Open Source Community Joining & Management

i290m Open Collaboration and Peer-Production Class[1]

School of Information,
UC Berkeley,
Berkeley, United States

Abstract. Here is the abstract

1 Introduction

Here is the introduction

2 Context

Here is the context

3 Background

Here is the Background

4 Methods

Survey Design Process To complement our qualitative understanding of the *joining process* we decided to design and run a survey. Each of us proposed a survey question and posted it on a Google Form [1]. We then categorized questions by assigning tags : communication, governance, contributions, social networks, joining (to be completed). One or more tags could be assigned to one question and has allowed to draw a bipartite network of relationships between questions (c.f. Figure, to be completed).

Once the first survey design was completed each of us took it. We debriefed the result in class and found several flaws that we described in a separate paragraph. However, the advantage of designing a survey in a collective way helped ensure that most questions would be relevant to most of us.

This is a starting point of course and in the future **this survey could be iteratively improved**

---

[1] `https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1KnkSkM3f_QBRQeYfUXpyXspSqavjcClKS2DoWAz1fyE/viewform`

4.1   Qualitative Reporting

Here is the qualitative reporting method based based on the assignments

4.2   Survey Design

Here is the survey methodology

5   Results

Here are the results

Funding and Response Tone When separating out the questions on funding, who responded and response tone we can see several interesting trends. While the question asked several different ways that people could be paid for their contributions, it can be simplified to a binary attribute of paid / unpaid. In most cases, there were a mix of funding but in this analysis all that mattered was if there was any financial incentives. Additionally the responses to How did the response read formed a binary attribute as well with all participants selecting either Peer or Teacher.

Though there isn't much data to go by, in funded organizations more people reported the response tone to their initial contribution read as being answered as peers rather than as teachers. Further exploration shows that unlike unfunded projects, in paid organizations it was rarely the project founder who responded but rather a senior project member. This might explain the presence of a more peer-to-peer response tone verse a pedagogical response tone.

6   Discussion

Here is the Discussion

Commentary on the Process of Writing This Report "Commentary on the process of writing this report: I'm lost. I can't see what others are writing and I have no perspective on how this paragraph will fit into the larger whole. Will it just fit? Will it be meaningful? Will it exist in a flow of thought? All of this makes me wonder how far we need to come with collaborative writing and coding tools. There needs to be a better vantage point of what others are doing and what needs to be done. GitHub provides some of this, but it's not in real time. Google docs is in real time, but it's uncontrolled chaos if 30 people are writing. What would a system in the middle look like?"

7   Conclusion

Here is the Conclusion