

Improving technical debt management and communication

A concept driven design study to explore the concept of a visualization tool to improve technical debt management and communication

Axel Ekwall

axelekw@kth.se

KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden

ABSTRACT

faucibus scelerisque eleifend donec pretium vulputate sapien nec sagittis aliquam malesuada bibendum arcu vitae elementum curabitur vitae nunc sed velit dignissim sodales ut eu sem integer vitae justo eget magna fermentum iaculis eu non diam phasellus vestibulum lorem sed risus ultricies tristique nulla aliquet enim tortor at auctor urna nunc id cursus metus aliquam eleifend mi in nulla posuere sollicitudin aliquam ultrices sagittis orci a scelerisque purus semper eget duis at tellus at urna condimentum mattis pellentesque id nibh tortor id aliquet lectus proin nibh nisl condimentum id venenatis a condimentum vitae sapien pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas sed tempus urna et pharetra pharetra massa massa ultricies mi quis hendrerit dolor magna eget est lorem ipsum dolor sit amet consectetur adipiscing elit pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas integer eget aliquet nibh praesent tristique magna sit amet purus gravida quis blandit turpis cursus in hac habitasse platea dictumst quisque sagittis purus sit amet volutpat consequat mauris nunc congue nisi vitae suscipit tellus mauris a diam maecenas sed enim ut sem viverra aliquet eget sit amet tellus cras adipiscing enim eu turpis egestas pretium aenean pharetra.

KEYWORDS

information visualization, technical debt management, concept driven design research

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years society has undergone a digital transformation and our everyday life depends on digital technology more than ever before. This development relies on an ever-growing collection of software systems and services that span our society and connect our lives. With the increasing size and scope of these software projects, and the growing numbers of software developers working in the same project

simultaneously, development planning and collaboration becomes harder. //SOURCE A common method to handle these challenges is for software development teams to work according to an agile methodology [7] where requirements and solutions in a project are evolving over time in collaboration between developers, project managers and users. This process is conducted in an iterative cycle with continuous reflections and improvements on previous work.

In order to handle these iterative and fast paced change to the source code in a project, development teams are using version control systems to keep track of changes. This allows developers to work on different versions of the software in parallel and *commit* their changes to the project in batches when new features are completed or bugs are fixed. All these small incremental changes are recorded and make up a rich source of information into the evolution of the code. However, this information is cumbersome to grasp and oversee and therefore often not used in an effective way, partly because it is not aggregated and presented as relevant metrics, but also because it is hidden from non-technical stakeholders who might not be able to retrieve the information from the VCS system. //SOURCE This makes it hard for stakeholders to get an overview of how the project in general, and more specifically the source code, evolves over time. In this context, where rapid continuous decision making and reflection is important, insights into the evolution of the source code and a shared understanding of the current state of the code can be valuable [1].

One method to gain knowledge from a large set of complex information is to visualize it, or in other words, form a mental model of the information in order to understand it better [10]. This practice has been conducted since long before modern technology was available to help and it is thus not necessarily required to use technology to aid in this process [6]. However, the trend in recent years of collecting increasingly larger amounts of data creates new challenges in visualization and manual processing of data might not be an option. In this scenario, the capability of modern technology is a useful

tool to help process, filter and map large data sets to visual representations in order to help the user to understand the data and form a mental model of the information [2]. Digital visualization tools can also enable rich interaction and allow a user to explore the data step by step rather than getting overwhelmed by too much information at once. //SOURCE

When exploring source code evolution, and problems that commonly occur in long term software projects, a useful concept to utilize is *technical debt*. First described by Cunningham in 1992 [5], technical debt (TB) is a metaphor to financial debt and describes the common situation with increased development costs over time in software projects caused by poor software engineering practices [12].

Research question

The goal of this paper is to design a concept of a visualization tool to aggregate and present an overview of technical debt in a software development project. In doing that, his thesis aims to investigate whether a information visualization tool can be used to empower software development teams to make better informed decisions about software architecture and source code maintenance on order to manage technical debt. Based on this goal, this paper will try to answer the following research question.

Can a visualization tool help software development teams manage technical debt by informing decisions regarding maintenance and refactoring?

In order to answer the research question, a prototype of a visualization tool will be developed and evaluated based on the following sub-questions:

- Does the prototype present enough information for developers to make decisions about if and when to pay off technical debt?
- Can the prototype help improve awareness about technical debt strategy and decisions withing a software development team?

Delimitations

The main objective of this study is to evaluate a design concept, not developing a fully functioning visualization tool. Only the features and interactions necessary to properly evaluate the concept and generate design guidelines will be implemented in the prototype.

2 RELATED RESEARCH

To be able to design and develop the prototype of a visualization tool to help manage technical debt, previous work in relevant fields of research was reviewed. This section presents and reviews the research from two main areas, technical debt management and information visualization, upon which this study builds.

Technical Debt

First described by Cunningham in 1992 [5], technical debt (TB) is a metaphor to financial debt and describes the common situation with increased development costs over time in software projects caused by poor software engineering practices [12].

Over time, the concept of technical debt gained in popularity and with that the scope of the metaphor was expanded to include any imperfection in the software lifecycle. With this broader definition of technical debt, the need for strategies to monitor and manage the debt in a project are created. Seaman and Guo, in the paper *MEASURING AND MONITORING TECHNICAL DEBT*, proposes a "technical debt list" with "debt items" in order to monitor and keep track of instances of debt present in the project [8].

The notion of a "debt item" will be used in this study to represent the debt in a project and present an overview to developers and other users of the proposed tool. The "debt item" described by Seaman and Guo includes a description of where in the system the debt is present and why the task needs to be payed off [8]. In this study the concept is expanded to also include the type, or dimension of debt the item represents.

The idea of *debt dimensions* was introduced by Tom et. al. in their exploration of the technical debt definition [12]. Through a multivocal literature review of the current technical debt literature as well as interviews with participants from industry, Tom et. al. proposed five distinct dimensions of technical debt; *Code debt*, *Design and architectural debt*, *Environmental debt*, *Knowledge distribution and documentation debt* and *testing debt* [12]. Further, Tom et. al. also explores the factors that contributes to technical debt in projects and among them they identified the following main factors; *Pragmatism*, *Prioritization*, *Process*, *Attitudes* and *Ignorance* [12].

Of special interest to this study are *Prioritization*, *Process* and *Attitudes* since these are factors that are addressable through a visualization tool. Tom et. al. writes, "The visibility of all forms of technical debt decreases when poor communication and collaboration processes are in place, making it easier for debt to accumulate without being noticed." [12] suggesting that visibility and communication are key to establishing a successful technical debt management process.

Worth noting when dealing with technical debt is that, even though concept in many ways are associated with negative effects, in some cases, taking on technical debt can be a strategic short term decision in order to reach a critical deadline in time. However, if not properly managed the debt can be costly by decreasing development velocity and increasing maintenance costs [9].




Figure 1: Reference model for visualization by Card et al. 1999. [3]

Information Visualization

The core of information visualizations are the mapping of data and intent to visual representations. Although there are many different techniques used in the field, this central process of visualizations can be described by the *Reference model for visualization* by Card et al. presented in figure 1 [3]. This common reference model is helpful in order to analyze and compare the different techniques as seen in the taxonomy proposed by Chi based on model by Card et al. [4].

The raw data can take many forms which can be classified into three main categories based on its properties, *nominal data* is simple data with some sort of label but no quantitative value, *ordinal data* can be ranked according to some attribute and *quantitative data* which support arithmetic operations [2].

3 METHOD

In this section the overall methodology used in this paper is presented. Each step is described in more detail in the next section "Study and results" together with the results.

In order to investigate the research question, a methodology informed by Stoltermans Concept-Driven Design Research (CDDR) [11] was used with four methodological activities listed below.

- (1) **Concept generation**, related literature study and survey gathering requirements.
- (2) **Concept exploration and design of artifact**, an interactive prototype manifesting the concept.
- (3) **External critique session**, user study with prepared tasks and interview of target users.
- (4) **Concept contextualization**, a discussion of the concept and results in this study positioning it against related research.

As described by Stolterman in order for a concept to be valuable it should be based on previous theoretical work [11]. In this study, the **concept generation** is based on the

theoretical work on *technical debt* and *information visualization* presented in the previous related work section as well as requirements gathered through a survey with respondents among potential users. The survey was used in order to gather insight into the problems users face as well as their current processes and tools to manage and communicate about technical debt. The survey was conducted online and included an introduction of the topic, a section collecting background information about the respondents and two sections with questions. In the first the respondents were presented with a collection of statements about their technical debt in their current project and were asked to evaluate their attitude on a Likert scale TODO: Likert ref, and in the second part the respondents were asked a set of open ended questions.

The next phase in this study was the combination of two activities, **Concept exploration** and **design of artifact**. During this phase, the form and functions of the concept was explored and an interactive prototype was designed and developed. The prototype was developed with the purpose of testing new ideas of how to present technical debt in a software development project rather than refining current solutions or evaluating details in a design. As Stolterman writes, "Concept design research does not strive to refine or test established ideas; instead, it explores new territories and design spaces" [11].

When the defined concept and features were implemented in the prototype, an **external critique session** was conducted in order to evaluate the concept manifested by the developed prototype. The sessions were conducted online, one-on-one, with a video conferencing service and all sessions were recorded with video and sound for later analysis. Each session followed a strict agenda starting with an introduction to the research project, concept and prototype read by the researcher followed by a section where the participant was exploring and interacting with the prototype by completing a set of predefined tasks. These steps were conducted mainly to allow for the participant to understand and assess the prototype to be able to criticize the concept and the tasks were not designed to evaluate the usability or interaction with the application. When the participant had completed the tasks were familiarized with the prototype, a semi-structured interview was conducted. The first part of the interview was TODO: Continue here...

4 STUDY AND RESULT

In this section the study will be described step by step in separate subsections in chronological order. For each step, the method and results will be presented together.

Survey

The survey was conducted among professionals with various roles in software development projects, with the most common role being "Developer" (90%) followed by "Tech Lead or Project Manager" (60%) and "DevOps" (20%). The number of respondents was 20 with mixed and somewhat evenly distributed level of experience between "less than 5 years" (40%), "between 6 and 10 years" (25%) and "more than 10 years" (35%). All but one (95%) of the respondents were familiar with the term "Technical Debt" indicating that the respondent have a understanding of the concept and thus the required prior knowledge to be able to provide relevant answers in the survey.

In order to understand how technical debt affects the daily work of the respondents and their experience of communicating about and manage technical debt in their current situation, the survey presented nine statements asking the respondents to indicate whether they agree or disagree according to a Likert scale. The results are presented in figure 2, where each statement is assigned a letter and the distribution of the answers for each statement represented with a bar in the figure.

Statements:

- I find that technical debt is a problem in my current project.
- Technical debt is often necessary in order to deliver in time.
- The amount of technical debt in my current project is acceptable.
- I have a clear overview of the amount of technical debt in the project.
- I have a clear overview of where in the project technical debt is present.
- The technical debt in the project is actively managed.
- The project team has clear communication about technical debt.
- The project team has a clear strategy for how to manage technical debt.
- Everyone in the project team are aware of the technical debt strategy.

The results show that although more than half of the respondent (60%) find technical debt to be a problem in their project, a majority (65%) agree that technical debt is necessary in order to deliver. Further, most respondents (75%) consider their current level of debt acceptable. This indicates that developers are facing the need to balance the problems caused by technical debt with the need to deliver in time and that this requires accepting a certain level of technical debt.

A greater part of the respondent indicate that they have a clear overview of both the amount of technical debt (70%) and where the debt is located in the project (80%). However, only




Figure 2: Chart representing the distribution of answers per statement.

half of the respondents work in a project where technical debt is actively managed (50%) or with a clear strategy for technical debt management (50%), and a majority (60%) does not experience that everyone in their team are aware of the technical debt strategy. This points to a problem with an absence of awareness and communication about technical debt in many software development projects.

The second part of the survey included a collection of open ended questions about the respondents experience with technical debt in their daily work. When asked how technical debt impacts their daily work the most common theme was that it leads to a slow down in the development process, results in longer time to deliver and limits the ability to add new features. One respondent writes:

"[It] takes longer time to deliver new features, onboard new team members, limits what solutions we can choose for problems." (respondent 17)

Next, the respondents were asked to describe how they currently manage technical debt. The most common answer was that they do it little by little as they stumbled upon it. The "boy scout principle" was mentioned multiple times by different respondents. One respondent explains:

"Boy scout principle. Leave the code a little better than you found it." (respondent 11)

Another aspect mentioned by multiple respondents is the difficulty managing a balance between paying off technical debt and adding new features as one respondent describes in the following statement:

"We write stories for it and add them to the backlog. Each sprint we include some such stories - but it's a bit of a tug of war with the business who wants more features instead." (respondent 16)

Improving technical debt management and communication

When asked about what tools or processes the respondents currently are using to manage technical debt most of the respondents did not use any special tool but rather relied on their existing workflow for bug and feature tracking, code reviews and sprint meetings.

Lastly, the respondents were asked what features they would want in a tool designed to help manage technical debt. Among the many different answers there were a few recurring suggestions for features or important aspects of such a tool. Multiple respondents requested a way of understanding the balance between the cost of fixing instances of debt and the potential benefit gained by paying off the debt. An example is the following answer:

"Wow, good question. Not sure, but I guess it'd important for me to somehow be able to see how 'expensive' a certain tech debt payoff project would be together with it's potential reward. This would make prioritization between different tech debt payoff projects better." (respondent 18)

Another respondent describes a platform where you can document areas in the code where technical debt is present and keep track of the technical debt in the project:

"A tool that could help us document part of the code we think as technical dept. A platform that we could have conversation about things and keep track of ideas how to solve things." (respondent 19)

The idea of a tool to help a team schedule and prioritize technical debt also surface multiple times among the answers. One respondent writes:

"Maybe a 'queue' of topics we have decided is tech debt and for how long they have not been addressed. Otherwise, a solution for the current standards and ways of working with notifications for 'now you have not reviewed this in X months'. Making a tool which proactively helps you schedule tech debt fixing which is open and transparent to both managers and developers." (respondent 15)

Prototype

TODO: More references to related work.

Based on the data collected and analyzed from the survey described in the previous section, a prototype of a tool was designed and developed. The goal of the tool is to raise awareness among the team members of a development team, about the strategy, decisions and priorities regarding technical debt in a project. Further, the tool also aims to be a common source of information about the technical debt in a

project and to be a helpful tool in discussions and decision making.

The prototype was development as a web application with modern web technologies. It consists of a main view with a dashboard containing multiple widgets containing information about the technical debt in the project. The widgets are interconnected and responsive to user interaction. In order to facilitate the evaluation, the prototype was developed with static data and no integration with live projects. However, the prototype is coded with real data in mind, and could be integrated with source code repositories with more development.

Technical debt is represented in the prototype as "debt items" which are instances of debt that can be assigned to a location in the source code. Each debt item includes, in addition to the location in the project, also a title, description, deadline, type and priority editable by the user.




Figure 3: The overview visualization in the prototype.

The overview widget (figure 3) is a visualization of the source code represented as a partition layout. Each file and folder in the tree structure is represented as a node, in this case a rectangle. The layout is presented in a top down orientation implying that the top most node contains all nodes below it. A node encodes three pieces of data, the location in the source code represented by the location in relation to other nodes, the size of the file or folder represented by the size of the node and the number of debt items associated with the node represented by the shade of the node.

The debt type widget (figure 4) visualizes the distribution of debt types among the debt items in the project as a circle chart. Each type corresponding to a distinct color which is recurring in other places in the prototype in order to help the user to find the type of a debt item at a glance.

To present the user with information about the evolution of debt in the project over a span of time, a timeline widget (figure 5) is included in the prototype. The timeline widget summarizes the number of debt items with deadlines for each month and visualizes this information as bar graph.




Figure 4: The debt type visualization in the prototype.

The bars include both completed (green) and non-completed (red) items colored by state.

The prototype also includes a column with cards (figure 6) representing debt items, a "backlog" of items for the development team to work on. The cards are sorted by priority and deadline with the highest priority debt items on top. Each




Figure 5: The history visualization in the prototype.




Figure 6: The backlog column in the prototype.

card presents all relevant information about a debt item and three action buttons: "complete", "edit" and "delete". The user can also create a new debt item by clicking the button at the end of the list of cards.

The concept proposed in this study through this prototype aims to help development teams communicate about and manage technical debt by enabling everyone in the team to have an overview of the current technical debt status and priorities. It allows the user to manage "debt items" representing an instance of debt somewhere in the project. The user can create, edit and delete "debt items" which are presented as a backlog for the team to work on. The user can also assign each item a deadline and priority. The goal is for this concept to be a common source of information about the teams strategy and priorities regarding technical debt, and also a help when making decision about technical debt in the project. In other words, a unified interface for all kinds of debt in a project.

Interviews

The prototype was then evaluated through semi-structured interviews with users in which the users were able to interact with and explore the interactive prototype.

The participants were recruited from two companies working with software development. Six participants from Mentimeter AB, a product company providing a SaaS solution for interactive presentations and four participants from Prototyp

Stockholm AB, a digital agency developing digital products and services for clients. TODO: describe the participants in more detail?

In the first part of each interview, after exploring the prototype, the participants were presented with the following four statements and asked whether they agree or disagree with each statement. They were also asked to explain their position briefly.

- (1) The prototype provides a good overview of technical debt in the project.
- (2) The visualizations in the prototype provides useful information.
- (3) The prototype provides clear information about the priority of debt items.
- (4) This tool provides the information needed in order to make a decision about when to pay off debt.

Most of the participants (TODO: x/10) generally agreed with the first statement. However, multiple participants noted that some types of debt might not map well to the source code and thus not be well presented in the overview visualization.

The second statement received mixed opinions. Almost all participants (TODO: x/10) agreed that visualizations in general do add value to the tool and were useful. However, The specific visualizations in the prototype receive some criticism regarding both the interaction and the presented information. Multiple participants mentioned that the overview visualization (figure 3) was missing labels for the nodes in order to understand it better without having to interact and trigger the tooltips. As with the first statement some participants noted that only visualizing the source files as an overview might be insufficient in order to show all kinds of technical debt, especially for environmental and architectural debt. Regarding the other two visualizations, a majority of the participants wanted to be able to filter the backlog based on type and date in addition to the location by selecting a debt type in the circle chart (figure 4) or a month in the timeline bar chart (figure 5).

Although the majority of the participants agree with the third statement about the priority of debt items, many ask for a sorting option for the backlog column (figure 6) in order to make it clear that the column is sorted by priority. In the current version of the prototype without a user selectable sorting option, many users took some time to realize that the backlog is sorted at all. Further, one user points out that it would be valuable to be able to filter out all low and normal priority debt items from both the backlog and visualizations to be able to focus on high priority items in some situations.

The fourth and last statement generated more disagreement (TODO: x/10) compared to the previous statements and many participants were reluctant to agree with the statement. The general response was that the decisions about when to

pay off debt are complex and requires weighing many different business opportunities against each other and a tool like this simply cant capture all that. With that said, most participants agreed that this tool would be a helpful addition in meetings and discussions about such decisions. One participant explains:

"Debt doesn't live in it's own little bubble where you can just pay off debt all day, you have to balance it against all the other items in a backlog."
(participant 3)

A feature many participants suggested that would help in that regard would be to add an estimated cost of paying off each debt item and the potential benefit of doing so.

After the initial statements, each participants was asked a couple of open ended questions in order to further explore their experience with the prototype and the broader concept of a tool like it.

- Do you think a tool like this would improve communications about technical debt?
- Do you think a tool like this would make it easier to manage technical debt?
- What would be the most important feature of a tool like this?
- In what context would you use a tool like this?
- How would you improve this tool?

Four themes were constructed from the answers and discussions resulting from the open questions: (1) *A designated place for technical debt discussions and decisions*, (2) *Flexible visual representation of software project with multiple levels of detail*, (3) *Not another tool* and (4) *Cost and benefit estimates*. The themes captures the recurring opinions voiced by the participants and are summarized below with examples from the transcribes interviews.

(1) Multiple participants (TODO: x/10) mentioned the need for a *designated place for technical debt discussions and decisions* and found that the prototype could fill that need. Discussions around technical debt are many times held casually among developers and never recorded or structured and thus hard to follow up or base decisions on. A platform or a tool that encourages these discussions and keep a record of the outcome of such discussions can be a valuable addition in a development teams workflow. TODO: Example quote.

(2) A large group of the participants (TODO: x/10) noted that in order to support the large variety in debt types and debt items possible in many project, the tool would need to adapt to multiple levels of detail. Some debt items could require the ability to specify an exact line of code in a source file, while other debt items can span a whole repository of source code or multiple micro services. This requires *flexible*

visual representation of software project with multiple levels of detail.

(3) A common opinion among the participants (TODO: x/10) was that a key factor to adoption of this tool in their team is how well it can integrate with their current workflow and tools. "*Not another tool*" to add to the already long list of services to keep up to date, unless it can bring enough value in relation to the cost of maintenance and learning. For some of the participants, the solution would be to make it well integrated with their workflow, for example allow them to add new debt items directly from their code editor or use this as a dashboard for an existing issue tracker etc. Other participants would rather have this tool be very simple to the point where it's so easy to use that it won't add much complexity to their process, and keep it separated from their other tools and services.

(4) When asked whether this tool could make it easier to manage technical debt, a recurring theme among the participants (TODO: x/10) was the need for a *cost and benefit estimate* from each debt item. Many participants noted that this is a complicated topic and one way of estimating might not translate to every project. However, a way of assigning cost and benefit to items is necessary in order to priorities and make decision about paying off debt.

TODO: Add example quotes for all themes.

5 DISCUSSION

Topics (placeholders)

- The importance of having a place for structuring and communicating about technical debt in order to successfully manage it and with that also be able to take advantage of the positive aspects of debt.

- The difficulty in presenting an overview of the debt in a single view since debt lives on many levels in a project. Some dimensions of debt are present in very specific locations in the source code and requires a single file overview to be able to localize in the project, where as some other dimensions of debt like architecture or environmental debt can span multiple micro services or code repositories and requires a much broader view of the project to be able to show the location.

Method Critique

Some points to mention:

- Few participants from recruited from two companies might not translate into developers in general?
- Only one design iteration, can the results be valuable?
- Remote interviews and special circumstances of the study, does that impact the results?
- Was the prototype able to fully capture the concept in order for it to be evaluated? Too many missing features?

Future Work

This study evaluated a concept of having a tool to manage technical debt by designing a prototype of such a tool and present it to users from a target group. The design of the tool and the interaction supported by it needs to be further developed and evaluated in future studies. Here follows some suggestions of areas of further research.

The visualizations used in this study to represent a project was, according to many of the users in the evaluation, not able to fully capture all the complexity of a large software project. Other visualization techniques do need to be evaluated in future studies to find a suitable representation, or collection of representations, that can fully capture a whole project and present a intuitive visual representation for users. This would be necessary in order for a technical debt tool, like the one proposed in this study, to be able to present the user with a good overview of the magnitude and location of technical debt in a software project.

The filtering and sorting functionality and interaction could be further explored in future work. There are many properties of debt items that can support filtering and sorting and the visualizations needs to support these data changes and visually reflect each state in an intuitive way for the user.

6 CONCLUSION

TODO: Summarize the findings and the discussion. This should be pretty similar to the abstract.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank Björn and Tino...

REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas Ball, Jung-Min Kim, Adam A Porter, and Harvey P Siy. 1997. If your version control system could talk, Vol. 11.
- [2] S.K. Card and J. Mackinlay. 1997. The structure of the information visualization design space. In *Proceedings of VIZ '97: Visualization Conference, Information Visualization Symposium and Parallel Rendering Symposium*. IEEE Comput. Soc, Phoenix, AZ, USA, 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFVIS.1997.636792>
- [3] Stuart K Card. 1999. *Readings in information visualization : using vision to think*. San Francisco : Kaufmann, San Francisco.
- [4] E.H. Chi. 2000. A taxonomy of visualization techniques using the data state reference model. In *IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization 2000. INFOVIS 2000. Proceedings*. IEEE Comput. Soc, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, 69–75. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFVIS.2000.885092>
- [5] Ward Cunningham. 1992. The WyCash portfolio management system. (1992), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1145/157709.157715>
- [6] Michael Friendly. 2008. A Brief History of Data Visualization. In *Handbook of Data Visualization*, Chun-houh Chen, Wolfgang Härdle, and Antony Unwin (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 15–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-33037-0_2
- [7] Orit Hazzan and Yael Dubinsky. 2014. The Agile Manifesto. In *Agile Anywhere*. Springer International Publishing, 9–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10157-6_3

Improving technical debt management and communication

- [8] Carolyn Seaman and Yuepu Guo. 2011. Measuring and Monitoring Technical Debt. In *Advances in Computers*. Vol. 82. Elsevier, 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385512-1.00002-5>
- [9] Carolyn Seaman, Yuepu Guo, Nico Zazworka, Forrest Shull, Clemente Izurieta, Yuanfang Cai, and Antonio Vetro. 2012. Using technical debt data in decision making: Potential decision approaches. In *2012 Third International Workshop on Managing Technical Debt (MTD)*. IEEE, Zurich, Switzerland, 45–48. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MTD.2012.6225999>
- [10] Robert Spence. 2014. *Information visualization*. Springer, New York.
- [11] Erik Stolterman and Mikael Wiberg. 2010. Concept-Driven Interaction Design Research. *Human–Computer Interaction* 25, 2 (May 2010), 95–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370020903586696>
- [12] Edith Tom, Aybüke Aurum, and Richard Vidgen. 2013. An exploration of technical debt. *Journal of Systems and Software* 86, 6 (June 2013), 1498–1516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2012.12.052>