprocessdocumentation	1	1	8.244435	4.3014	0.0404
whatprocessCM	1	1	4.718440	2.4618	0.1195
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	3.108055	1.6216	0.2056
whatproductsnone	1	1	18.895017	9.8583	0.0022

Risk = 4.42 + sys-avia(-0.89) + sys-comm(-0.80) + shrinkutil(1.67) + comp-OS(-1.20) + comp-dev(0.60) + ent-OES(-2.48) + ent-script(-1.74) + ent-web(-1.00) + proc-reeng(0.43) + proc-train(-0.64) + proc-doc(0.87) + proc-CM(-0.54) + proc-SWEngSup(0.40) + prod-none(-1.78)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (Quality)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
	189.43786	113	1.6764412	0.2326	0.1647	-7.669622	74.54865		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	5.94560058	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.702784	0.417	0.5197		
	X	whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	0.26314942	1	3.272454	1.952	0.1651		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.167217	0.694	0.4065		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.424218	0.251	0.6171		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.62277	0.369	0.5446		
X	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.3755373	1	2.466045	1.471	0.2277		
X	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.3354296	1	5.360056	3.197	0.0764		
		whattypescomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.764469	1.053	0.3070		
		whattypescomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	1.137608	0.677	0.4125		
		whattypescomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.019883	0.012	0.9139		
X		whattypescomponentOS{0-1}	-0.5995587	1	9.896998	5.904	0.0167		
		whattypescomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.327059	0.194	0.6607		
		whattypesenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	1.378625	0.821	0.3668		
		whattypesenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.194249	0.115	0.7352		
		whattypesenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.24247	0.144	0.7055		
X		whattypesenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.566412	1	2.424813	1.446	0.2316		
		whattypesenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	0.226878	0.134	0.7147		
		whattypesenterprise web{0-1}	0	1	1.396231	0.832	0.3638		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.003828	0.002	0.9621		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.224508	0.133	0.7161		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.000249	0.000	0.9903		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.937928	0.557	0.4569		
X		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.3090394	1	6.91938	4.127	0.0445		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.315444	0.187	0.6664		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.105099	0.062	0.8036		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.000012	0.000	0.9979		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.160431	0.095	0.7586		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.205294	0.122	0.7281		
X		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.29849357	1	4.552133	2.715	0.1022		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.04929	0.029	0.8647		
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.012637	0.007	0.9313		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.74469	0.442	0.5075		
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.025794	0.015	0.9019		
		whatproducts custom{0-1}	0	1	0.137466	0.081	0.7760		
X		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.44743634	1	13.31403	7.942	0.0057		
X		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0.22413105	1	3.859695	2.302	0.1320		
X		whatproductsnone{0-1}	-0.4120728	1	4.314293	2.573	0.1115		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0171	11.27763	0.0457	-2.687	2
2	whattypescomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0161	11.04828	0.0904	-6.188	3
3	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0353	8.175523	0.1236	-8.259	4
4	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.0664	6.064783	0.1481	-9.279	5
5	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0771	5.518937	0.1705	-10.03	6
6	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1542	3.537692	0.1848	-9.789	7
7	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.1357	3.842127	0.2004	-9.702	8
8	whattypesystemembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.1840	3.020196	0.2126	-9.206	9
9	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.2233	2.523122	0.2228	-8.462	10
10	whattypesenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.2316	2.424813	0.2326	-7.67	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.232644
RSquare Adj	0.164737
Root Mean Square Error	1.294775
Mean of Response	4.532258
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	124

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	57.43311	5.74331	3.4259
Error	113	189.43786	1.67644	Prob > F
C. Total	123	246.87097		0.0006

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	29	58.10016	2.00345	1.2814
Pure Error	84	131.33770	1.56354	Prob > F
Total Error	113	189.43786		0.1907
				Max RSq
				0.4680

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.5807612	0.17842	25.67	<.0001
whattypesystemembedded[1-0]	-0.526299	0.376695	-1.40	0.1651
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	0.7510746	0.619265	1.21	0.2277
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	0.6708591	0.375181	1.79	0.0764
whattypescomponentOS[1-0]	1.1991173	0.493519	2.43	0.0167
whattypesenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.1328241	0.941928	1.20	0.2316
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.6180787	0.304232	2.03	0.0445
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.596987	0.362286	-1.65	0.1022
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	-0.894873	0.317542	-2.82	0.0057
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	-0.448262	0.295427	-1.52	0.1320
whatproductsnone[1-0]	0.8241457	0.51374	1.60	0.1115

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemembedded	1	1	3.272454	1.9520	0.1651
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	2.466045	1.4710	0.2277
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	5.360056	3.1973	0.0764
whattypescomponentOS	1	1	9.896998	5.9036	0.0167
whattypesenterpriseOES	1	1	2.424813	1.4464	0.2316
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	6.919380	4.1274	0.0445
whatprocessfielding	1	1	4.552133	2.7154	0.1022
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	13.314025	7.9418	0.0057
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	3.859695	2.3023	0.1320
whatproductsnone	1	1	4.314293	2.5735	0.1115

Quality = 4.58 + sys-embed(-0.53) + shrink-util(0.75) + shrink-int(0.67) + comp-OS(1.20) + ent-OES(1.13) + proc-reeng(0.62) + proc-field(-0.60) + prod-COTS(-0.89) + prod-comcust(-0.45) + prod-none(0.82)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (Rework)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 173.48063	DFE 111	MSE 1.5628886	RSquare 0.2137	RSquare Adj 0.1428	Cp -4.186418	AIC 64.94948		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X		Intercept	4.81287671	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.854713	0.545	0.4621		
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.2848	0.181	0.6714		
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0.30431091	1	6.868883	4.395	0.0383		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.420943	0.268	0.6060		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.265706	0.169	0.6820		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.6082568	1	6.340475	4.057	0.0464		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.22584	0.143	0.7057		
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.504342	0.962	0.3288		
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.141421	0.090	0.7651		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.830824	0.529	0.4684		
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.3696466	1	3.94366	2.523	0.1150		
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-0.421562	1	11.94422	7.642	0.0067		
		whattypeenterpriseactng{0-1}	0	1	0.090616	0.057	0.8110		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.043839	0.028	0.8679		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.492515	0.313	0.5769		
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0.58363878	1	2.587659	1.656	0.2009		
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.659303	0.420	0.5185		
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.012623	0.008	0.9289		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.111326	0.071	0.7909		
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.2590507	1	5.487904	3.511	0.0636		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.005561	0.004	0.9528		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.010112	0.006	0.9363		
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0.2077958	1	3.053797	1.954	0.1649		
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.863636	0.550	0.4598		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.093804	0.060	0.8077		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.932767	0.595	0.4423		
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.106412	0.068	0.7955		
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0.26027606	1	3.654039	2.338	0.1291		
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.794367	0.506	0.4784		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.604069	1.027	0.3132		
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.058588	0.675	0.4130		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.581387	0.370	0.5443		
	X	whatprocessnone{0-1}	-0.6424936	1	2.936087	1.879	0.1733		
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	1.12927	0.721	0.3977		
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.392169	1	10.80005	6.910	0.0098		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.212798	0.135	0.7139		
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.286422	0.182	0.6706		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0168	10.31003	0.0467	-1.844	2
2	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0614	6.118156	0.0745	-3.223	3
3	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1027	4.575584	0.0952	-3.75	4
4	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0751	5.353451	0.1195	-4.707	5
5	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1113	4.217847	0.1386	-5.036	6
6	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.1317	3.734342	0.1555	-5.099	7
7	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.1462	3.434737	0.1711	-4.996	8
8	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.1694	3.044465	0.1849	-4.677	9
9	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1245	3.766049	0.2019	-4.757	10
10	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.2009	2.587659	0.2137	-4.186	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.213678
RSquare Adj	0.142838
Root Mean Square Error	1.250155
Mean of Response	4.245902
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	122

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	47.14232	4.71423	3.0164
Error	111	173.48063	1.56289	Prob > F
C. Total	121	220.62295		0.0021

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	33	43.42869	1.31602	0.7893
Pure Error	78	130.05195	1.66733	Prob > F
Total Error	111	173.48063		0.7730
				Max RSq
				0.4105

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.2150128	0.312235	13.50	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications{1-0}	-0.608622	0.290314	-2.10	0.0383
whattypeshrinkutilities{1-0}	1.2165136	0.603977	2.01	0.0464
whattypecomponentOS{1-0}	-0.739293	0.465405	-1.59	0.1150
whattypecomponentdevelopment{1-0}	0.843124	0.304984	2.76	0.0067
whattypeenterpriseOES{1-0}	-1.167278	0.907162	-1.29	0.2009
whatprocessdesign{1-0}	0.5181014	0.276487	1.87	0.0636
whatprocessreengineering{1-0}	-0.415592	0.297311	-1.40	0.1649
whatprocesscoding{1-0}	-0.520552	0.340441	-1.53	0.1291
whatprocessnone{1-0}	1.2849872	0.937515	1.37	0.1733
whatproductsCOTS{1-0}	0.7843379	0.298369	2.63	0.0098

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	6.868883	4.3950	0.0383
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	6.340475	4.0569	0.0464
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	3.943660	2.5233	0.1150
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	11.944224	7.6424	0.0067
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	2.587659	1.6557	0.2009
whatprocessdesign	1	1	5.487904	3.5114	0.0636
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	3.053797	1.9539	0.1649
whatprocesscoding	1	1	3.654039	2.3380	0.1291
whatprocessnone	1	1	2.936087	1.8786	0.1733
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	10.800048	6.9103	0.0098

Rework = 4.22 + sys-comm(-0.61) + shrink-util(1.22) + comp-OS(-0.74) + comp-dev(0.84) + ent-OES(-1.17) + proc-des(0.52) + proc-reeng(-0.42) + proc-coding(-0.52) + proc-none(1.28) + prod-COTS(0.78)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (Visibility)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	158.35814	111	1.4266499	0.3228	0.2557	-0.492922	55.079			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.86890586	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.091465	0.064	0.8014			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	1.64202	1.153	0.2854			
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	-0.2541736	1	5.048573	3.539	0.0626			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.392463	0.273	0.6022			
	X	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	-0.2772284	1	6.279905	4.402	0.0382			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.359519	0.250	0.6179			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.401354	0.279	0.5981			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.697239	1.192	0.2774			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.158115	0.110	0.7408			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	1.331849	0.933	0.3362			
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.103933	0.072	0.7886			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.073543	0.051	0.8216			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.112491	0.078	0.7803			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.156561	0.109	0.7421			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.077588	0.054	0.8168			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	-1.0290139	1	7.93466	5.562	0.0201			
		whattypeenterprise scripting{0-1}	0	1	1.82071	1.279	0.2605			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	1.584916	1.112	0.2939			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.193714	0.135	0.7143			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.10288	0.072	0.7897			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.051857	0.036	0.8498			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.563034	0.392	0.5323			
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.1906506	1	2.50037	1.753	0.1883			
	X	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	-0.3483678	1	7.903873	5.540	0.0203			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.015385	0.011	0.9178			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.171667	0.119	0.7304			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.199242	0.139	0.7104			
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0.18443306	1	2.203369	1.544	0.2166			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.65864736	1	18.51537	12.978	0.0005			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.000158	0.000	0.9916			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.663244	0.463	0.4978			
		whatprocessSWEngSupt{0-1}	0	1	1.494537	1.048	0.3082			
	X	whatprocessnone{0-1}	1.09808057	1	6.561818	4.599	0.0342			
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	-0.3885451	1	12.72592	8.920	0.0035			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	1.169263	0.818	0.3677			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.18332	1	2.347732	1.646	0.2022			
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	-1.2801653	1	26.43738	18.531	0.0000			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0117	12.00514	0.0513	19.001	2
2	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0064	13.39518	0.1086	12.669	3
3	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0325	7.888774	0.1424	9.7617	4
4	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0513	6.37973	0.1696	7.7932	5
5	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0112	10.44024	0.2143	3.2988	6
6	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0537	5.826821	0.2392	1.6742	7
7	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0838	4.586294	0.2588	0.8213	8
8	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.0932	4.250829	0.2770	0.177	9
9	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.0499	5.682871	0.3013	-1.358	10
10	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Removed	0.2604	1.8504	0.2934	-2.207	9
11	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.2062	2.330128	0.3033	-1.656	10
12	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.2170	2.21219	0.3128	-1.033	11
13	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.2022	2.347732	0.3228	-0.493	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.322832
RSquare Adj 0.255726
Root Mean Square Error 1.194424
Mean of Response 3.585366
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 123

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	75.49552	6.86323	4.8107
Error	111	158.35814	1.42665	Prob > F
C. Total	122	233.85366		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	43	53.78591	1.25084	0.8134
Pure Error	68	104.57222	1.53783	Prob > F
Total Error	111	158.35814		0.7640
			Max RSq	0.5528

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	2.8586022	0.34161	8.37	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	0.5083472	0.270231	1.88	0.0626
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	0.5544567	0.264271	2.10	0.0382
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	2.0580277	0.872661	2.36	0.0201
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.3813011	0.288021	1.32	0.1883
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	0.6967357	0.29601	2.35	0.0203
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	-0.368866	0.296814	-1.24	0.2166
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-1.317295	0.365658	-3.60	0.0005
whatprocessnone[1-0]	-2.196161	1.024026	-2.14	0.0342
whatproductscustom[1-0]	0.7770903	0.260187	2.99	0.0035
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.36664	0.285808	1.28	0.2022
whatproductsnone[1-0]	2.5603306	0.594765	4.30	<.0001

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	5.048573	3.5388	0.0626
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	6.279905	4.4019	0.0382
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	7.934660	5.5617	0.0201
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	2.500370	1.7526	0.1883
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	7.903873	5.5402	0.0203
whatprocesscoding	1	1	2.203369	1.5444	0.2166
whatprocessfielding	1	1	18.515375	12.9782	0.0005
whatprocessnone	1	1	6.561818	4.5995	0.0342
whatproductscustom	1	1	12.725925	8.9201	0.0035
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	2.347732	1.6456	0.2022
whatproductsnone	1	1	26.437376	18.5311	<.0001

Visibility = 2.86 + sys-comm(0.51) + shrink-bus(0.55) + ent-OES(2.06) + proc-reeng(0.38) + proc-appsup(0.70) + proc-coding(-0.37) + proc-field(-1.32) + proc-none(-2.20) + prod-cust(0.78) + prod-comcust(0.37) + prod-none(2.56)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (ControlProduct)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
149.55216		114	1.3118611	0.3039	0.2429	-1.000899	44.41644		
Lock X	Entered X	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
		Intercept	4.39807857	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.781292	0.593	0.4427		
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0.27157371	1	3.401116	2.593	0.1101		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	1.150687	0.876	0.3512		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.408255	0.309	0.5792		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.049642	0.038	0.8468		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.8418239	1	11.6627	8.890	0.0035		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.618538	0.469	0.4947		
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.39122876	1	4.070965	3.103	0.0808		
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.305409	0.231	0.6315		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.002439	0.002	0.9658		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	1.50076	1.145	0.2868		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.210125	0.159	0.6908		
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	1.090822	0.830	0.3641		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.035315	0.788	0.3767		
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	0.591976	0.449	0.5041		
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.220122	0.167	0.6840		
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.048012	0.036	0.8493		
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	1.02201	0.778	0.3798		
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.668217	0.507	0.4778		
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.279946	0.212	0.6462		
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.709319	0.539	0.4646		
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	1.378113	1.051	0.3075		
	X	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	-0.4178804	1	11.5409	8.797	0.0037		
	X	whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	-0.4136855	1	10.46595	7.978	0.0056		
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	1.101103	0.838	0.3619		
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.21449	0.162	0.6878		
	X	whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	-0.2246851	1	2.087969	1.592	0.2097		
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.052207	0.039	0.8429		
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.5839269	1	13.73191	10.468	0.0016		
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	1.379668	1.052	0.3072		
	X	whatprocessstoolsuppt{0-1}	0.24238327	1	3.645529	2.779	0.0983		
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.773598	0.588	0.4450		
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.08412	0.064	0.8014		
		whatproductsustom{0-1}	0	1	0.719046	0.546	0.4615		
	X	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0.40089332	1	10.74864	8.193	0.0050		
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	1.477006	1.127	0.2906		
	X	whatproductsnone{0-1}	-0.4394939	1	4.861569	3.706	0.0567		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0136	10.41445	0.0485	18.43	2
2	whatprocessappsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0022	15.17643	0.1191	10.079	3
3	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0254	7.684275	0.1549	6.8382	4
4	whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	Entered	0.0310	6.935124	0.1872	4.1082	5
5	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.0478	5.680442	0.2136	2.234	6
6	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.0234	7.232595	0.2473	-0.699	7
7	whatprocessstoolsuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.0804	4.189049	0.2668	-1.556	8
8	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1059	3.526401	0.2832	-1.961	9
9	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.1828	2.369105	0.2942	-1.577	10
10	whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	Entered	0.2097	2.087969	0.3039	-1.001	11

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.303916
RSquare Adj	0.242856
Root Mean Square Error	1.145365
Mean of Response	3.904
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	125

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	10	65.29584	6.52958	4.9773
Error	114	149.55216	1.31186	Prob > F
C. Total	124	214.84800		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	36	52.03764	1.44549	1.1562
Pure Error	78	97.51452	1.25019	Prob > F
Total Error	114	149.55216		0.2924
				Max RSq
				0.5461

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.9505157	0.149943	26.35	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.543147	0.337327	-1.61	0.1101
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.6836479	0.564671	2.98	0.0035
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-0.782458	0.444177	-1.76	0.0808
whatprocessreengineering[1-0]	0.8357607	0.281777	2.97	0.0037
whatprocessappsuppt[1-0]	0.8273711	0.292924	2.82	0.0056
whatprocessdocumentation[1-0]	0.4493702	0.356194	1.26	0.2097
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-1.167854	0.360966	-3.24	0.0016
whatprocessstoolsuppt[1-0]	-0.484767	0.290801	-1.67	0.0983
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	-0.801787	0.280108	-2.86	0.0050
whatproductsnone[1-0]	0.8789878	0.456603	1.93	0.0567

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	3.401116	2.5926	0.1101
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	11.662705	8.8902	0.0035
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	4.070965	3.1032	0.0808
whatprocessreengineering	1	1	11.540897	8.7973	0.0037
whatprocessappsuppt	1	1	10.465953	7.9779	0.0056
whatprocessdocumentation	1	1	2.087969	1.5916	0.2097
whatprocessfielding	1	1	13.731912	10.4675	0.0016
whatprocessstoolsuppt	1	1	3.645529	2.7789	0.0983
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	10.748639	8.1934	0.0050
whatproductsnone	1	1	4.861569	3.7059	0.0567

ControlProduct = 3.95 + sys-embed(-0.54) + shrink-util(1.68) + comp-domain(-0.78) + proc-reeng(0.84) + proc-appsup(0.83) + proc-doc(0.45) + proc-field(-1.17) + proc_toolsup(-0.48) + prod-COTS(-0.80) + prod-none(0.88)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (ChangeCost)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 182.1889	DFE 109	MSE 1.6714578	RSquare 0.2761	RSquare Adj 0.1831	Cp 1.0826579	AIC 77.71055			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	5.27126411	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.5939639	1	7.716578	4.617	0.0339			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.719231	0.428	0.5143			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.523547	0.311	0.5781			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.039326	0.023	0.8789			
X		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0.23493251	1	4.200341	2.513	0.1158			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.083262	0.049	0.8246			
X		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0.24817787	1	2.58409	1.546	0.2164			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.51206	0.304	0.5823			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	1.594578	0.954	0.3310			
X		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.63733259	1	6.705303	4.012	0.0477			
X		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	-0.3885275	1	4.236056	2.534	0.1143			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	1.31359	0.784	0.3778			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	1.351273	0.807	0.3710			
X		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.6949918	1	6.883628	4.118	0.0449			
		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	0	1	1.653086	0.989	0.3222			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	1.563605	0.935	0.3357			
		whattypeenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.872628	0.520	0.4725			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.245861	0.146	0.7032			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.830499	0.495	0.4834			
X		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.230211	1	2.986489	1.787	0.1841			
X		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0.32425223	1	7.071045	4.230	0.0421			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.494454	0.294	0.5888			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.320418	0.190	0.6636			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.098376	0.058	0.8096			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	0.868956	0.518	0.4735			
X		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	-0.331706	1	7.468708	4.468	0.0368			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.920031	0.548	0.4607			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.04385	0.026	0.8722			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.018616	0.011	0.9165			
X		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.27679138	1	4.573154	2.736	0.1010			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	1.670843	1.000	0.3196			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	2.059798	1.235	0.2689			
X		whatprocessnone{0-1}	-0.7388523	1	3.041814	1.820	0.1801			
		whatproductscustom{0-1}	0	1	0.360992	0.214	0.6443			
X		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.1975663	1	2.787146	1.667	0.1993			
X		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.3805012	1	10.24175	6.127	0.0148			
X		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0.67920278	1	7.941852	4.751	0.0314			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductsnone{0-1}	Entered	0.0086	13.8972	0.0552	4.0952	2
2	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0317	8.932005	0.0907	1.4337	3
3	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0469	7.438187	0.1203	-0.448	4
4	whatprocesstesting{0-1}	Entered	0.1274	4.30053	0.1374	-0.693	5
5	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.1138	4.572401	0.1555	-1.079	6
6	whatprocessspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.0953	5.015248	0.1754	-1.696	7
7	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.1405	3.865907	0.1908	-1.714	8
8	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.1588	3.500871	0.2047	-1.541	9
9	whatprocessnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1537	3.556793	0.2188	-1.397	10
10	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1842	3.057907	0.2310	-0.993	11
11	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.2153	2.647287	0.2415	-0.375	12
12	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1426	3.677618	0.2561	-0.294	13
13	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.2305	2.442474	0.2658	0.4313	14
14	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.2164	2.58409	0.2761	1.0827	15

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.276102
RSquare Adj	0.183124
Root Mean Square Error	1.292849
Mean of Response	4.225806
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	124

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	69.48852	4.96347	2.9695
Error	109	182.18890	1.67146	Prob > F
C. Total	123	251.67742		0.0007

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	48	98.63890	2.05498	1.5003
Pure Error	61	83.55000	1.36967	Prob > F
Total Error	109	182.18890		0.0671
				Max RSq
				0.6680

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1156334	0.29475	13.96	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	1.1879278	0.552873	2.15	0.0339
whattypeshrinkbusiness[1-0]	-0.469865	0.2964	-1.59	0.1158
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	-0.496356	0.399197	-1.24	0.2164
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-1.274665	0.636407	-2.00	0.0477
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	0.7770549	0.488111	1.59	0.1143
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	1.3899836	0.684934	2.03	0.0449
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	0.460422	0.344448	1.34	0.1841
whatprocessspecification[1-0]	-0.648504	0.315296	-2.06	0.0421
whatprocessCM[1-0]	0.6634121	0.31384	2.11	0.0368
whatprocessnone[1-0]	-0.553583	0.334674	-1.65	0.1010
whatproductsnone[1-0]	1.4777047	1.095391	1.35	0.1801
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.3951327	0.305993	1.29	0.1993
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.7610024	0.30743	2.48	0.0148
whatproductsnone[1-0]	-1.358406	0.623184	-2.18	0.0314

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	7.716578	4.6167	0.0339
whattypeshrinkbusiness	1	1	4.200341	2.5130	0.1158
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	2.584090	1.5460	0.2164
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	6.705303	4.0116	0.0477
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	4.236056	2.5343	0.1143
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	6.883628	4.1183	0.0449
whatprocesstesting	1	1	2.986489	1.7868	0.1841
whatprocessspecification	1	1	7.071045	4.2305	0.0421
whatprocessCM	1	1	4.573154	2.7360	0.1010
whatprocessnone	1	1	3.041814	1.8199	0.1801
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	2.787146	1.6675	0.1993
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	10.241752	6.1274	0.0148
whatproductsnone	1	1	7.941852	4.7515	0.0314

ChangeCost = 4.12 + sys-avia(1.19) + shrink-bus(-0.47) + shrink-int(-0.50) + comp-class(-1.27) + comp-OS(0.78) + ent-mnht(1.39) + proc-des(0.46) + proc-test(-0.65) + proc-spec(0.66) + proc-CM(-0.55) + proc-none(1.48) + prod-COTS(0.40) + prod-comcust(0.76) + prod-none(-1.36)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (LangCulture)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	85.614974	110	0.7783179	0.2228	0.1451	-3.851436	-19.2076			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.6380565	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
	X	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	-0.3500808	1	2.948675	3.789	0.0542			
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	-0.2931314	1	3.846151	4.942	0.0283			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.021928	0.028	0.8676			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.062169	0.079	0.7789			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.359798	0.460	0.4991			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.440956	0.564	0.4541			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.000432	0.001	0.9813			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.169986	0.217	0.6424			
		whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0	1	0.40814	0.522	0.4715			
X		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0.63799671	1	4.917043	6.318	0.0134			
X		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.37983132	1	3.966181	5.096	0.0260			
X		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0.14034206	1	1.298713	1.669	0.1992			
X		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.2070367	1	1.270391	1.632	0.2041			
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	0.439016	0.562	0.4551			
X		whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	-0.5678941	1	5.056645	6.497	0.0122			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.11079	0.141	0.7078			
		whattypeenterprisescrptng{0-1}	0	1	0.236924	0.302	0.5835			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.313628	0.401	0.5280			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.956486	1.232	0.2696			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.173837	0.222	0.6386			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.289753	0.370	0.5442			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.917058	1.180	0.2797			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.014185	0.018	0.8933			
X		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0.25714825	1	3.893406	5.002	0.0273			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	1.002621	1.292	0.2582			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.082599	0.105	0.7462			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.132814	0.169	0.6815			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	0.099159	0.126	0.7229			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.686525	0.881	0.3500			
		whatprocessCM{0-1}	0	1	0.000019	0.000	0.9961			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.005267	0.007	0.9349			
X		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	-0.1463898	1	1.711346	2.199	0.1410			
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.026231	0.033	0.8553			
		whatproductsustom{0-1}	0	1	0.483697	0.619	0.4330			
X		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	-0.1588631	1	1.736235	2.231	0.1382			
X		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.2182791	1	3.597185	4.622	0.0338			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.535693	0.686	0.4092			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0426	3.726009	0.0338	-0.953	2
2	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.0649	3.017563	0.0612	-2.271	3
3	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0830	2.612083	0.0849	-3.144	4
4	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.1210	2.059673	0.1036	-3.409	5
5	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.2040	1.369954	0.1161	-2.915	6
6	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.2076	1.341197	0.1282	-2.39	7
7	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.2101	1.31984	0.1402	-1.841	8
8	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Removed	0.2535	1.09421	0.1303	-2.638	7
9	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Entered	0.1183	2.037389	0.1488	-2.879	8
10	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.1837	1.461845	0.1620	-2.486	9
11	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0269	3.966099	0.1980	-4.848	10
12	whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	Entered	0.2098	1.24858	0.2094	-4.221	11
13	whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.1956	1.322177	0.2214	-3.675	12
14	whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	Entered	0.2415	1.077821	0.2312	-2.86	13
15	whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	Removed	0.2797	0.917058	0.2228	-3.851	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.22284
RSquare Adj	0.145124
Root Mean Square Error	0.882223
Mean of Response	4.311475
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	122

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	24.54896	2.23172	2.8674
Error	110	85.61497	0.77832	Prob > F
C. Total	121	110.16393		0.0024

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	33	29.068942	0.880877	1.1995
Pure Error	77	56.546032	0.734364	Prob > F
Total Error	110	85.614974		0.2541
				Max RSq
				0.4867

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.1116998	0.137641	29.87	<.0001
whattypesystemsavionics[1-0]	0.7001615	0.359719	1.95	0.0542
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.5862629	0.263729	2.22	0.0283
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-1.275993	0.507662	-2.51	0.0134
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.759663	0.336522	-2.26	0.0260
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	-0.280684	0.21729	-1.29	0.1992
whattypeenterpriseacctng[1-0]	0.4140734	0.324106	1.28	0.2041
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	1.1357881	0.445599	2.55	0.0122
whatprocessappsupt[1-0]	-0.514297	0.229947	-2.24	0.0273
whatprocessSWEngSuppt[1-0]	0.2927796	0.197447	1.48	0.1410
whatproductsCOTS[1-0]	0.3177263	0.212729	1.49	0.1382
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.4365582	0.203067	2.15	0.0338

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemsavionics	1	1	2.9486750	3.7895	0.0542
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	3.8461511	4.9416	0.0283
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	4.9170425	6.3175	0.0134
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	3.9661810	5.0958	0.0260
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	1.2987132	1.6686	0.1992
whattypeenterpriseacctng	1	1	1.2703910	1.6322	0.2041
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	5.0566448	6.4969	0.0122
whatprocessappsupt	1	1	3.8934065	5.0023	0.0273
whatprocessSWEngSuppt	1	1	1.7113455	2.1988	0.1410
whatproductsCOTS	1	1	1.7362352	2.2308	0.1382
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	3.5971846	4.6217	0.0338

LangCult = 4.11 + sys-avia(0.70) + sys-embed(0.59) + comp-class(-1.28) + comp-OS(-0.76) + comp-dev(-0.28) + ent-acct(0.41) + ent-pay(1.14) + proc-appsup(-0.51) + proc-SWEngSup(0.29) + prod-COTS(0.32) + prod-comcust(0.44)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (TurfWar)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	137.06985	105	1.3054272	0.3554	0.2572	4.4366712	48.20929			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	4.5668949	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.020697	0.016	0.9005			
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	-0.2365855	1	2.419592	1.853	0.1763			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.363862	0.277	0.5999			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.258886	0.197	0.6582			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.486793	0.371	0.5440			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.003339	0.003	0.9600			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.013964	0.011	0.9182			
		whattypesecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	0.000435	0.000	0.9855			
	X	whattypesecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.52026112	1	4.303907	3.297	0.0723			
		whattypesecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.364638	0.277	0.5995			
	X	whattypesecomponentOS{0-1}	0.53528226	1	7.571654	5.800	0.0178			
	X	whattypesecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-0.2394009	1	3.326867	2.548	0.1134			
	X	whattypeseenterpriseacctng{0-1}	-0.3997281	1	4.524383	3.466	0.0654			
	X	whattypeseenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.7099058	1	6.621548	5.072	0.0264			
		whattypeseenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.784754	0.599	0.4408			
		whattypeseenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.639765	0.488	0.4865			
		whattypeseenterprisescrpting{0-1}	0	1	0.337333	0.257	0.6136			
	X	whattypeseenterpriseweb{0-1}	-0.3153353	1	3.026957	2.319	0.1308			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	-0.2686756	1	5.280131	4.045	0.0469			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.356763	0.271	0.6035			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.914068	0.698	0.4053			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.00006	0.000	0.9946			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0.48676186	1	11.6541	8.927	0.0035			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0.57408812	1	17.99557	13.785	0.0003			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0.34172417	1	5.760811	4.413	0.0381			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.564068	0.430	0.5136			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.333817	0.254	0.6154			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0.30232284	1	5.291409	4.053	0.0466			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.737188	0.562	0.4550			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0.25408779	1	3.142885	2.408	0.1238			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	-0.7733196	1	23.71521	18.167	0.0000			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	1.461392	1.121	0.2922			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0.55882584	1	2.22603	1.705	0.1945			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.044254	0.034	0.8549			
	X	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	-0.5796411	1	20.46879	15.680	0.0001			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.466721	0.355	0.5524			
		whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	0	1	0.000268	0.000	0.9887			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	Entered	0.0092	11.74757	0.0552	17.488	2
2	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.0303	7.799643	0.0919	14.228	3
3	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.0283	7.748843	0.1284	11.002	4
4	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0230	8.046927	0.1662	7.5755	5
5	whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	Entered	0.0526	5.674788	0.1929	5.7486	6
6	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1010	3.985615	0.2116	5.0608	7
7	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.1233	3.471789	0.2280	4.7195	8
8	whattypesecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.1012	3.873055	0.2462	4.1076	9
9	whattypesecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.1548	2.88453	0.2597	4.1623	10
10	whattypesecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.1545	2.862171	0.2732	4.2322	11
11	whattypesecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1077	3.610261	0.2902	3.7975	12
12	whattypesecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.1715	2.579441	0.3023	4.058	13
13	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	Entered	0.1513	2.814811	0.3155	4.1597	14
14	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	Removed	0.3401	1.237236	0.3097	2.9941	13
15	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	Entered	0.2098	2.131854	0.3197	3.5564	14
16	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	Entered	0.1983	2.230599	0.3302	4.0522	15
17	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	Entered	0.1867	2.334264	0.3412	4.478	16
18	whattypeseenterprise{0-1}	Entered	0.1308	3.026957	0.3554	4.4367	17

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.355438
RSquare Adj 0.257219
Root Mean Square Error 1.142553
Mean of Response 4.377049
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 122

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	16	75.58589	4.72412	3.6188
Error	105	137.06985	1.30543	Prob > F
C. Total	121	212.65574		<.0001

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.6176517	0.282545	16.34	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.473171	0.347555	1.36	0.1763
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-1.040522	0.573055	-1.82	0.0723
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-1.070565	0.444523	-2.41	0.0178
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.4788018	0.299926	1.60	0.1134
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.7994561	0.429429	1.86	0.0654
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	1.4198116	0.630416	2.25	0.0264
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.6306706	0.414167	1.52	0.1308
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	0.5373511	0.267185	2.01	0.0469
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.973524	0.325824	-2.99	0.0035
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-1.148176	0.309245	-3.71	0.0003
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.683448	0.325342	-2.10	0.0381
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.604646	0.300325	-2.01	0.0466
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.508176	0.327511	-1.55	0.1238
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	1.5466391	0.362871	4.26	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-1.117652	0.855889	-1.31	0.1945
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	1.1592822	0.292765	3.96	0.0001

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	2.419592	1.8535	0.1763
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	4.303907	3.2969	0.0723
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	7.571654	5.8001	0.0178
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	3.326867	2.5485	0.1134
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	4.524383	3.4658	0.0654
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	6.621548	5.0723	0.0264
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	3.026957	2.3187	0.1308
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	5.280131	4.0448	0.0469
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	11.654100	8.9274	0.0035
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	17.995573	13.7852	0.0003
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	5.760811	4.4130	0.0381
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	5.291409	4.0534	0.0466
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	3.142885	2.4076	0.1238
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	23.715213	18.1666	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	2.226030	1.7052	0.1945
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	20.468789	15.6798	0.0001

TurfWar = 4.62 + sys-embed(0.47) + comp-CASE(-1.04) + comp-OS(-1.07) + comp-dev(0.48) + ent-acct(0.80) + ent-mnft(1.42) + ent-web(0.63) + proc-req(0.54) + proc-reeng(-0.97) + proc-appsupp(-1.15) + proc-train(-0.68) + proc-coding(-0.60) + proc-CM(-0.51) + proc-toolsup(1.55) + proc-none(-1.12) + prod-COTS(1.16)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (FailLikely)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC			
	166.39835	109	1.5265904	0.3228	0.2358	1.7688794	66.46878			
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
X	X	Intercept	3.95055205	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.370571	0.241	0.6244			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.017659	0.011	0.9149			
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.001352	0.001	0.9764			
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	1.213651	0.794	0.3750			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.001915	0.001	0.9719			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	1.17976	0.771	0.3818			
	X	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	-0.2578722	1	2.810802	1.841	0.1776			
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	-0.2754059	1	2.149182	1.408	0.2380			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	0.45796955	1	3.496079	2.290	0.1331			
	X	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	1.22898413	1	18.47525	12.102	0.0007			
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0.29528485	1	2.46399	1.614	0.2066			
	X	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	-0.2013401	1	2.755115	1.805	0.1819			
		whattypeenterpriseacntng{0-1}	0	1	0.531129	0.346	0.5577			
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	-0.670198	1	6.388775	4.185	0.0432			
	X	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	-0.5688313	1	4.94407	3.239	0.0747			
		whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	0	1	0.592608	0.386	0.5357			
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	1.305427	0.854	0.3575			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.000002	0.000	0.9992			
		whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0	1	0.894859	0.584	0.4464			
	X	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	-0.265596	1	5.376917	3.522	0.0632			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.194076	0.126	0.7232			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	1.555584	1.019	0.3150			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.461737	0.301	0.5847			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.17235	0.112	0.7386			
	X	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0.24963291	1	3.709239	2.430	0.1220			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	0.568556	0.370	0.5441			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.881279	0.575	0.4499			
		whatprocesscoding{0-1}	0	1	1.188967	0.777	0.3800			
		whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0	1	0.762618	0.497	0.4822			
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	0.63522587	1	19.60305	12.841	0.0005			
	X	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	-0.7348127	1	24.08974	15.780	0.0001			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.491541	0.320	0.5728			
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.179422	0.117	0.7334			
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	-0.2137006	1	3.989618	2.613	0.1089			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	1.578858	1.035	0.3114			
	X	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	-0.413646	1	11.99162	7.855	0.0060			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.119167	0.077	0.7814			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	Entered	0.0187	10.92985	0.0445	15.125	2
2	whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.0076	13.499	0.0994	9.3559	3
3	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0700	5.994467	0.1238	7.9059	4
4	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.0673	5.998143	0.1482	6.4537	5
5	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.0975	4.833965	0.1679	5.6716	6
6	whatprocessstoolsupt{0-1}	Entered	0.0021	16.00938	0.2331	-1.542	7
7	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.1551	3.269241	0.2464	-1.424	8
8	whatprocessdesign{0-1}	Entered	0.1635	3.112914	0.2590	-1.216	9
9	whattypeenterprise payroll{0-1}	Entered	0.1298	3.643562	0.2739	-1.313	10
10	whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	Entered	0.2121	2.451961	0.2838	-0.724	11
11	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.2167	2.392106	0.2936	-0.101	12
12	whatprocesstraining{0-1}	Entered	0.2082	2.470708	0.3036	0.4774	13
13	whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	Entered	0.2294	2.242039	0.3128	1.187	14
14	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.2066	2.46399	0.3228	1.7689	15

Response Column 59
Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.322785
RSquare Adj 0.235803
Root Mean Square Error 1.235553
Mean of Response 4.048387
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 124

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	14	79.31132	5.66509	3.7109
Error	109	166.39835	1.52659	Prob > F
C. Total	123	245.70968		<.0001

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	50	80.62057	1.61241	1.1091
Pure Error	59	85.77778	1.45386	Prob > F
Total Error	109	166.39835		0.3494
			Max RSq	0.6509

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	3.2162465	0.279705	11.50	<.0001
whattypeshrinkinternet[1-0]	0.5157443	0.380085	1.36	0.1776
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	0.5508117	0.464224	1.19	0.2380
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	-0.915939	0.605253	-1.51	0.1331
whattypecomponentclass[1-0]	-2.457968	0.706459	-3.48	0.0007
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	-0.59057	0.46485	-1.27	0.2066
whattypecomponentdevelopment[1-0]	0.4026802	0.299745	1.34	0.1819
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	1.3403961	0.655218	2.05	0.0432
whattypeenterprise payroll[1-0]	1.1376626	0.632168	1.80	0.0747
whatprocesstesting[1-0]	0.5311919	0.283039	1.88	0.0632
whatprocesstraining[1-0]	-0.499266	0.320295	-1.56	0.1220
whatprocessCM[1-0]	-1.270452	0.354534	-3.58	0.0005
whatprocessstoolsupt[1-0]	1.4696255	0.369958	3.97	0.0001
whatproductscustom[1-0]	0.4274012	0.264382	1.62	0.1089
whatproductscommoncust[1-0]	0.8272921	0.295176	2.80	0.0060

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypeshrinkinternet	1	1	2.810802	1.8412	0.1776
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	2.149182	1.4078	0.2380
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	3.496079	2.2901	0.1331
whattypecomponentclass	1	1	18.475254	12.1023	0.0007
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	2.463990	1.6140	0.2066
whattypecomponentdevelopment	1	1	2.755115	1.8048	0.1819
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	6.388775	4.1850	0.0432
whattypeenterprise payroll	1	1	4.944070	3.2386	0.0747
whatprocessdesign	1	1	5.376917	3.5222	0.0632
whatprocesstraining	1	1	3.709239	2.4298	0.1220
whatprocessCM	1	1	19.603051	12.8411	0.0005
whatprocessstoolsupt	1	1	24.089740	15.7801	0.0001
whatproductscustom	1	1	3.989618	2.6134	0.1089
whatproductscommoncust	1	1	11.991615	7.8552	0.0060

FailLikely = 3.22 + shrink-int(0.52) + comp-domain(0.55) + comp-CASE(-0.92) + comp-class(-2.46) + comp-OS(-0.59) + comp-dev(0.40) + ent-mnft(1.34) + ent-pay(1.14) + proc-des(0.53) + proc-train(-0.50) + proc-CM(-1.27) + proc-toolsup(1.47) + prod-cust(0.43) + prod-comcust(0.83)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (RespCust)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

SSE		DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC		
157.22697		108	1.4558052	0.2738	0.1662	2.0078492	62.67208		
Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"		
X	X	Intercept	4.61847758	1	0	0.000	1.0000		
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.245073	0.167	0.6836		
	X	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0.25344136	1	2.852401	1.959	0.1645		
		whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	0	1	0.928216	0.635	0.4271		
		whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0	1	0.07507	0.051	0.8216		
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.082611	0.056	0.8130		
	X	whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	-0.6894193	1	7.407935	5.089	0.0261		
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	1.299606	0.892	0.3471		
	X	whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0.31037685	1	2.385032	1.638	0.2033		
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	-0.7770687	1	9.889576	6.793	0.0104		
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.484837	0.331	0.5663		
		whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	0	1	0.054864	0.037	0.8471		
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.020271	0.014	0.9067		
		whattypeenterpriseacntg{0-1}	0	1	0.004567	0.003	0.9556		
		whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0	1	1.351214	0.928	0.3377		
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.000259	0.000	0.9894		
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.5211476	1	2.025051	1.391	0.2408		
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	0.178287	0.121	0.7281		
	X	whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0.22597924	1	2.229366	1.531	0.2186		
	X	whattypesystemrequirements{0-1}	-0.3574829	1	7.439745	5.110	0.0258		
		whattypesystemdesign{0-1}	0	1	0.024247	0.017	0.8980		
		whattypesystemtesting{0-1}	0	1	1.111781	0.766	0.3834		
		whattypesystemmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	0.115248	0.078	0.7799		
		whattypesystemengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.31358	0.214	0.6447		
		whattypesystemsupp{0-1}	0	1	1.104345	0.757	0.3863		
	X	whattypesystemtraining{0-1}	-0.3401992	1	6.508563	4.471	0.0368		
	X	whattypesystemspecification{0-1}	0.37085993	1	8.876244	6.097	0.0151		
		whattypesystemdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.294804	0.201	0.6548		
		whattypesystemcoding{0-1}	0	1	0.3672	0.250	0.6178		
	X	whattypesystemfielding{0-1}	0.41361452	1	7.096394	4.875	0.0294		
	X	whattypesystemCM{0-1}	-0.4635919	1	11.66933	8.016	0.0055		
		whattypesystemtoolsupp{0-1}	0	1	0.402726	0.275	0.6012		
	X	whattypesystemSWEngSupp{0-1}	0.39637726	1	9.736792	6.688	0.0110		
	X	whattypesystemnone{0-1}	0.70355886	1	3.612233	2.481	0.1181		
	X	whattypesystemcustom{0-1}	0.23379276	1	4.062698	2.791	0.0977		
	X	whattypesystemCOTS{0-1}	0.33350658	1	6.245348	4.290	0.0407		
	X	whattypesystemcommoncust{0-1}	0.19604238	1	2.677357	1.839	0.1779		
		whattypesystemnone{0-1}	0	1	0.23399	0.159	0.6904		

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whattypesystemtraining{0-1}	Entered	0.1009	4.705069	0.0217	4.2947	2
2	whattypesystemCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0997	4.673597	0.0433	3.53	3
3	whattypesystemfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0822	5.126642	0.0670	2.4974	4
4	whattypesystemCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1026	4.453593	0.0876	1.8628	5
5	whattypesystemSWEngSupp{0-1}	Entered	0.0291	7.781651	0.1235	-0.74	6
6	whattypesystemspecification{0-1}	Entered	0.1350	3.574227	0.1400	-0.855	7
7	whattypesystemrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.1183	3.857667	0.1578	-1.137	8
8	whattypesystemshrinkutilities{0-1}	Entered	0.1063	4.071727	0.1766	-1.545	9
9	whattypesystementerpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.1219	3.686133	0.1937	-1.726	10
10	whattypesystemCOTS{0-1}	Entered	0.1910	2.610475	0.2057	-1.27	11
11	whattypesystemcustom{0-1}	Entered	0.1805	2.720252	0.2183	-0.879	12
12	whattypesystemcommoncust{0-1}	Entered	0.1910	2.57511	0.2302	-0.403	13
13	whattypesystemnone{0-1}	Entered	0.1555	3.015157	0.2441	-0.186	14
14	whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	Entered	0.2389	2.060051	0.2536	0.5951	15
15	whattypesystemcomponentdomain{0-1}	Entered	0.2286	2.144318	0.2635	1.3266	16
16	whattypesystementerpriseweb{0-1}	Entered	0.2186	2.229366	0.2738	2.0078	17

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare 0.273819
RSquare Adj 0.166236
Root Mean Square Error 1.206568
Mean of Response 4.352
Observations (or Sum Wgts) 125

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	16	59.28503	3.70531	2.5452
Error	108	157.22697	1.45581	Prob > F
C. Total	124	216.51200		0.0023

Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.9071177	0.264709	18.54	<.0001
whattypesystemseembedded[1-0]	-0.506883	0.362121	-1.40	0.1645
whattypeshrinkutilities[1-0]	1.3788387	0.611247	2.26	0.0261
whattypecomponentdomain[1-0]	-0.620754	0.48498	-1.28	0.2033
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	1.5541374	0.596283	2.61	0.0104
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.0422951	0.88374	1.18	0.2408
whattypeenterpriseweb[1-0]	-0.451958	0.365224	-1.24	0.2186
whattypesystemrequirements[1-0]	0.7149658	0.31627	2.26	0.0258
whattypesystemtraining[1-0]	0.6803984	0.32179	2.11	0.0368
whattypesystemspecification[1-0]	-0.74172	0.300384	-2.47	0.0151
whattypesystemfielding[1-0]	-0.827229	0.374678	-2.21	0.0294
whattypesystemCM[1-0]	0.9271838	0.327487	2.83	0.0055
whattypesystemSWEngSupp[1-0]	-0.792755	0.306537	-2.59	0.0110
whattypesystemnone[1-0]	-1.407118	0.893294	-1.58	0.1181
whattypesystemcustom[1-0]	-0.467586	0.279902	-1.67	0.0977
whattypesystemCOTS[1-0]	-0.667013	0.322038	-2.07	0.0407
whattypesystemcommoncust[1-0]	-0.392085	0.28912	-1.36	0.1779

Effect Tests

Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemseembedded	1	1	2.852401	1.9593	0.1645
whattypeshrinkutilities	1	1	7.407935	5.0885	0.0261
whattypecomponentdomain	1	1	2.385032	1.6383	0.2033
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	9.889576	6.7932	0.0104
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	2.025051	1.3910	0.2408
whattypeenterpriseweb	1	1	2.229366	1.5314	0.2186
whattypesystemrequirements	1	1	7.439745	5.1104	0.0258
whattypesystemtraining	1	1	6.508563	4.4708	0.0368
whattypesystemspecification	1	1	8.876244	6.0971	0.0151
whattypesystemfielding	1	1	7.096394	4.8745	0.0294
whattypesystemCM	1	1	11.669333	8.0157	0.0055
whattypesystemSWEngSupp	1	1	9.736792	6.6883	0.0110
whattypesystemnone	1	1	3.612233	2.4813	0.1181
whattypesystemcustom	1	1	4.062698	2.7907	0.0977
whattypesystemCOTS	1	1	6.245348	4.2900	0.0407
whattypesystemcommoncust	1	1	2.677357	1.8391	0.1779

ResponseCustomer = 4.91 + sys-embed(-0.51) + shrink-util(1.38) + comp-domain(-0.62) + comp-CASE(1.55) + ent-OES(1.04) + ent-web(-0.45) + proc-req(0.71) + proc-train(0.68) + proc-spec(-0.74) + proc-field(-0.83) + proc-CM(0.93) + proc-SWEngSup(-0.79) + proc-none(-1.41) + prod-cust(-0.47) + prod-COTS(-0.67) + prod-comcust(-0.39)

Stepwise Fit - Combined Survey Data - Consequences (ResponseOrg)

Response:
Column 59

Stepwise Regression Control

Prob to Enter 0.250
Prob to Leave 0.250

Direction:

Rules:


Current Estimates

	SSE 214.07154	DfE 113	MSE 1.8944384	RSquare 0.1988	RSquare Adj 0.1208	Cp -5.89511	AIC 91.24956			
Lock X	Entered X	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	"F Ratio"	"Prob>F"			
		Intercept	4.94532414	1	0	0.000	1.0000			
		whattypesystemsavionics{0-1}	0	1	0.000022	0.000	0.9973			
		whattypesystemseembedded{0-1}	0	1	0.558277	0.293	0.5895			
	X	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	-0.2688162	1	5.275968	2.785	0.0979			
	X	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	0.47834009	1	6.976999	3.683	0.0575			
		whattypeshrinkbusiness{0-1}	0	1	0.666903	0.350	0.5553			
		whattypeshrinkutilities{0-1}	0	1	0.027499	0.014	0.9047			
		whattypeshrinkinternet{0-1}	0	1	0.024793	0.013	0.9095			
		whattypecomponentdomain{0-1}	0	1	1.03364	0.543	0.4626			
	X	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	-0.8414831	1	11.93592	6.301	0.0135			
		whattypecomponentclass{0-1}	0	1	0.198188	0.104	0.7479			
	X	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	-0.3677225	1	3.756402	1.983	0.1618			
		whattypecomponentdevelopment{0-1}	0	1	0.361773	0.190	0.6641			
		whattypeenterpriseacctng{0-1}	0	1	0.052845	0.028	0.8682			
	X	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	0.64825314	1	6.105685	3.223	0.0753			
		whattypeenterprisepayroll{0-1}	0	1	0.0287	0.015	0.9027			
	X	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	-0.7031229	1	3.767142	1.989	0.1612			
		whattypeenterprisescripting{0-1}	0	1	1.776085	0.937	0.3351			
		whattypeenterpriseweb{0-1}	0	1	0.0025	0.001	0.9712			
	X	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	0.25732566	1	5.270874	2.782	0.0981			
		whatprocessdesign{0-1}	0	1	2.073217	1.095	0.2976			
		whatprocesstesting{0-1}	0	1	0.006896	0.004	0.9522			
		whatprocessmaintenance{0-1}	0	1	1.331687	0.701	0.4042			
		whatprocessreengineering{0-1}	0	1	0.610359	0.320	0.5726			
		whatprocessappsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.006254	0.003	0.9545			
		whatprocesstraining{0-1}	0	1	1.216748	0.640	0.4253			
		whatprocessspecification{0-1}	0	1	1.135903	0.597	0.4412			
		whatprocessdocumentation{0-1}	0	1	0.489486	0.257	0.6134			
	X	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	-0.2029815	1	2.69195	1.421	0.2357			
	X	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	0.46621156	1	9.50673	5.018	0.0270			
	X	whatprocessCM{0-1}	-0.4565346	1	12.52597	6.612	0.0114			
		whatprocesstoolsupt{0-1}	0	1	0.063618	0.033	0.8555			
		whatprocessSWEngSuppt{0-1}	0	1	0.450038	0.236	0.6281			
		whatprocessnone{0-1}	0	1	0.190592	0.100	0.7527			
	X	whatproductscustom{0-1}	0.25523252	1	6.263891	3.306	0.0717			
		whatproductsCOTS{0-1}	0	1	1.448571	0.763	0.3842			
		whatproductscommoncust{0-1}	0	1	0.05577	0.029	0.8647			
		whatproductsnone{0-1}	0	1	0.013771	0.007	0.9325			

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	"Sig Prob"	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	whatproductscustom{0-1}	Entered	0.0947	6.023529	0.0225	-4.968	2
2	whattypeenterprisemanufact{0-1}	Entered	0.1195	5.159982	0.0419	-5.26	3
3	whattypecomponentCASE{0-1}	Entered	0.0844	6.251471	0.0653	-6.038	4
4	whattypesystemsdevice{0-1}	Entered	0.0990	5.624373	0.0863	-6.536	5
5	whattypecomponentOS{0-1}	Entered	0.1303	4.670796	0.1038	-6.611	6
6	whatprocessCM{0-1}	Entered	0.1404	4.388318	0.1202	-6.561	7
7	whatprocessfielding{0-1}	Entered	0.0554	7.291518	0.1475	-7.8	8
8	whattypeenterpriseOES{0-1}	Entered	0.2018	3.190133	0.1594	-7.218	9
9	whattypesystemscommunications{0-1}	Entered	0.1937	3.288992	0.1717	-6.679	10
10	whatprocessrequirements{0-1}	Entered	0.1248	4.547398	0.1888	-6.699	11
11	whatprocesscoding{0-1}	Entered	0.2357	2.69195	0.1988	-5.895	12

Response Column 59 Actual by Predicted Plot



Summary of Fit

RSquare	0.198834
RSquare Adj	0.120844
Root Mean Square Error	1.376386
Mean of Response	4.28
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	125

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Model	11	53.12846	4.82986	2.5495
Error	113	214.07154	1.89444	Prob > F
C. Total	124	267.20000		0.0064

Lack Of Fit

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Lack Of Fit	36	80.28582	2.23016	1.2836
Pure Error	77	133.78571	1.73748	Prob > F
Total Error	113	214.07154		0.1795
			Max RSq	0.4993


Parameter Estimates

Term	Estimate	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob> t
Intercept	4.2100264	0.33382	12.61	<.0001
whattypesystemscommunications[1-0]	0.5376324	0.322162	1.67	0.0979
whattypesystemsdevice[1-0]	-0.95668	0.498509	-1.92	0.0575
whattypecomponentCASE[1-0]	1.6829661	0.670483	2.51	0.0135
whattypecomponentOS[1-0]	0.7354449	0.522281	1.41	0.1618
whattypeenterprisemanufact[1-0]	-1.296506	0.722184	-1.80	0.0753
whattypeenterpriseOES[1-0]	1.4062458	0.99723	1.41	0.1612
whatprocessrequirements[1-0]	-0.514651	0.30854	-1.67	0.0981
whatprocesscoding[1-0]	0.4059629	0.34056	1.19	0.2357
whatprocessfielding[1-0]	-0.932423	0.416234	-2.24	0.0270
whatprocessCM[1-0]	0.9130692	0.35509	2.57	0.0114
whatproductscustom[1-0]	-0.510465	0.280727	-1.82	0.0717


Effect Tests



Source	Nparm	DF	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	Prob > F
whattypesystemscommunications	1	1	5.275968	2.7850	0.0979
whattypesystemsdevice	1	1	6.976999	3.6829	0.0575
whattypecomponentCASE	1	1	11.935924	6.3005	0.0135
whattypecomponentOS	1	1	3.756402	1.9829	0.1618
whattypeenterprisemanufact	1	1	6.105685	3.2230	0.0753
whattypeenterpriseOES	1	1	3.767142	1.9885	0.1612
whatprocessrequirements	1	1	5.270874	2.7823	0.0981
whatprocesscoding	1	1	2.691950	1.4210	0.2357
whatprocessfielding	1	1	9.506730	5.0182	0.0270
whatprocessCM	1	1	12.525974	6.6120	0.0114
whatproductscustom	1	1	6.263891	3.3065	0.0717



ResponseOrg = 4.21 + sys-comm(0.54) + sys-dev(-0.96) + comp-CASE(1.68) + comp-OS(0.74) + ent-mnft(-1.30) + ent-OES(1.41) + proc-req(-0.51) + proc-coding(0.41) + proc-field(-0.93) + proc-CM(0.91) + prod-cust(-0.51)







Appendix E - Cross Validation Neurosolution's Screen Shots







































Appendix F - Training Neurosolution's Screen Shots































Software Outsourcing — Study Objectives



We are researchers in the Arizona State University's Computer Science and Engineering Department who are investigating software development outsourcing. According to published accounts, software development outsourcing has become commonplace and often meets organizational goals. Unfortunately, nearly 30% of outsourcing relationships end poorly (anything from general dissatisfaction to legal action).

With your assistance, we hope to identify software outsourcing strategies, motivations, benefits, drawbacks, and relevant project situation variables. This information will help us to discern why outsourcing efforts succeed or fail to meet goals and which strategies are most appropriate for specific projects and goals. Using this knowledge, we will produce a process simulation tool which will allow researchers and project managers to more closely study the inter-organizational relations within a planned outsourcing relationship and their impact on the overall software development process. A second tool, for decision support, will then be constructed to aid software development project managers and consultants in making software outsourcing strategy decisions for specific projects.

Who can help?

You can help by completing this brief survey if, within the last 2 years, you have participated in a software development project where any portion of the product development or effort has been contracted to an outside vendor (regardless of which side of the relationship you worked on). This survey includes questions about your background, your most recent software outsourcing project, and general outsourcing experience over the past five years. The questionnaire is designed to take less than 15 minutes to complete.

What do I get for helping?

If you choose to participate, your answers will be held in the **strictest** confidence. Only our research team will see your individual answers. Our reports will consist of summaries of data from all respondents. When completed (planned for late spring 1999), these summary reports will be available to survey participants via our outsourcing website (<http://www.eas.asu.edu/~outsrc/>). **If you provide the optional contact information, you will be notified when survey results are posted and will be provided with free copies of the decision support tools when they become available.**

Feel free to contact us with any questions you might have regarding our research. Thank you for your assistance.

Brian G. Hermann

Ph.D. Candidate

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Arizona State University
brian.hermann@asu.edu

Stephen T. Roehling

Master's Candidate

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Arizona State University
roehling@imap3.asu.edu

Definition

Software development outsourcing: hiring of vendors to perform software development activities or develop a portion of an overall software product. It does not include the hiring of temporary employees.

I. Instructions

1. For the purposes of this study, we define software development outsourcing as the hiring of vendors to perform software development activities or to develop a portion of a software product. It does not include the hiring of temporary employees.
2. Please answer every question. Some questions may look like others, but each one is different.
3. There are no right or wrong answers. Please provide a realistic assessment of each item based on your experiences. The focus of the survey is on your experience, not on what you wish were true or what may be true in the future.
4. For questions pertaining to this survey please contact Brian Hermann via e-mail at brian.hermann@asu.edu.
5. Please return this survey to:
Brian G. Hermann
Computer Science and Engineering Department
College of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Arizona State University
Box 875406
Tempe, AZ 85287-5406, U.S.A.
6. Please remove this page for your information and continue with the survey.

Confidentiality

Your responses to this survey are confidential. As summarized below, no organization or individual respondent will be identified by name in any analyses or report without your written permission.

PUBLIC LAW 93-759, entitled the Privacy Act of 1974 requires that all individuals be informed of the purposes and uses to be made of the information which is solicited. The following is furnished to explain why the information is requested and the general uses to which the information may be put.

Purpose: This study strives to examine software outsourcing strategies, motivations, benefits, drawbacks, and relevant project situation variables. The survey results will be used both to better understand software outsourcing, as well as to develop a software outsourcing process simulation tool.

Uses: Survey data are used for research purposes only. Individual responses are confidential. Only summarized data will be reported to you, if you so request, and academic audiences.

Effects of Non-Disclosure: Participation in the study is voluntary. No penalty will be imposed for failure to respond to any particular question.

II. Background Information

1. How many software development projects involving outsourcing have you participated in during the past five years? _____ Projects
2. Roughly, what portion of your organization's software development has been outsourced during the past five years? _____ %
3. The final result of this research will be a suite of software tools to help practitioners in various roles evaluate software outsourcing strategies and better understand software outsourcing dynamics and constraints. Would these types of tools be helpful to you?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Why or Why Not? _____
4. In the future, would you like to be contacted to have the opportunity to provide inputs to other software outsourcing research questionnaires and to receive copies of the software outsourcing decision support and simulation tools?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
5. Please provide your name and best method of contact (all results will be kept confidential)

Name	
Electronic mail	
Telephone	() - extension
Standard Mail	

III. Most Recent Software Development Outsourcing Project Experience

Please answer the following questions for the *most recent* software outsourcing project that you worked on (within the last 2 years). If you have worked on multiple projects recently, please answer the questions utilizing the project about which you have the most knowledge.

6. What type of software was developed in this project? Please check application area (domain) and/or project type.
- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>♦ Systems software, e.g.:</p> <p>☐ Avionics</p> <p>☐ Embedded controllers and firm-ware</p> <p>☐ Communications systems</p> <p>☐ Device drivers</p> <p>☐ Other: _____</p> | <p>♦ Shrink-wrap commercial/consumer software products, e.g.:</p> <p>☐ Entertainment</p> <p>☐ Business productivity</p> <p>☐ Utilities</p> <p>☐ Internet</p> <p>☐ Other: _____</p> |
| <p>♦ Software component development, e.g.:</p> <p>☐ Domain frameworks</p> <p>☐ CASE tools</p> <p>☐ Class libraries</p> <p>☐ Operating systems</p> <p>☐ Development tools</p> <p>☐ Other: _____</p> | <p>♦ Enterprise software development and package customization, e.g.:</p> <p>☐ Accounting systems</p> <p>☐ Manufacturing requirements planning</p> <p>☐ Payroll systems</p> <p>☐ Order Entry System</p> <p>☐ Scripting and extensions development</p> <p>☐ Interactive web-site development</p> <p>☐ Other: _____</p> |

7. Which software development *process* components or activities were outsourced on this project? (Select all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Requirements | ☐ Coding |
| ☐ Design | ☐ Fielding |
| ☐ Testing | ☐ Configuration management |
| ☐ Maintenance | ☐ Tools support (e.g., requirements database, version control tool) |
| ☐ Reengineering | ☐ Software engineering support (e.g., code reviews, SEI reviews, quality reviews) |
| ☐ Application support (for enterprise systems) | ☐ None |
| ☐ Training (e.g., languages, processes) | ☐ Other (please list) _____ |
| ☐ Specification | |
| ☐ Documentation | |

How would you describe the process components you outsourced? _____

8. Which *product* components were outsourced during this software development?

- ☐ Custom (specialized)
- ☐ Common application (off the shelf)
- ☐ Common application (customized version of an available component)
- ☐ None
- ☐ Other (please list) _____
- _____
- _____

How would you describe the product components you outsourced? _____

9. With respect to in-house development, what project goals (motivations for outsourcing) were part of the decision to outsource software development for this project?

Please note there are two parts to this question:

- Estimate the importance of each goal using the importance scale and the blanks to the left of each goal.
- Estimate the degree to which these goals were realized by the selected outsourcing strategy -- circle the appropriate number on the scale to the right of each goal.

Importance Scale							
Not Important		Somewhat Important		Very Important			
1		2		3		4	
Importance	Goals	Significantly Worse than Expectations	Exactly on Target	Significantly Better than Expectations			
Costs & Schedule							
_____	a. Reduce project costs by taking advantage of outsourcing vendor's economies of scale	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	b. Reduce development schedule — a vendor can complete the job faster than our in-house team	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	c. Reduce development schedule — parallel activities from dividing the effort speeds up the overall schedule	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	d. Cash flow from sale of the outsourced product's distribution rights to the outsourcing vendor	1	2	3	4	5	
Personnel							
_____	e. Acquire expertise not available within the internal organization (e.g. domain, language, tool, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	f. Add more personnel to the project (necessary due to an insufficient in-house capacity)	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	g. Add more personnel to fill a short-term, part-time or transient need for effort (e.g., only for fielding at the end of the project)	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	h. Outsource 'non-core' activities	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	i. Control over outsourced project management process	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	j. Improved response to customer objectives	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	k. Improved response to organizational objectives and strategies	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	l. Keep in-house staffing levels more stable	1	2	3	4	5	
General							
_____	m. Risk sharing or reduction of likelihood and/or consequence (e.g., technical, cost)	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	n. Product quality improvement	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (please list)							
_____	o. _____	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	p. _____	1	2	3	4	5	
_____	q. _____	1	2	3	4	5	

10. What were the consequences of outsourcing in this project in comparison to similar in-house efforts? (Put the appropriate number from the consequence scale in the blank next to each factor)

Decreased Dramatically	Decreased Significantly	Decreased Slightly	No Change	Increased Slightly	Increased Significantly	Increased Dramatically
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
_____	a. Project costs					
_____	b. Development schedule (vendor outsourcing compared to in-house)					
_____	c. Intellectual capital (your organization's rights to the developed software product)					
_____	d. Scheduling flexibility (including ability to respond to immediate needs such as a late project productivity burst)					
_____	e. Administrative overhead					
_____	f. Control over outsourced project management process					
_____	g. In-house effort spent on 'non-core' activities					
_____	h. In-house personnel turnover					
_____	i. Project learning curve (time required to become productive on the project)					
_____	j. Development risks					
_____	k. Product quality					
_____	l. Rework					
_____	m. Visibility into software development process (ability to ascertain development progress, adherence to process standards, and product quality)					
_____	n. Control over final product					
_____	o. Costs associated with design or requirements changes					
_____	p. Cultural, location, and language problems					
_____	q. Turf wars (e.g. finger pointing between development groups -- either in-house or vendors)					
_____	r. Likelihood of a failed or cancelled project					
_____	s. Response to customer objectives					
_____	t. Response to organizational objectives and strategies					
Other (please list any other outsourcing consequences not already shown -- include impact rating if appropriate)						
_____	u. _____					
_____	v. _____					
_____	w. _____					

11. On this project who (or what project roles) drove outsourcing decision making? (Select all that apply)

Outsourcing Customer (organization which hires and outside vendor to develop software)

- ☐ Project manager
- ☐ Contract officer
- ☐ Technical lead
- ☐ Software developer
- ☐ Corporate management policy
- ☐ Corporate management (one-time decision)
- ☐ Management consultant working for an outsourcing customer
- ☐ Other (Please Explain) _____

Outsourcing Vendor (organization which develops software for another organization)

- ☐ Project manager
- ☐ Contract officer
- ☐ Technical lead
- ☐ Software developer
- ☐ Other (Please Explain) _____

12. What role(s) did you play in this software outsourcing relationship?(Select all that apply)

Outsourcing Customer (organization which hires and outside vendor to develop software)

- ☐ Project manager
- ☐ Contract officer
- ☐ Technical lead
- ☐ Software developer
- ☐ Management consultant working for an outsourcing customer
- ☐ Other (Please Explain) _____

Outsourcing Vendor (organization which develops software for another organization)

- ☐ Project manager
- ☐ Contract officer
- ☐ Technical lead
- ☐ Software developer
- ☐ Other (Please Explain) _____

IV. General Outsourcing Experience

Instructions - Consider outsourcing projects you've worked on in the last five years.

13. Based upon your experience, identify your level of agreement with the following assertions about software development outsourcing.

(Put the appropriate number from the scale in the blank next to each assertion)

Agreement Scale

Strongly Disagree Neither Agree Nor Disagree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5

Project Assertions

- _____ a. Outsourcing portions of larger software development projects is more successful than outsourcing portions of smaller software development projects.
- _____ b. Larger outsourcing efforts are more successful than smaller outsourcing efforts.
- _____ c. Outsourcing development of software in some domains is more successful than outsourcing development of software in other domains.
- _____ d. Outsourcing development of software in a domain familiar to the **buyer** (in-house organization) is more successful than outsourcing development of software in an unfamiliar domain.
- _____ e. Outsourcing development of software in a domain familiar to the **vendor** is more successful than outsourcing development of software in a domain with which the vendor is unfamiliar.
- _____ f. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when more vendors are available in the project domain.
- _____ g. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the software vendor has more experience with tools or languages.
- _____ h. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the software vendor has reusable design or code components.

Buyer-Seller Relationship and Contract Assertions

- _____ i. Outsourcing projects with frequent reviews and inspections are more successful than outsourcing projects with less frequent reviews and inspections.
- _____ j. Outsourcing project success is closely related to payment strategies and incentives in the vendor contract (e.g., fixed-price contracts projects are more or less successful than cost-plus type contracts).
- _____ k. Outsourcing project success is closely tied to the form of communication between the buyer and vendor (forms of communication include formal letters, e-mail, telephone conversations, face-to-face meetings, etc.).
- _____ l. Outsourcing projects are more successful when the buyer has more visibility into the vendor's development process.
- _____ m. Outsourcing projects are more successful when the buyer and vendor are located nearby.
- _____ n. Outsourcing projects are more successful when the buyer and vendor are located far apart (such as "off-shore" arrangements) because time differences increase the collaborative work day length.
- _____ o. Outsourcing projects are more successful when the buyer and vendor have previously worked together successfully.
- _____ p. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the software **vendor** has a higher process maturity (e.g. SEI CMM rating).
- _____ q. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the **buyer** has a higher process maturity (e.g. SEI CMM rating).
- _____ r. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the vendor has a successful track record.

(Question 13 Continued) Based upon your experience, identify your level of agreement with the following assertions about software development outsourcing.
(Put the appropriate number from the scale in the blank next to each assertion)

Agreement Scale				
Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5
Goal and Expectation Assertions				
_____	s. Outsourcing projects with more aggressive cost reduction goals are less likely to be successful than those with more modest cost reduction goals.			
_____	t. Outsourcing projects with more aggressive cost reduction goals are more likely to be successful than those with more modest cost reduction goals.			
_____	u. Outsourcing projects with more aggressive schedule duration reduction goals are less likely to be successful than those with more modest schedule duration reduction goals.			
_____	v. Outsourcing projects with more aggressive schedule duration reduction goals are more likely to be successful than those with more modest schedule duration reduction goals.			
Product Assertions				
_____	w. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the system is not complex.			
_____	x. Outsourcing development of software is more successful when the system can be easily divided into components (highly modular).			
Other Assertions (please list)				
_____	y. _____			
_____	z. _____			
_____	aa. _____			

14. Based on your experience, identify your level of agreement with each of the following assertions about which factors determine whether *product* component outsourcing will be successful.
(Put the appropriate number from the scale in the blank next to each assertion)

Agreement Scale				
Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5
_____	a. Outsourcing larger components is generally more successful than outsourcing smaller components.			
_____	b. Outsourcing smaller components is generally more successful than outsourcing larger components.			
_____	c. Outsourcing components of highly modular products is generally more successful than outsourcing components of monolithic products.			
_____	d. Outsourcing is more successful when the interfaces for an outsourced component are well-defined.			
_____	e. Outsourcing is more successful when the tools and languages used by both in-house and vendor developers are compatible.			
_____	f. Outsourcing is more successful when an outsourced component's requirements are well-defined up-front.			
_____	g. Outsourcing is more successful when the vendor and buyer organizations communicate well and overcome administrative obstacles to solve problems.			
Other (please list)				
_____	h. _____			
_____	i. _____			
_____	j. _____			

15. Based on your experience, identify your level of agreement with each of the following assertions about which factors determine if *process* component (development activity) outsourcing will be successful. (Put the appropriate number from the scale in the blank next to each assertion)


Agreement Scale				
Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5
_____	a. Outsourcing is more successful when organizational interfaces and responsibilities are well-defined than when organizational interfaces and responsibilities are loosely defined.			
_____	b. Outsourcing is more successful when organizational lifecycle models (e.g. prototyping, spiral, waterfall, incremental) used by both the vendor and buyer are the same rather than different.			
_____	c. Outsourcing is more successful when tools and methods allow information to flow easily between the vendor and in-house organization.			
_____	d. Outsourcing is more successful when the vendor's process maturity (e.g. SEI CMM rating) is higher.			
_____	e. Outsourcing is more successful when the in-house organization's process maturity (e.g. SEI CMM rating) is higher.			
_____	f. Outsourcing is more successful when the buyer's and vendor's process maturity levels (e.g. SEI CMM rating) are the same or close than when the ratings differ greatly.			

Other (please list)	
_____	g. _____
_____	h. _____
_____	i. _____

16. Do you have any general comments about the survey, or software outsourcing in general?

Appendix H

Cost of Development




Cost Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	3.00	4.19	2.32	6.34	4.07	1.19	0.68	3.34	1.07
2	3.00	1.12	5.06	7.36	4.28	1.88	2.06	4.36	1.28
3	2.00	3.52	2.32	5.61	2.77	1.52	0.32	3.61	0.77
4	3.00	4.47	5.53	4.95	4.16	1.47	2.53	1.95	1.16
5	2.00	4.91	2.32	5.42	4.04	2.91	0.32	3.42	2.04
6	2.00	0.17	3.70	3.57	1.89	1.83	1.70	1.57	0.11
Total Difference (Neural Network):						10.80			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							7.61		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								18.25	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									6.43

Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 3rd
NDR – 2nd
ODR – 4th
CDR – 1st

Schedule Duration




Schedule Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	3.24	1.06	4.13	3.36	1.76	3.94	0.87	1.64
2	3.00	6.46	5.02	7.36	5.47	3.46	2.02	4.36	2.47
3	2.00	3.41	1.06	3.10	3.05	1.41	0.94	1.10	1.05
4	4.00	2.74	2.41	2.22	4.43	1.26	1.59	1.78	0.43
5	5.00	5.82	4.24	5.87	5.96	0.82	0.76	0.87	0.96
6	2.00	2.35	2.21	3.42	3.05	0.35	0.21	1.42	1.05
Total Difference (Neural Network):						9.06			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							9.46		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								10.40	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									7.60

Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 2nd
NDR – 3rd
ODR – 4th
CDR – 1st




Intellectual Capital Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	3.80	5.04	3.98	3.60	0.20	1.04	0.02	0.40
2	4.00	3.84	4.20	7.65	4.44	0.16	0.20	3.65	0.44
3	3.00	3.82	5.04	4.57	4.73	0.82	2.04	1.57	1.73
4	4.00	4.06	4.16	5.95	3.99	0.06	0.16	1.95	0.01
5	5.00	3.79	3.38	5.07	3.60	1.21	1.62	0.07	1.40
6	3.00	5.02	5.56	4.27	4.69	2.02	2.56	1.27	1.69
Total Difference (Neural Network):						4.47			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							7.62		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								8.53	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									5.67

Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st
 NDR – 3rd
 ODR – 4th
 CDR – 2nd




Schedule Flexibility Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	6.06	8.09	5.44	5.23	2.06	4.09	1.44	1.23
2	2.00	1.97	0.67	3.81	3.22	0.03	1.33	1.81	1.22
3	6.00	5.86	9.34	5.71	5.23	0.14	3.34	0.29	0.77
4	4.00	5.88	5.67	4.84	4.14	1.88	1.67	0.84	0.14
5	6.00	4.28	5.07	3.71	3.15	1.72	0.93	2.29	2.85
6	6.00	4.57	7.42	4.19	5.12	1.43	1.42	1.81	0.88
Total Difference (Neural Network):						7.26			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							12.78		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								8.48	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									7.09

Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 2nd
 NDR – 4th
 ODR – 3rd
 CDR – 1st



Administrative Overhead Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	4.13	4.38	4.39	4.20	0.87	0.62	0.61	0.80
2	6.00	3.12	1.83	8.25	2.21	2.88	4.17	2.25	3.79
3	2.00	4.50	3.05	5.38	4.20	2.50	1.05	3.38	2.20
4	3.00	4.00	3.14	3.70	3.74	1.00	0.14	0.70	0.74
5	5.00	4.63	3.05	6.70	5.36	0.37	1.95	1.70	0.36
6	2.00	2.70	1.28	5.65	2.21	0.70	0.72	3.65	0.21
Total Difference (Neural Network):						8.32			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							8.65		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								12.29	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									8.10


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 2nd

NDR – 3rd

ODR – 4th

CDR – 1st



Control Process Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	3.00	3.47	2.82	3.85	4.03	0.47	0.18	0.85	1.03
2	6.00	3.94	4.59	4.14	3.30	2.06	1.41	1.86	2.70
3	5.00	4.23	3.95	4.71	6.24	0.77	1.05	0.29	1.24
4	3.00	4.76	3.30	3.41	4.07	1.76	0.30	0.41	1.07
5	3.00	5.00	4.93	3.85	3.26	2.00	1.93	0.85	0.26
6	4.00	3.37	1.65	4.71	4.19	0.63	2.35	0.71	0.19
Total Difference (Neural Network):						7.69			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							7.22		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								4.97	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									6.49


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 4th

NDR – 3rd

ODR – 1st

CDR – 2nd



In-house Non-Core Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	3.54	2.82	4.50	4.74	1.46	2.18	0.50	0.26
2	2.00	5.05	6.05	4.84	3.71	3.05	4.05	2.84	1.71
3	2.00	4.11	1.76	4.50	4.42	2.11	0.24	2.50	2.42
4	4.00	3.92	2.84	4.33	2.63	0.08	1.16	0.33	1.37
5	2.00	2.90	3.82	2.43	2.40	0.90	1.82	0.43	0.40
6	2.00	1.43	1.76	2.50	1.45	0.57	0.24	0.50	0.55
Total Difference (Neural Network):						8.17			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							9.69		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								7.10	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									6.71


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 3rd

NDR – 4th

ODR – 2nd

CDR – 1st



In-house Personnel Turnover Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	3.00	4.10	2.34	4.34	3.75	1.10	0.66	1.34	0.75
2	2.00	6.22	6.38	3.20	4.17	4.22	4.38	1.20	2.17
3	2.00	4.15	1.65	4.56	3.75	2.15	0.35	2.56	1.75
4	3.00	3.12	3.54	3.42	3.86	0.12	0.54	0.42	0.86
5	4.00	4.08	3.40	3.10	3.75	0.08	0.60	0.90	0.25
6	5.00	1.79	1.65	3.96	3.75	3.21	3.35	1.04	1.25
Total Difference (Neural Network):						10.88			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							9.88		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								7.46	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									7.03


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 4th

NDR – 3rd

ODR – 2nd

CDR – 1st



Learning Curve Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	4.52	4.44	3.91	4.28	0.48	0.56	1.09	0.72
2	3.00	4.71	3.79	3.91	3.83	1.71	0.79	0.91	0.83
3	5.00	3.56	5.08	3.91	4.28	1.44	0.08	1.09	0.72
4	5.00	3.98	5.73	5.33	5.29	1.02	0.73	0.33	0.29
5	6.00	3.99	4.44	4.27	4.28	2.01	1.56	1.73	1.72
6	5.00	3.30	4.44	3.91	3.83	1.70	0.56	1.09	1.17
Total Difference (Neural Network):						8.36			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							4.28		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								6.24	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									5.45


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 4th

NDR – 1st

ODR – 3rd

CDR – 2nd



Risk Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	4.17	3.48	4.52	4.42	0.83	1.52	0.48	0.58
2	2.00	4.30	4.49	4.52	3.67	2.30	2.49	2.52	1.67
3	3.00	3.95	3.48	4.52	4.42	0.95	0.48	1.52	1.42
4	3.00	2.27	3.51	2.50	0.97	0.73	0.51	0.50	2.03
5	5.00	2.98	3.48	4.52	3.53	2.02	1.52	0.48	1.47
6	4.00	3.30	3.48	4.52	2.64	0.70	0.52	0.52	1.36
Total Difference (Neural Network):						7.53			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							7.04		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								6.02	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									8.53


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 3rd

NDR – 2nd

ODR – 1st

CDR – 4th



Quality Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	3.00	4.51	5.09	4.55	4.58	1.51	2.09	1.55	1.58
2	1.00	6.00	4.23	5.70	5.49	5.00	3.23	4.70	4.49
3	6.00	5.50	4.20	4.55	4.58	0.50	1.80	1.45	1.42
4	6.00	5.69	3.99	3.86	5.06	0.31	2.01	2.14	0.94
5	3.00	4.99	5.09	4.55	4.58	1.99	2.09	1.55	1.58
6	6.00	5.31	5.04	4.55	6.07	0.69	0.96	1.45	0.07
Total Difference (Neural Network):						10.00			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							12.18		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								12.84	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									10.08


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st

NDR – 3rd

ODR – 4th

CDR – 2nd



Rework Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	4.92	3.83	4.07	4.22	0.08	1.17	0.93	0.78
2	5.00	4.87	5.41	3.03	5.16	0.13	0.41	1.97	0.16
3	5.00	5.18	4.61	4.07	3.70	0.18	0.39	0.93	1.30
4	4.00	4.37	3.00	3.37	3.23	0.37	1.00	0.63	0.77
5	5.00	6.02	5.50	4.07	4.22	1.02	0.50	0.93	0.78
6	2.00	3.62	3.83	5.20	3.70	1.62	1.83	3.20	1.70
Total Difference (Neural Network):						3.40			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							5.30		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								8.59	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									5.49


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st

NDR – 2nd

ODR – 4th

CDR – 3rd



Visibility Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	5.16	4.21	3.72	3.27	1.16	0.21	0.28	0.73
2	3.00	8.32	9.51	6.20	7.05	5.32	6.51	3.20	4.05
3	5.00	5.38	3.37	4.28	3.97	0.38	1.63	0.72	1.03
4	5.00	4.08	0.42	5.97	4.30	0.92	4.58	0.97	0.70
5	4.00	3.29	3.46	3.04	3.82	0.71	0.54	0.96	0.18
6	6.00	4.41	5.98	5.96	5.05	1.59	0.02	0.04	0.95
Total Difference (Neural Network):						10.08			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							13.49		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								6.17	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									7.64


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 3rd

NDR – 4th

ODR – 1st

CDR – 2nd



Control Product Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	3.43	4.48	4.19	3.95	0.57	0.48	0.19	0.05
2	3.00	5.55	6.18	5.53	5.96	2.55	3.18	2.53	2.96
3	6.00	5.07	3.19	6.00	4.78	0.93	2.81	0.00	1.22
4	6.00	3.56	5.43	1.95	3.51	2.44	0.57	4.05	2.49
5	3.00	2.60	3.19	4.19	3.95	0.40	0.19	1.19	0.95
6	6.00	4.88	4.89	4.19	4.19	1.12	1.11	1.81	1.81
Total Difference (Neural Network):						8.01			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							8.34		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								9.77	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									9.48


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st

NDR – 2nd

ODR – 4th

CDR – 2nd



Change Cost Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	3.00	4.97	3.51	5.41	4.59	1.97	0.51	2.41	1.59
2	2.00	3.34	2.14	5.55	3.49	1.34	0.14	3.55	1.49
3	2.00	1.90	3.51	5.41	3.47	0.10	1.51	3.41	1.47
4	3.00	6.26	4.80	6.83	5.51	3.26	1.80	3.83	2.51
5	2.00	4.57	3.51	4.93	5.31	2.57	1.51	2.93	3.31
6	2.00	2.53	1.43	5.46	1.61	0.53	0.57	3.46	0.39
Total Difference (Neural Network):						9.77			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							6.04		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								19.59	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									10.76


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 2nd

NDR – 1st

ODR – 4th

CDR – 3rd



Language/Culture/Distance Problems Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.78	4.52	0.57	0.81	0.22	0.48
2	3.00	4.83	2.71	4.34	3.91	1.83	0.29	1.34	0.91
3	5.00	4.06	3.38	4.51	4.01	0.94	1.62	0.49	0.99
4	5.00	5.13	2.74	4.97	4.40	0.13	2.26	0.03	0.60
5	6.00	3.98	4.19	4.94	4.84	2.02	1.81	1.06	1.16
6	5.00	4.51	3.72	4.07	4.11	0.49	1.28	0.93	0.89
Total Difference (Neural Network):						5.98			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							8.07		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								4.07	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									5.03


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 3rd

NDR – 4th

ODR – 1st

CDR – 2nd




Turf War (Teamwork) Problems Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	5.00	5.40	3.80	4.62	5.36	0.40	1.20	0.38	0.36
2	4.00	4.15	3.79	2.94	5.41	0.15	0.21	1.06	1.41
3	3.00	4.20	5.11	3.16	3.67	1.20	2.11	0.16	0.67
4	5.00	5.78	2.56	5.20	4.72	0.78	2.44	0.20	0.28
5	5.00	4.50	3.80	3.12	4.02	0.50	1.20	1.88	0.98
6	5.00	3.87	2.94	5.60	4.02	1.13	2.06	0.60	0.98
Total Difference (Neural Network):						4.16			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							9.22		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								4.28	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									4.68

Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st
 NDR – 4th
 ODR – 2nd
 CDR – 3rd




Failure Likelihood Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	4.09	3.94	3.15	4.18	0.09	0.06	0.85	0.18
2	1.00	3.20	5.85	2.25	5.49	2.20	4.85	1.25	4.49
3	2.00	2.56	3.29	3.85	3.65	0.56	1.29	1.85	1.65
4	4.00	5.86	2.28	4.35	4.19	1.86	1.72	0.35	0.19
5	3.00	3.94	3.69	3.85	4.18	0.94	0.69	0.85	1.18
6	3.00	2.89	4.58	5.43	3.74	0.11	1.58	2.43	0.74
Total Difference (Neural Network):						5.76			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							10.19		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								7.58	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									8.43

Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st
 NDR – 4th
 ODR – 2nd
 CDR – 3rd



Response to Customer Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	4.72	6.87	4.60	4.41	0.72	2.87	0.60	0.41
2	4.00	4.17	3.80	3.90	5.11	0.17	0.20	0.10	1.11
3	5.00	4.21	5.64	3.38	4.44	0.79	0.64	1.62	0.56
4	5.00	3.13	3.56	4.33	3.96	1.87	1.44	0.67	1.04
5	6.00	4.60	3.66	4.20	3.70	1.40	2.34	1.80	2.30
6	6.00	5.68	6.28	5.12	4.91	0.32	0.28	0.88	1.09
Total Difference (Neural Network):						5.27			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							7.77		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								5.67	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									6.51


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st

NDR – 4th

ODR – 2nd

CDR – 3rd



Response to Organization Consequence Validation Table:

Survey #	Actual Response	Neural Network	NDR	ODR	CDR	Diff. NN	Diff. NDR	Diff. ODR	Diff. CDR
1	4.00	3.92	3.79	5.07	3.60	0.08	0.21	1.07	0.40
2	2.00	2.04	3.65	3.14	2.40	0.04	1.65	1.14	0.40
3	6.00	4.54	4.94	3.80	4.11	1.46	1.06	2.20	1.89
4	5.00	4.61	6.17	4.30	6.30	0.39	1.17	0.70	1.30
5	5.00	4.78	3.92	4.33	4.11	0.22	1.08	0.67	0.89
6	6.00	4.35	4.80	5.07	4.62	1.65	1.20	0.93	1.38
Total Difference (Neural Network):						3.84			
Total Difference (New Data Regression):							6.37		
Total Difference (Old Data Regression):								6.71	
Total Difference (Combined Data Regression):									6.26


Model Closest to Actual Result:

NN – 1st

NDR – 3rd

ODR – 4th

CDR – 2nd



NN	NDR	ODR	CDR
148.81	171.2	175.01	143.46
2nd	3rd	4th	1st

Though Combined Data Regression (CDR) learning mechanism was closest in predicting the actual response, Neural Networks (NN) almost tied CDR by only 5.35 points. The NN and CDR performance results were reasonable due to both being trained with all the data.


There was a tight correlating coupling between all four learning mechanisms with a few exceptions. In these exceptions, New Data Regression (NDR) and Old Data Regression (ODR), found problems with interpolation which would cause an extreme output greater than seven or less than one. This was due to by not having enough data in either case which was the reason why the CDR was included.

Appendix I - SODS2 Window Outline

1.1 SODS2 Introductory Window

With the MS Access VB development tool, an introductory window, found in Figure 1 below, provided the user a short description of SODS2 along with a disclaimer that such an observational tool should not be mistaken for an experimental cause and effect tool. This application was built to provide observational type knowledge. Along with this user's introductory guidance, SODS2 used an immediate startup module. Upon the user opening the outsourcing MS Access database, the introductory window would immediately be opened and maximized to enforce a certain flow for this and the other windows to follow. Along with this maximizing feature, the window control buttons normally found on the top right corner were turned off preventing the accidental bypass of such an orderly window flow. This provided SODS2 a user friendly approach. Once the introductory window has been displayed for the very first time, the user could select to turn it off and immediately proceed to the maximize version of the main window.

Figure 1 SODS2 Introductory Window



1.2 SODS2 Main Window

The main window, found below in Figure 2, provided the user an easy “point and click” interface for all required input. Help labels were added to guide the user through each color coded input division. Smart help tags were also added so additional information regarding each input and command button would be displayed as needed. This window also would open maximized to provide an orderly SODS2 window flow. Four command buttons were found on this window. Clear selected input command button allowed the user to wipe away all selections. Close SODS2 application command button allowed the user to exit the application and provided normal access to the database contained within the application. NN report command button took the user’s inputs and proceeded to opening a maximized NN report window. Regression report command button took the user’s inputs and proceeded to opening a maximized regression report window.

Figure 2 SODS2 Main Window

The screenshot displays the SODS2 Main Window with the following sections and options:

- Step 1: Select domain for the outsourced project**
 - System Software Domain**
 - systems/awcronics ☐
 - systems/embedded ☐
 - systems/communications ☒
 - systems/device ☐
 - Enterprise Software Domain**
 - enterprise/accounting ☐
 - enterprise/manufacturing ☒
 - enterprise/supply ☐
 - enterprise/identity ☐
 - enterprise/scaling ☐
 - enterprise/web site ☐
 - Component Software Domain**
 - component/domain ☐
 - component/CASE ☐
 - component/class/library ☐
 - component/opening/system ☒
 - component/development/tools ☐
- Step 2: Select outsourcing strategy (outsourcing processes, products or both)**
 - Outsourcing Processes**
 - requirements ☒
 - specification ☐
 - design ☐
 - coding ☐
 - testing ☐
 - maintenance ☐
 - training ☐
 - application/support ☐
 - Outsourcing Products**
 - custom/specialized ☐
 - commercial off the shelf ☐
 - customizable/economy ☒
 - No Product Outsourcing ☐
- Step 3: Select outsourcing consequences that have significant impact in decision to outsource**
 - cost of development ☐
 - schedule duration ☒
 - intellectual capital ☐
 - schedule flexibility ☐
 - admin overhead ☐
 - control of dev process ☒
 - in-house noncore tasks ☐
 - in-house staff turnover ☐
 - learning curve ☐
 - tasks ☒
 - quality ☐
 - network ☐
 - visibility into dev prod ☐
 - control of product ☐
 - change costs ☐
 - culture/lang probs ☐
 - response to bug ☐
 - hull war/network probs ☐
 - failure likelihood ☐
 - response to customer ☐
 - response to org ☐
- Step 4: Decide which report to develop for this project**
 - Regression Report: Select desired data (all 3 can be selected) and click the Regression Report button
 - Neural Network: All data is used just click the Neural Network Report button
- Buttons:** Clear Selection, Close Form, Neural Network Report, Regression Model Report
- Footer:** New Data (2000-2003) ☐ Old Data (1995-1999) ☐ Combined Data ☐

1.3 SODS2 Regression Report Window

Upon the regression report command button being clicked, a regression report window, found below in Figure 3, would be opened fully maximized with all right top corner window commands turned off. Upon SODS2 opening this window, all information relating to the regression report was transferred so that regression results can be correctly displayed, printed and/or saved. Each of these functions was found coded behind their respective command buttons. Before printing or saving such report, the user was given edit capabilities making the versatility of such a report much more dynamic. The logic behind the results also provided the user an easy to use application. Based upon the regression model report command button (located in the main window) being clicked, SODS2 would decipher the user's inputs and selected consequences to generate the associated regression model output. Such output would use the regression logic to determine whether the proposed outsourcing plan was favorable or unfavorable. This output decision came complete with better/worse scale. Any consequence that this logic found as "dramatically better" received "+++", "better" received "++," "slightly better" received "+," "neutral or no change" received nothing, "slightly worse" received "-", "worse" received "--," or "dramatically worse" received "---." All inputs and outputs were then displayed in an orderly fashion within the main text box. From this window the user was given a command button to allow a review of the corresponding assertions (those methods found to increase outsourcing success). Once this button was clicked, the application would open that report window. Once the user finished viewing the regression report window, a close button provided the means to exit this window taking the user back to the main window.

Figure 3 SODS2 Regression Report Window

The screenshot displays the 'Regression Report Window' with a title bar. The main content area is titled 'Report of Outsourcing Consequences using Linear Regression Formulas'. It lists selected outsourcing consequences (Schedule, Control Process, Quality, Control Product, Change Cost), domains (Systems Communications, Shrink Business, Enterprise Manufacturing, Component Operating System), and process strategies (Requirements, Maintenance, Software Engineer Support, Configuration Management). It also lists selected outsourcing product strategies (Common Customizable). The report shows calculated consequences for new and old data, comparing them to a combined data baseline. A yellow box highlights a message: 'Not Satisfied with the Resulting Consequences - Click Assertion Button to Discover Ways for Improving Outsourcing Results'. At the bottom, there are buttons for 'Print Report', 'Save Report', 'Assertions', and 'Close Form'.

Category	Item	Value	Interpretation
New Data Calculated Consequences:	New Data Schedule Consequence	Equals 3.31	
	Slightly Reduces This Consequence	(This is Slightly Better +)	
	New Data Control Process Consequence	Equals 2.58	
	Slightly Reduces This Consequence	(This is Slightly Worse -)	
	New Data Quality Consequence	Equals 4.43	
Old Data Calculated Consequences:	Old Data Schedule Consequence	Equals 3.04	
	Slightly Reduces This Consequence	(This is Slightly Better +)	
	Old Data Control Process Consequence	Equals 4.25	
	This Consequence Is Neutral	(Neither Better or Worse)	
	Old Data Quality Consequence	Equals 3.92	

1.4 SODS2 NN Report Window

Upon the NN report command button being clicked from the main window, a NN report window, found below in Figure 4, would be opened fully maximized with all right top corner window commands turned off. This window duplicated all the same features found in the regression report window with the exception that the results were calculated with the corresponding NN consequence DLLs.

Figure 4 SODS2 NN Report Window

The screenshot displays the 'Neural Network Report Window' with a title bar. The main content area is titled 'Report of Outsourcing Consequences using Non Linear MLP Neural Networks'. It lists selected outsourcing consequences, domains, process strategies, and product strategies. Below these, it provides predicted outcomes for each consequence, including numerical values and qualitative assessments like 'Slightly Better' or 'Neutral'. At the bottom, there are buttons for 'Print Report', 'Save Report', 'Assertions', and 'Close Form'. A yellow tooltip is visible over the 'Assertions' button, stating: 'Not Satisfied with the Resulting Consequences - Click Assertion Button to Discover Ways for Improving Outsourcing Results'.

Neural Network Report Window

Report of Outsourcing Consequences using Non Linear MLP Neural Networks

Selected Outsourcing Consequences Include:
Schedule
Control Process
Quality
Control Product
Change Cost

Selected Domains Include:
Systems Communications
Shrink Business
Enterprise Manufacturing
Component Operating System

Selected Outsourcing Process Strategies Include:
Requirements
Maintenance
Software Engineer Support
Configuration Management

Selected Outsourcing Product Strategies Include:
Common Customizable

Neural Network (NN) Predicted Outcomes:
Neural Network Schedule Consequence Equals 3.172778
Slightly Reduces This Consequence (This is Slightly Better +)
Neural Network Control Process Consequence Equals 3.948083
This Consequence Is Neutral (Neither Better or Worse)
Neural Network Quality Consequence Equals 4.661629
Slightly Increases This Consequence (This is Slightly Better +)
Neural Network Control Product Consequence Equals 4.98754
Slightly Increases This Consequence (This is Slightly Better +)
Neural Network Change Cost Consequence Equals 4.376586
This Consequence Is Neutral (Neither Better or Worse)

Print Report Save Report Assertions Close Form

Not Satisfied with the Resulting Consequences - Click Assertion Button to Discover Ways for Improving Outsourcing Results

1.5 SODS2 Assertion Report Window

From both the regression or NN report windows, the user was given a command button that would allow them to view this assertion report illustrated in Figure 5. This report was very useful when the tool indicated worse than expected consequence results and the user was limited in making strategy changes. Thus, these assertions reported within this window would guide the user to make the best of the given situation. This report like the others would open maximized with the window control button at the top right corner turned off. The report also used logic to decide which assertions were appropriate given the user's input. Again, like the other report windows, this information was editable, printable and savable.

Figure 5 SODS2 Assertion Report Window

Regression Report Window

Report of Assertions Matching Outsourcing Strategy to Improve Consequences

Assertions report includes techniques recorded by the majority of respondents that improve outsourcing.

Standard Outsourcing Project Assertions Include:

- Contractor needs experience with projects coding language and associated tools
- Contractor needs experience with projects domain
- Inhouse buyers organization needs experience with projects domain
- It is good when buyer realizing different domains have different effects on outsourcing
- Contractors availability (A vs. B team, how busy are they, and number employed) affects outsourcing success
- Amount of contractors reusable designs and code components tends to increase outsourcing

Standard Outsourcing Relationship Assertions Include:

- Contractors track record is a good indicator for improving outsourcing
- Frequent reviews between buyer and contractor increases outsourcing success
- Increasing buyer and contractor communications (face to face, phone calls, email, etc...) increases outsourcing success
- Increasing buyers visibility into contractors development process increases outsourcing success
- Having payment incentives (payment strategy) increases outsourcing success
- Having a past, successful working relationship increases outsourcing success
- Contractors process maturity level is a good indicator for improving outsourcing
- Buyers process maturity level is a good indicator for improving outsourcing

Process Outsourcing Assertions Include:

- Compatible tools and methods increasing the flow of information increases outsourcing success
- Having interfaces and responsibilities well defined increases outsourcing success
- Sharing same lifecycles between buyer and contractor increases outsourcing success
- Having a higher contractor maturity level increases outsourcing success
- Having a higher buyer maturity level increases outsourcing success
- Having a similar maturity level between buyer and contractor increases outsourcing success

Product Outsourcing Assertions Include:

- Increasing buyer and contractor communication increases outsourcing success
- Having interfaces well defined increases outsourcing success
- Having requirements well defined increases outsourcing success
- Compatible tools and programming languages increases outsourcing success
- Having a higher modular product increases outsourcing success

Print Report **Save Report** **Close Form**

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 074-0188	
The public reporting burden for this 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 the collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 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. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 23-03-2004		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (From – To) Jun 2003 – Mar 2004	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OUTSOURCING DECISION SUPPORT TOOL WITH NEURAL NETWORK LEARNING				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Newberry, James D., Captain, USAF				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(S) Air Force Institute of Technology Graduate School of Engineering and Management (AFIT/EN) 2950 Hobson Way WPAFB OH 45433-7765				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AFIT/GCS/ENG/04-16	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Maj Robert Weber AFIT/LSS 3100 Research Blvd Kettering, OH 45420-4022 255-7777, x3260 Robert.Weber@afit.edu				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 The Air Force (AF) needs an evolving software tool for guiding decision makers through the complexities of software outsourcing. Previous research identified specific outsourcing strategies and linked them to goals and consequences through a variety relationship rules. These strategies and relationship rules were inserted into a decision support tool. Since that time, more historical data and outsourcing literature has been collected thus necessitating an update to such a tool. As the number of software outsourcing projects are completed, the AF must capture the outsourcing decision experiences which guided the projects and their outcomes. In order to efficiently incorporate this new experience, the decision tool must be redesigned to allow the additional knowledge to be added in such a way that the decision rule base is automatically updated. With this new feature, the tool would increase its precision of predicting software outsourcing success as the software outsourcing knowledge evolves. Capturing software outsourcing as knowledge instead of raw information will help guide decision makers down paths proven to succeed staying clear of risks that historically plagued software outsourcing projects of the past. Software outsourcing decision makers desire not only a characterization of past experiences and predictions of future outcomes, but also reasons to help them make informed decisions.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Software Outsourcing, Decision Support Tool, Stepwise Regression, Neural Networks, Knowledge Management, Outsourcing Survey, In house Software Development, Contracting Software Development, Software Development Oversight Management					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 246	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Brian G. Hermann, Lt Col, USAF (LSS/GCS)
REPORT U	ABSTRACT U	c. THIS PAGE U			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (937) 255-7777, ext 3131; e-mail: Brian.Hermann@afit.edu

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18