

SIGCHI Conference Proceedings Format

Gustav Bylund

Affiliation

Address

e-mail address

Optional phone number

Filip Lindman Marko

Affiliation

Address

e-mail address

Optional phone number

ABSTRACT

Planning poker is a technique for estimating the time required for tasks within a programming project, which tries to eliminate certain biases of the participants in order to achieve greater accuracy of the estimates. This study aims to examine the participants perception of two different methods for time estimation, and compare them to each other.

Author Keywords

Guides; instructions; author's kit; conference publications; keywords should be separated by a semi-colon.

Optional section to be included in your final version, but strongly encouraged.

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.m. Information Interfaces and Presentation (e.g. HCI): Miscellaneous

See: <http://www.acm.org/about/class/1998/> for more information and the full list of ACM classifiers and descriptors.

Optional section to be included in your final version, but strongly encouraged. On the submission page only the classifiers letter-number combination will need to be entered.

INTRODUCTION

Within agile development it has become more and more important to have accurate time estimates. There has been some studies on the accuracy of estimates, where planning poker has been found to possibly increase the accuracy of estimates. But accuracy is not the only measurement by which an estimation technique can be valued. Other factors, such as group "togetherness" can affect "something". That's why we want to examine what other factors that affect participants experience of Planning Poker.

PURPOSE

This study will examine Planning Poker as a method to estimate time required for tasks within a programming project. It is to be investigated especially how the test participants experience the method, but also how the estimates compare to other methods.

Paste the appropriate copyright statement here. ACM now supports three different copyright statements:

- ACM copyright: ACM holds the copyright on the work. This is the historical approach.
- License: The author(s) retain copyright, but ACM receives an exclusive publication license.
- Open Access: The author(s) wish to pay for the work to be open access. The additional fee must be paid to ACM.

This text field is large enough to hold the appropriate release statement assuming it is single spaced.

Every submission will be assigned their own unique DOI string to be included here.

QUESTIONS

We want to examine:

- Precision of estimates
- experienced work for participants
- participants appreciation of the method
- time spent estimating[1]

Of particular interest is examining if and how the accuracy of estimates affect participants appreciation of the method.

LIMITATIONS

The study will only involve two different methods of time estimation. The study only involves one group of programmers.

BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORKS

There are

Variations/types/... of planning poker Example1, example2, these people said this about that.

Important things, observed improvements, stuff like that

References [1] Grenning, James. "Planning poker or how to avoid analysis paralysis while release planning." Hawthorn Woods: Renaissance Software Consulting 3 (2002). [2] Molokken-Ostfold, Kjetil, and Nils Christian Haugen. "Combining estimates with planning poker—an empirical study." In Software Engineering Conference, 2007. ASWEC 2007. 18th Australian, pp. 349-358. IEEE, 2007. [3] Wellington, Carol A., Thomas Briggs, and C. Dudley Girard. "Examining team cohesion as an effect of software engineering methodology." In ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 1-5. ACM, 2005.:w

CONCLUSION

Our conclusion

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to all of IP

REFERENCES

1. Adobe Acrobat Reader 7.
<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/>.