Inter-team retrospectives in scaled agile programs: An in-depth qualitative analysis at Ascent

Daniel Toegl, University of Antwerp / Antwerp Management School

Introduction & Research Question

We want to gain in-depth knowledge on the perceived value of inter-team retrospectives [1,2], their connection to intra-team retrospectives and their evolution over time at a custom software development agency.

RQ: What are perceived values of inter-team retrospectives for delivery teams within an agile setting?

Expected Conclusions

After a 6-month period, we expect to identify a well working inter-team retrospective set-up and ruleset that can be incorporated to commonly used scaled agile frameworks.

Limitation: The research is limited to 5-6 iterations as we expect to have reached a theoretical saturation point by then. [3]

Expected Results (Research in progress)

We expect to find evidence that supports findings from our previous quantitative experimental study, where we show that inter-team retrospectives have a measurable positive impact on the program/business output, now in a real-world setting and derive a framework for inter-team retrospectives in scaled agile programs.

- A stable and practicable set-up for inter-team retrospectives in practice.
- Seeing how topics raised in intra-team retrospectives are brought up in inter-team retrospectives. As part of this, the topics brought up might be more generic or generalized to address overarching topics relevant for multiple teams.

Methods and Data

We have chosen an interpretative embedded revelatory case study for the investigation, as it explores cause-effect relationships of retrospectives and/or how they evolve. [4, 5, 6].

By conducting semi-structured interviews after each inter-team retrospective[7] and in combination with reviewing sticky notes[8] from their retrospective meeting boards, we expect to understand how the team perceived each retrospective.

Data collection over 6 months:
- Structured sticky notes
- Semi-structured interviews with each member of an inter-team retrospective after each iteration.

Limitation: The unit of analysis is limited to the actual inter-team meeting participants.

Literature cited

[1] C. J. Stettina and L. Schoemaker. Reporting in agile portfolio management: routines, metrics and artefacts to maintain an effective oversight. *International Conference on Agile Software Development*, 199-215, 2018.
[2] T. Dingsoyr, M. Mikalsen, A. Solem, and K. Vestues. Learning in the large-an exploratory study of retrospectives in large-scale agile development. *International Conference on Agile Software Development*, 191-198, 2018a.
[3] G. Bowen. Naturalistic Inquiry and the Saturation Concept: A Research Note. *Qualitative Research 8* (1): 137–52, 2008.
[4] H. K. Klein and M. D. Myers. A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems. *MIS quarterly*, pages 67-93, 1999.
[5] P. Runeson and M. Höst. Guidelines for conducting and reporting case study research in software engineering. *Empirical software engineering*, 14(2):131-164, 2009. 21
[6] R. K. Yin. Case study research design and methods. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 30(1), 2015a.
[7] P. Diebold, et al. What do practitioners vary in using scrum? *Agile Processes in Software Engineering and Extreme Programming: 16th International Conference Proceedings* e, XP 2015, 2015.
[8] A. Fischel, K. Halskov. A survey of the usage of sticky notes. *Extended abstracts of the 2018 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems,* 2018.

Acknowledgments

Get in Touch!

E: daniel@toegl.at
LinkedIn: linkedin.com/in/dtoegl