Bare Demo of IEEEtran.cls for IEEE Conferences

Michael Shell
School of Electrical and
Computer Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332–0250
Email: http://www.michaelshell.org/contact.html

Homer Simpson
Twentieth Century Fox
Springfield, USA
Email: homer@thesimpsons.com

James Kirk
and Montgomery Scott
Starfleet Academy
San Francisco, California 96678–2391
Telephone: (800) 555–1212
Fax: (888) 555–1212

***Abstract*—The abstract goes here.**

I. Introduction

This demo file is intended to serve as a "starter file" for IEEE conference papers produced under LaTeX using IEEEtran.cls version 1.8b and later. I wish you the best of success.

mds

August 26, 2015

A. Subsection Heading Here

Subsection text here.

1) Subsubsection Heading Here: Subsubsection text here.

II. Introduction

III. Related Work

IV. Experimental Design

A. Research Questions

RQ1: How effective are review meetings in regards to improving document or code quality?

RQ2: Are code review meetings an efficient way of increasing document or code quality?

B. Hypothesis

H1: Review meetings are effective at improving document or code quality.

H10: Review meetings are not effective at improving document or code quality.

H2: Review meetings are an efficient way of increasing document or code quality.

H20: Review meetings are not an efficient way of increasing document or code quality.

C. Design

Quantitative and qualitative analysis.? One factor 2 treatment.

For our quantitative analysis we used a one factor two treatment design. The first treatment is the control treatment of dong no review meetings, while the second treatment is the execution of a review meeting. Since doing no review does not influence the subjects, each group was assigned to both treatments.

Subjects	No Review Meeting	Review Meeting
"SoPra" Group 1	x	x
"SoPra" Group 2	x	x
...	x	x

TABLE I
The one factor two treatment design used for our experiment.

D. Objects

The idea of our experiment was that we analyse the report lists that result out of the review meetings and compare them to the merged lists of reports from each individual reviewer.

E. Data collection Procedure

F. Analysis Procedure

G. Validity Procedure

V. Analysis

VI. Threats to Validity

A. Conclusion Validity

The threat level to conclusion validity of our experiment is rather high. This is due to the fact that some of our measurements could not be automatically calculated but instead had to be determined manually by the conductors. In order to reduce this threat, we decided to let three conductors determine the values independently and finally took the median as our final result.

Code quality definition?

B. Internal Validity

Due to the fact that the participants had to be informed about the experiment to give us their consent, they knew that some part of their work will be evaluated and thus might have been influenced in their behavior by the experiment, e.g. resulting in them making more efforts than they would have done otherwise.

C. Construct Validity

The construct validity between the treatment and the cause construct is a given, since they are identical, being the review meeting.

As for the validity between the outcome and the construct of the effect, ?

D. External Validity

Our study also contains external threats to validity. Since every group of students in the ”SoPra” has to solve the exact same task, all produces code or specifications should ideally be semantically equal and thus our results might not necessarily be generalizable to all kind of software systems.

Another external factor that threatens validity are the participants of the study. These are limited to students of the university Stuttgart and thus represent only a minor part of software engineers.

Lastly, the size of the ”SoPra” is very small, since it is only a six month project for three developers and thus is far off from realistic industrial projects.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank...

REFERENCES

[1] H. Kopka and P. W. Daly, *A Guide to LaTeX*, 3rd ed. Harlow, England: Addison-Wesley, 1999.