from the editor

Art, Science, and Engineering

Steve McConnell

ngineering's use of mathematics and science exposes it to the criticism that it is dry—that it saps the artistic elements out of structures that are engineered. The same criticism has been applied to software engineering. How true is this criticism? Does software engineering exclude aesthetics? Or are programmers' debates about the most beautiful way

to format source code really just the tip of a deep softwareaesthetics iceberg?

Far from being antithetical to aesthetics, traditional engineering is largely concerned with all aspects of design, including aesthetic aspects. Its designs aren't just limited to shapes and colors. Engineers design everything from electronic circuits to load-bearing beams to vehicles that land on the

moon. As Samuel C. Florman says in the *Existential Pleasures of Engineering* (St. Martin's Griffin, 1994), "Creative design is the central mission of the professional engineer."

Consider a comparison of two wellknown buildings, the Reims Cathedral in France and the Sydney Opera House in Australia. The Reims Cathedral, shown in Figure 1, was completed about 1290; the Sydney Opera House in 1973. The Reims Cathedral was designed to use materials whose properties were understood (more or less) at the time.

The Sydney Opera House was constructed 700 years after the Reims Cathedral. As you can see in Figure 2, it's stylistically quite different from the Reims Cathedral. Its architects used modern materials such as steel and reinforced concrete, and they employed engineering techniques including computer modeling to determine how little material could safely be used.

Which building you prefer is a matter of taste, but which building can actually be built is a matter of engineering. It would be possible for modern builders to construct another Reims cathedral, but it would not have been possible for 13th-century builders to construct a Sydney Opera House. The reason is not the 13th century's lack of art but of engineering. Engineering without art can be ugly, but art without engineering can be impossible. Engineering does not constrain artistic possibilities. The lack of engineering constrains artistic possibilities.

So it is with modern software systems. The level of engineering prowess determines how large a system can be built successfully, how easy it will be to use, how fast it will operate, how many errors it will contain, and how well it will cooperate with other systems. Software includes many aesthetic elements, and software developers have no lack of artistic ambition. What we in the software industry sometimes lack is the engineering technique that enables us to realize some of our grandest aesthetic aspirations.

Maturation of engineering disciplines

Mary Shaw at Carnegie Mellon University has identified a progression that fields travel through on their way to professional engineering ("Prospects for an Engineering Discipline of Software," *IEEE Software*, Nov. 1990).



Söftware

DEPARTMENT EDITORS

Bookshelf: Warren Keuffel, wkeuffel@computer.org Country Report: Deependra Moitra,

d.moitra@computer.org Design: Martin Fowler, ThoughtWorks, fowler@acm.org

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

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

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

STAFF

Group Managing Editor Dick Price

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

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

> Staff Lead Editor Shani Murray

Staff Editor Scott Andreson

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

> Art Director **Toni Van Buskirk** Cover Illustration

Dirk Hagner

Technical Illustrator Alex Torres

Production Artists Carmen Flores-Garvey and Larry Bauer

Acting Executive Director Anne Marie Kelly

> Publisher Angela Burgess

Membership/Circulation Marketing Manager Georgann Carter

Advertising Assistant Debbie Sims

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Greg Goth, Kirk Kroeker, Nancy Mead, Ware Myers, Paula Powers, Judy Shane, Gil Shif

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

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



Figure I. The Reims Cathedral.

The Reims Cathedral was built when civil engineering was in its "commercial" stage. In software, many commercialstage organizations achieve respectable levels of quality and productivity by using carefully selected, well-trained personnel. They rely on familiar practices and change them incrementally in pursuit of better products and better project performance.

Some of the problems that commercial production encounters can't be solved by trial and error, and, if the economic stakes are high enough, a

FROM THE EDITOR

corresponding science will develop. As the science matures, it develops theories that contribute to commercial practice, and this is the point at which true professional engineering practice emerges. At that point, progress arises from application of scientific principles as well as from practical experimentation. The practitioners working in the field at that point must be well educated in both the theory and practice of their profession.

A science for software development

Software science has been lagging behind commercial software development for years. Extremely large software systems were developed in the 1950s and 1960s, including the Sage missile defense system, the Sabre airline reservation system, and IBM's OS/360 operating system. Commercial development of these large systems proceeded much faster than supporting research did.

But are we really asking software science to provide the right things? For many classes of applications, including inventory management systems, payroll programs, general-ledger software, operating system design, database management software, language compilers—the list is nearly endless the same basic applications have been written so many times that these systems shouldn't require as much unique design effort as they usually get. Shaw



Figure 2. The Sydney Opera House.

FROM THE EDITOR

points out that in mature engineering fields routine design involves solving familiar problems and reusing large portions of prior solutions. Often these "solutions" are codified in the form of equations, analytical models, or prebuilt components.

Science has yet to provide software development with a set of equations that describe how to run a project successfully. Perhaps it never will. But science doesn't necessarily have to consist of formulas and mathematics. In The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (University of Chicago Press, 1970), Thomas Kuhn points out that a scientific paradigm can consist of a set of solved problems. Reusable software project artifacts are a set of solved problemssolved requirements problems, estimation problems, planning problems, design problems, and so on.

We know that software engineering is different from other engineering disciplines in some respects; perhaps the kind of science that underpins it is different as well. The one thing we know that is not different is that software engineers care about the aesthetics of their work. Historically, perhaps that has focused on source code, and perhaps in the future software engineers will care just as much about the aesthetics of their reusable estimates, plans, requirements, designs, and other "solved problems." @

Acknowledgment

The images used here were obtained from IMSI's MasterPhotos Collection, 1895 Francisco Blvd. East, San Rafael, CA 94901-5506, USA

Software Engineering that affects our society.

We are the Software Engineering Institute (SEI), a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense and operated by Carnegie Mellon University. As an integral component of Carnegie Mellon University, we have access to leading-edge technology and provide career-minded professionals with a progressive work environment that is conducive to their personal achievement.

A <u>web site</u> that can change your future.

If you would like to learn more about the work we do and the opportunities we offer, visit our web site:

www.sei.cmu.edu

Included below are the technical initiatives that have career opportunities currently available.

- CERT® Coordination Center (CERT/CC) for information security
- Capability Maturity Model® for Software (SW-CMM®) framework
- Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI)sn
- Personal Software Processsm (PSPsm) and Team Software Processsm (TSPsm) methods
- Application of product line practices to software development
- Integration of systems from commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software

We offer a competitive salary, tuition reimbursement and benefits package along with the chance to work on projects that have major impact on the future of software technology. Please email your resume referencing job code: Jobs-IEEE ehh@sei.cmu.edu or fax 412-268-5758.

Equal Opportunity Employer. We do not accept resumes from recruiting firms.



٩,

0, 10

010

Software Engineering Institute

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

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

ASSOCIATE EDITORS IN CHIEF

Design: Maarten Boasson, Quaerendo Invenietis boasson@science.uva.nl Construction: Terry Bollinger, Mitre Corp. terrv@mitre.org Requirements: Christof Ebert, Alcatel Telecom christof.ebert@alcatel.be Management: Ann Miller, University of Missouri, Rolla millera@ece umr edu Quality: Jeffrey M. Voas, Cigital voas@cigital.com

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

INDUSTRY ADVISORY BOARD

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

MAGAZINE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

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

PUBLICATIONS BOARD

Rangachar Kasturi (chair), Angela Burgess (publisher), Jake Aggarwal, Laxmi Bhuyan, Mark Christensen, Lori Clarke, Mike T. Liu, Sorel Reisman, Gabriella Sannitti di Baja, Sallie Sheppard, Mike Williams, Zhiwei Xu