



# **WHY DO DEVELOPERS PARTICIPATE IN OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE PROJECTS?**

Version 1.02/2024.6.6

Lappeenranta–Lahti University of Technology LUT

Master's programme in Software Product Management and Business, Master's thesis

2024

Duc Thinh Tran

Examiners: Associate Professor D.Sc Antti Knutas

MSc. Daria Levaniuk

# Abstract

Lappeenranta–Lahti University of Technology LUT

LUT School of Engineering Science

Master's programme in Software Product Management and Business

Duc Thinh Tran

## **Why do developers participate in open source software projects?**

Version 1.02/2024.6.6

Master's thesis

2024

61 pages, 18 figures, 7 tables and 1 appendices

Examiners: Associate Professor D.Sc Antti Knutas and MSc. Daria Levaniuk

Keywords: open source software motivation, systematic literature review, software development, barriers, social impact

This thesis embarks on an in-depth exploration of the intricate landscape of open-source software development, with a particular emphasis on the multifaceted motivations that drive developers to contribute to these projects. Utilizing Kitchenham's framework as a guiding principle, a systematic literature review was conducted, meticulously examining existing research to uncover the diverse factors influencing developer engagement. By analyzing a carefully curated selection of 20 pertinent articles, this study delves into the social impact, challenges, and underlying motivations within the open-source software community. The findings aim to illuminate the complexities of developer behavior in open-source projects, identify gaps in existing theoretical frameworks, and provide additional insight for future research in this dynamic and ever-evolving field.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deeply thanks to my thesis supervisor, Associate Professor Antti Knutas, for his support and counsel throughout this project. His expertise in civic technology software engineering was instrumental in shaping my research and keeping me focused. I especially appreciate his insightful feedback.

I am particularly grateful to my classmates, especially Nan Yang and Roshan Devullapalli, for their invaluable co-operation and encouragement throughout this master program. Their willingness to brainstorm ideas and provide encouragement proved to be a tremendous help, especially during the thesis development stage. Our experience as teammates in previous courses fostered a strong foundation for collaboration, making this journey all the more rewarding.

My heartfelt thanks to my friends in Lahti and Helsinki for their incredible support during my time in Finland.

Last I would also like to express the love to my family, my relatives and especially my mother for her unwavering support. Her constant encouragement, especially during challenging moments, motivated me to persevere and finish my thesis. I am truly fortunate to have her in my life.

Despite my commitment, I'm aware that this project is still inadequate and contains inevitable errors. I would like to receive feedback from lecturers in order to improve further.

*Duc Thinh Tran*

*Lahti, May 2024*

## Acronyms

**ACM** Association for Computing Machinery

**AI** Artificial Intelligence

**ASF** Apache Software Foundation

**CGI** Common Gateway Interface

**DEC** Digital Equipment Corporation

**GPL** General Public License

**HTTP** Hypertext Transfer Protocol

**IEEE** Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

**NCSA** National Center for Supercomputing Applications

**OSS** Open-source software

**PR** Pull Requests

**SLR** Systematic Literature Review

**TeX** Typesetting Engine

**UNIX** Uniplexed Information and Computing Service

## Table of contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Abstract   |    |
| Acknowledgements   |    |
| Symbols and abbreviations  |    |
| Table of contents  | 5  |
| Lists of figures and tables (optional)   | 7  |
| 1 Introduction   | 9  |
| 1.1 Objectives . . . . .   | 10 |
| 1.2 Motivation . . . . .   | 10 |
| 2 Research questions   | 12 |
| 2.1 What are the primary motivations driving developers to participate in open-source software projects? . . . . .   | 12 |
| 2.2 To what extent do social dynamics, such as community interactions and networking opportunities, impact developer participation in open-source software projects? . . . . . | 12 |
| 2.3 What barriers or challenges do developers encounter when participating in open-source software projects? . . . . .   | 13 |
| 3 Background   | 14 |
| 3.1 Origins and Early Practices . . . . .  | 15 |
| 3.2 Defining Open Source . . . . .   | 16 |
| 3.3 Open Source Project . . . . .  | 17 |
| 3.4 Ownership and Licensing . . . . .  | 18 |
| 3.5 Morden adoption and future . . . . .   | 19 |
| 4 Research methods   | 22 |
| 4.1 Systematic Literature Review . . . . .   | 22 |
| 4.1.1 Systematic Literature Review definition . . . . .  | 22 |
| 4.1.2 Systematic Literature Review approach . . . . .  | 23 |
| 5 Systematic Literature Review   | 24 |
| 5.1 Review planning . . . . .  | 25 |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 5.1.1 | Search criteria . . . . .  | 25 |
| 5.1.2 | Data source . . . . .  | 26 |
| 5.1.3 | Inclusion and exclusion criteria . . . . .                                 | 26 |
| 5.1.4 | Study selection . . . . .  | 27 |
| 5.2   | Review conducting . . . . .  | 27 |
| 5.2.1 | Extract the data . . . . .   | 27 |
| 5.2.2 | Synthesis . . . . .  | 29 |
| 6     | Review reporting   | 31 |
| 6.1   | RQ1: Primary motivation for developers contributing in open source . . . . | 32 |
| 6.1.1 | Intrinsic motivations . . . . .  | 34 |
| 6.1.2 | Extrinsic motivations . . . . .  | 38 |
| 6.2   | RQ2: Impact of social dynamics . . . . .                                   | 43 |
| 6.2.1 | Community interaction . . . . .  | 43 |
| 6.2.2 | Networking opportunities . . . . .   | 44 |
| 6.2.3 | Community culture and support . . . . .                                    | 45 |
| 6.3   | RQ3: Contribution barriers . . . . .                                       | 47 |
| 6.3.1 | Technical challenges . . . . .   | 48 |
| 6.3.2 | Social challenges . . . . .  | 50 |
| 6.3.3 | Process challenges . . . . .   | 51 |
| 7     | Conclusion   | 54 |
| 7.1   | Finding . . . . .  | 54 |
| 7.2   | Implications . . . . .   | 55 |
| 7.3   | Limitations . . . . .  | 55 |
| 7.4   | Future work . . . . .  | 56 |
|       | References   | 58 |
|       | Appendices   |    |
|       | Appendix 1 Selected articles and papers for SLR                            |    |

## List of Figures

- 1 A quick look on motivations for contributing to open-source projects (Belshaw, 2020)
- 2 OSI's Open Source Definition (Häußge, n.d.)
- 3 How How Big Tech Contributes to Open Source (Statista, 2021)
- 4 Percentage of External Contributors
- 5 FreeCodeCamp's Open Source Contribution
- 6 Systematic Literature Review process (Kitchenham, 2004)
- 7 Process of selecting papers for SLR
- 8 Collaboration relationship between authors of selected papers for SLR
- 9 Number of articles mentioning each motivation
- 10 As a proportion of all contributors to OSS, developers by motivation class (Ghosh et al., 2002)
- 11 How often paid and volunteer developers contribute to Rust project (Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024)
- 12 How open-source software systems and communities grow together (Ye & Kishida, 2003)
- 13 A screenshot of the interface of the OpenRank Leaderboard in May, 2024
- 14 Barriers to contributing to open-source software projects
- 15 The background of the 223 developers from Apache Software Foundation (ASF) (Guizani et al., 2021)
- 16 Time required to learn skills particular to a project (Bird et al., 2007)
- 17 Social barriers from Steinmacher's study (Steinmacher, M. Gerosa, et al., 2019)
- 18 Challenges faced by developers contributing to ASF projects (Guizani et al., 2021)

## List of Tables

- 1 Open Source Software Timeline (Alexander Hars, 2002)
- 2 Specific categories of search terms
- 3 Initial search results from scientific databases
- 4 Selected papers for SLR
- 5 Data synthesis
- 6 Systematic map of selected papers
- 7 Articles and papers selected for SLR.

**Declaration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) usage**

I acknowledge that Google Gemini, a language model, helped enhance the writing quality of this thesis. However, the final document and its content are original and not AI-generated. The model was used to refine and improve the text, rather than create it.



# 1 Introduction

Open-source software has emerged as a revolutionary force in the quickly changing field of software development today (Fitzgerald, 2006). Because of its collaborative approach, which lowers obstacles to entry, fosters a worldwide community of developers, and makes code available, it fosters creativity.

The widespread adoption of the internet created a natural environment for open-source collaboration and distribution (Schweik & English, 2012). Additionally, the emergence of cloud computing and agile methodologies has further streamlined the development process, empowering developers to build and deploy open-source solutions with unprecedented speed and flexibility (Raj, Venkatesh & Amirtharajan, 2013).

Moreover, the exponential growth of data highlights the need for solutions capable of handling vast amounts of information (Berman, 2013). This need drives the development of fields such as big data and data science, which often rely heavily on open-source tools and libraries.

The software landscape has become more inclusive due to open source software's versatility and accessibility. It provides a worthwhile substitute for proprietary solutions, especially for low-resource people, startups, and organizations. Because open-source development is collaborative, it frequently fosters quick innovation and the production of reliable, secure, and ever-improving software solutions.

While the benefits of open-source software are widely recognized – from heightened security and community collaboration to cost savings and adaptability – the motivations behind developers' contributions often remain in the shadows. This lack of understanding obscures the reasons why individuals and organizations invest their time and expertise in creating and sustaining open-source software, which powers much of our digital landscape.

The figure 1 provides a snapshot of the motivations that drive developers to contribute to open-source projects. However, this is merely a surface-level view. This thesis aims to conduct a more in-depth exploration of the complex and varied motivations that inspire developers to participate in the open-source community.

It is important to look at this subject for a number of reasons. Gaining an understanding of the motives of developers can help us guarantee the long-term viability of open-source initiatives. Furthermore, companies and organizations hoping to attract top talent within the open-source space would benefit from knowing what drives developer participation within




Figure 1: A quick look on motivations for contributing to open-source projects (Belshaw, 2020)

these communities. Uncovering these motivations can also shed light on how open-source projects function, how collaboration occurs, and how knowledge is shared and developed.

## 1.1 Objectives

This research project ventures beyond the surface of open-source software development, delving into the intricate web of motivations that drives developers within this collaborative community. By employing a multifaceted approach that combines empirical analysis with in-depth qualitative inquiries, the study seeks to illuminate the underlying forces that propel developers to contribute. These forces encompass not only the tangible incentives but also the value systems and socio-technical factors that influence their engagement. Ultimately, this investigation aims to provide a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics that shape the ever-evolving landscape of modern software development, with a specific focus on the crucial role played by open-source communities.

## 1.2 Motivation

As a former software engineer engrossed in the dynamic world of software development, my daily experience was enriched by the constant use of open-source software. From leveraging fundamental frameworks like ReactJS from Facebook to seamlessly integrating libraries and packages sourced from NPM, open-source solutions became an indispensable aspect of my workflow. Their ubiquitous presence became so ingrained in my routine that their influence often went unnoticed, seamlessly woven into the fabric of my daily tasks. However, as I

transition into the realm of program software product management, I find myself drawn to exploring a new frontier – one that encompasses not only the technical aspects but also delves into the world of human psychology. It is this intersection of technology and human behavior that piques my curiosity and drives my desire to embark on this research endeavor.

Through this thesis, I aspire to investigate the nuanced interplay between open-source software adoption and the human factors influencing developer behavior and decision-making processes. By unraveling these complexities, I aim to contribute to a deeper understanding of how human elements shape the adoption, utilization, and evolution of open-source software, ultimately informing more effective software product management strategies.

## 2 Research questions

This thesis seeks to explain the factors influencing developer participation in open-source projects. To achieve this, the study will delve into three key areas. It will first examine the main reasons behind developers contributing their time and skills to cooperative open-source projects. Second, the research will investigate the impact of social dynamics within these communities. This includes examining how interactions with other developers and potential networking opportunities influence a developer's decision to participate and their ongoing engagement. I would like to approach these two questions using a Systematic Literature Review methodology, which will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.1.

In the end, the research will pinpoint the obstacles and difficulties that developers face while collaborating on open-source projects. This thesis attempts to offer a thorough grasp of the dynamics influencing developer engagement in the open-source scene by tackling these complex elements.

### 2.1 What are the primary motivations driving developers to participate in open-source software projects?

The purpose of this inquiry is to learn more about the fundamental motivations behind developers' decisions to give their time, abilities, and knowledge to open, publicly available collaborative software development projects. The study intends to identify the wide variety of characteristics that encourage developers to work on open-source projects by investigating this subject. These incentives might come from a mix of internal and external sources and can differ greatly amongst people.

### 2.2 To what extent do social dynamics, such as community interactions and networking opportunities, impact developer participation in open-source software projects?

Open-source software thrives on the contributions of volunteer developers. While individual motivations to participate have been explored, a gap exists in understanding how the social environment itself fosters engagement. The second question investigates the impact of social dynamics within open-source projects. Specifically, it examines how interactions within the community and opportunities to build professional networks influence the level of developer participation. By studying these dynamics, the study aims to illuminate how open-source communities can be nurtured to maximize developer engagement and project success.

### 2.3 What barriers or challenges do developers encounter when participating in open-source software projects?

Last, a crucial aspect of this research involves understanding the roadblocks developers encounter when contributing to open-source projects. This includes technical hurdles like complex codebases, time constraints, and communication challenges within geographically dispersed communities. Additionally, factors like unclear project direction and unfamiliarity with open-source etiquette can hinder participation. The challenges faced by developers can greatly influence their willingness to participate in open-source projects. To create a more welcoming and inclusive community, these obstacles must be tackled head-on.

### 3 Background

Open-source software (OSS) has become a cornerstone of modern software development. Defined as software freely available for use, modification, and distribution, the open-source movement has experienced a surge in popularity due to its collaborative development model and mutual benefits for both users and developers. Table 1 outlines key milestones in the evolution of open-source software.

| Year        | Event  |
|-------------|--|
| 1950s-1960s | Source code for software is freely shared in Association for Computing Machinery (ACM)'s Algorithms Section, IBM and Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) user organizations, etc.                      |
| 1969        | Ken Thompson is the author of the original Uniplexed Information and Computing Service (UNIX) version. The source code for it was made available for free throughout the 1970s.                        |
| 1978        | Donald Knuth (Stanford) releases Typesetting Engine (TeX) as free software.  |
| 1979        | UC Berkeley develops BSD, a variant of UNIX, after AT&T commercializes it. Student Eric Allmann creates software for ARPANET communication, which later becomes Sendmail.                              |
| 1983        | In addition to founding the Free Software Foundation, Richard Stallmann publishes the GNU Manifesto, which advocates for free software.  |
| 1986        | The flexible programming language Perl (Practical Extraction and Report Language), developed by Larry Wall, is used to write Common Gateway Interface (CGI) scripts.                                   |
| 1987        | Minix is a UNIX version released by developer Andrew Tanenbaum for PC, Mac, Amiga, and Atari ST. The whole source code is included.  |
| 1991        | In a Minix newsgroup, Linus Torvalds releases version 0.02 of a new UNIX variation he names Linux.   |
| 1993        | FreeBSD 1.0 is made available. It has networking, virtual memory, task switching, and big filenames; it is based on BSD Unix. Debian Linux is a brand-new Linux distribution developed by Ian Murdock. |

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1994 | Red Hat Linux is formed by Marc Ewing. It takes the lead in Linux distribution quite rapidly.  |
| 1995 | Based on HTTPd 1.3 from the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA) and a set of patch files, the Apache Group creates a new Web server called Apache. It is now the most used Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server. |
| 1998 | Netscape releases Communicator 5.0 source code (Mozilla) and major software manufacturers announce support for Linux. Sun releases Java 2 source code.   |
| 1999 | It is expected that 7.5 million people use Linux.  |
| 2000 | Software businesses such as Novell and Real also provide Linux-compatible versions of their products.  |
| 2008 | GitHub is launched, providing a platform for hosting and collaborating on open-source projects.  |
| 2013 | Facebook releases the React - a front-end JavaScript library as open source.   |
| 2014 | Microsoft publishes the .NET Framework and contributing to various open-source projects  |
| 2015 | Google releases TensorFlow, an open-source machine learning framework.   |
| 2021 | An estimated 67 million people use Linux worldwide. Linux is used by more than 96% of the top 1 million web servers.   |

Table 1: Open Source Software Timeline (Alexander Hars, 2002)

### 3.1 Origins and Early Practices

Open source software has its roots in the early years of computers, when cooperation and sharing were common practices. Code was openly shared and altered by programmers in academic environments, motivated by a desire to enhance the technology they utilized. However, as software began to be commercialized, this openness clashed with the rise of proprietary software models. Restrictions on use and a lack of transparency led to frustration

among many programmers, sparking the desire for an alternative.

In 1983, Richard Stallman's launch of the GNU Project became a catalyst for the modern open source movement (DiBona & Ockman, 1999). This ambitious initiative aimed to create a completely free operating system built on the principles of software freedom. Stallman's advocacy for free redistribution, user modification rights, and transparent development laid the philosophical foundation for the open source movement.

Early open source projects relied heavily on collaborative development through online communities of programmers. This distributed model allowed for efficient bug fixing, rapid development, and fostered knowledge exchange. Moreover, the creation of licenses like the GNU General Public License (GPL) was crucial. These licenses protected open source freedoms, ensuring that software and any modifications made to it would remain accessible to all (License, 1989).

Several notable projects defined the early era of open source software. Linus Torvalds' creation of the Linux kernel in 1991 became the poster child for successful open source development, eventually forming the heart of countless operating systems. Additionally, the GNU Project provided essential tools, the Apache Web Server became the dominant force powering the internet, and BIND played a critical role in the internet's infrastructure. These landmark projects proved the viability and potential of the open source model.

### 3.2 Defining Open Source

There is debate about what define open source software. It sparks debate between those who see it as synonymous with "free software" and those who view "open source" as a distinct approach (Fuggetta, 2003).

"Free software", a term stemming from the GNU project, prioritizes user freedoms over cost. At its core, free software grants users the right to use, share, study, modify, and even improve software without restrictions (*What is free software?* n.d.). Access to the source code is vital, as it is what empowers users to exercise these freedoms.

The term "open source" was introduced later than "free software." While both aim to describe software with accessible source code, there are key philosophical differences. The "open source" term was partly motivated by a desire for a less politically charged, business-friendly label, though its official definition aligns closely with "free software". Stallman argues that the everyday interpretation of "open source" merely denotes visibility of the source code, not the full freedoms of free software (Stallman, n.d.). This ambiguity allows the term to be applied to semi-free or even proprietary software, diluting its meaning.



Open source projects come in a variety of shapes and sizes, there are two primary types: open source software and open source content (Oreg & Nov, 2008). Code that is openly accessible for anyone to view, alter, and distribute is referred to as open source software. This cooperative strategy encourages creativity and quick progress. On the other side, open source content includes a greater variety of creative elements, including artistic creations, scientific data, and educational tools. Similar to software, licensing for open source content allow users to access, distribute, and alter the information within certain bounds.

### 3.3 Open Source Project

An open-source project is a cooperative effort in which the public is given unrestricted access to the source code of a software program or application. This indicates that, in accordance with the conditions of the project's license, anybody may access, alter, and distribute the code. Open-source initiatives frequently promote openness, community-driven development, and cross-disciplinary developer cooperation.

One of the most common used definitions of open source comes from the Open Source Initiative (OSI), which defines open source software as having a license that meets the following criteria in the figure 2.




Figure 2: OSI's Open Source Definition (Häußge, n.d.)

Among the most well-known and significant OSS projects are:

- **Linux:** A very well-liked and adaptable kernel for operating systems. Numerous gadgets, including smartphones, embedded systems, servers, and supercomputers, are powered by Linux. It is renowned for its security, stability, and customizability (Fink, 2003).

- Git: A widely-used system that helps developers manage and track changes to their code. It has become the preferred tool in software development, enabling collaboration and allowing developers to explore different versions of their project without affecting the main codebase (Loeliger & McCullough, 2012).
- Apache HTTP Server: A very popular software used to deliver web content. It powers a large number of websites and is known for being dependable, adaptable, and feature-rich (Fielding & Kaiser, 1997).
- Python: A user-friendly programming language designed for clarity and simplicity. It is widely used in various fields such as data science, web development, machine learning, and system administration. (Srinath, 2017).
- TensorFlow: A free, open-source framework designed to make machine learning accessible. It offers a wide range of tools, libraries, and a supportive community, so both researchers and developers can create and use powerful ML applications (Developers, 2022).

### 3.4 Ownership and Licensing

The concept of ownership within the open-source software landscape deviates from the traditional models of individual or corporate proprietorship. While thousands of developers might contribute to a single open-source project, the idea of ownership is more accurately framed in terms of rights, intellectual property, and copyright (Greiler, Herzig & Czerwonka, 2015). In this context, it's vital to understand the pivotal role of open-source licenses.

In the world of software, open-source licenses reign supreme. The MIT License offers broad permissions for use, modification, and distribution, making it incredibly developer-friendly (Saltzer, 2020). Similarly, the Apache License 2.0 is permissive and emphasizes providing clear copyright and patent notices (Sinclair, 2010). For those seeking “copyleft” protection, ensuring that derived works stay open-source, the GNU GPL is a common choice (License, 1989).

Licenses establish the boundaries and freedoms granted to users and contributors in utilizing and modifying open-source software (Laurent, 2004). These licenses come in a variety of forms, each with its own set of rules and restrictions. Some licenses, for example, expressly prohibit the sale of the original software or its derivative versions (Madison, 2003). This is done to safeguard the open-source ethos and prevent commercial exploitation that may stifle community-driven development.

In sum, understanding the intricate interplay of ownership and licensing is essential for nav-

igating the open-source ecosystem. While traditional notions of ownership take a backseat, the principles of intellectual property, copyright, and the specific terms of open-source licenses dictate the rights and responsibilities of all those who interact with this collaborative software model.

### 3.5 Morden adoption and future

OSS is now a major part of software development, and its impact is expected to increase in the future. As the community behind it grows and tackles its problems, I can look forward to even more creative and effective software created through collaboration.

Although open source has been around since the 1960s, when businesses like IBM began including free software with their first mainframe systems (Moreno & Muffatto, 2006), its ubiquity has grown dramatically in the last few years. Even though tech behemoths like Google, Apple, and Microsoft rule the business world (Jacobides, 2020), these businesses are essential to the open-source ecosystem as well, especially with donations made to sites like GitHub.

The substantial impact of open source is exemplified by EU-based companies, which invested an estimated €1 billion in OSS in 2018. This investment yielded a significant return for the European economy, with an estimated contribution ranging from €65 to €95 billion (Blind et al., 2021).

Figure 3 underscores the active participation of tech leaders in the open-source movement. In 2020 alone, 5,709 Google employees submitted over ten commits to GitHub’s public code repository. This was closely followed by contributions from Microsoft, Red Hat, IBM, and others...

Current observations indicate a heightened workload for maintainers of open-source projects. Notably, the majority of contributions from external developers primarily consist of non-code based interactions such as comments, questions, issue reports, and pull request reviews. In contrast, developers employed by organizations continue to contribute code to their respective company’s projects at a significantly higher rate than external contributors. The figure 4 illustrates this trend, showing that most contributions are made by external developers, which did not belong to the organization that owns the repository.

Analysis of successful commercially-backed open-source projects on GitHub reveals that salaried developers employed by the companies behind these projects regularly contribute to them. This suggests that companies foster the most active and engaged communities when their developers actively participate as members of those communities, rather than simply




Figure 3: How How Big Tech Contributes to Open Source (Statista, 2021)

releasing code under an open-source license.

The open-source movement's trajectory promises transformative impacts across industries, fueled by increasing collaboration, transparency, and knowledge sharing within its expanding community. This trajectory indicates the emergence of groundbreaking technologies, tools, and solutions that will serve the interests of both users and developers, underscoring the potential of open source to revolutionize sectors and drive innovation on a global scale.




Figure 4: Percentage of External Contributors

April 12, 2024 – May 12, 2024

Period: 1 month ▾




Figure 5: FreeCodeCamp's Open Source Contribution

## 4 Research methods

This thesis delves into the complex motivations behind developer participation in open-source projects by combining a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) and an in-depth case study. The literature review establishes a robust foundation of knowledge, while the case study illuminates the nuanced social interactions and experiential factors shaping individual developers' decisions to contribute.

### 4.1 Systematic Literature Review

SLR offers a disciplined research method that promotes a clear, targeted investigation through a well-defined question. This study employs the SLR methodology as outlined by Kitchenham (2004), ensuring a reliable and unbiased review.

#### 4.1.1 Systematic Literature Review definition

SLR is a meticulously planned research approach aiming to identify, evaluate, and synthesize all available evidence related to a clearly defined research question (Kitchenham, 2004). It employs a transparent, reproducible protocol to minimize bias, emphasizing comprehensiveness and critical appraisal of included studies.

The methodology consists of three main phases. First, in the planning phase, researchers must clearly define the research questions that guide the entire review. A detailed review protocol should then be developed, outlining the search strategy (databases, search terms), study selection criteria (e.g., publication types and dates), quality assessment methods, data extraction plans, and the strategy for synthesizing the findings.

The second phase involves conducting the review. This includes identifying research using the search strategy, selecting studies based on the eligibility criteria, critically evaluating study quality, extracting the relevant data, and finally, synthesizing that data using techniques like meta-analysis or thematic analysis.

Finally, the reporting phase focuses on transparently documenting the entire SLR process for reproducibility and critical assessment. Researchers must present the results in a clear manner, addressing the initial research questions and their implications, while also acknowledging any limitations within the review process.

#### 4.1.2 Systematic Literature Review approach

Open source software development presents a unique model of collaboration where developers voluntarily contribute their time and expertise. Unlike traditional software engineering environments, motivations in open source extend beyond direct financial compensation. Researchers have investigated these motivations from various perspectives, including psychological, economic, and social factors. This complex landscape can lead to potentially varied interpretations of what drives participation.

The SLR will lay the groundwork for my thesis by providing a thorough understanding of current research on open source developer motivations. Based on the SLR findings, I will be able to identify under-investigated areas or potential gaps in the theoretical frameworks used to explain developer behavior.

## 5 Systematic Literature Review

Guided by Kitchenham's SLR framework, this study carefully addressed review planning (defining research questions, developing a protocol), conducting (literature search, study selection, data extraction and quality assessment), and reporting (Kitchenham, 2004).




Figure 6: Systematic Literature Review process (Kitchenham, 2004)

The figure 6 shows an overview of my work to execute a systematic literature review. I meticulously outlined a protocol and defined my overarching research questions 1 and 2. A comprehensive search strategy was then established to pinpoint pertinent articles within electronic databases relevant to the field of open source software motivation. Stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria ensured the selection of methodically sound studies. Following the search, I carefully screened titles and abstracts of retrieved database articles. Studies initially deemed relevant underwent a thorough full-text analysis. This systematic review will culminate in a detailed report encompassing search strategies, selection criteria, the number of articles evaluated at each stage, and an overarching synthesis of the findings.



## 5.1 Review planning

In chapter 2, I explored the process of defining a research question. Here, I will concentrate on developing a protocol for the initial review planning phase of a SLR. While numerous scientific databases exist online, selecting the most suitable ones for evidence synthesis can be challenging (Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2020). This section will offer guidance on database selection and explain the rationale behind different choices.

### 5.1.1 Search criteria

Building on a previous study from Chua, Ying Zhang, et al. (2020), I established inclusion criteria to ensure the selected articles addressed my research questions and utilized strong methodologies:

- Research articles and conference papers, peer-reviewed and available through major academic search platforms like Google Scholar, Springer, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), ACM, Science Direct.
- Restriction to English-language sources.
- Disciplines in Computer Science, Software Engineering
- Publication date: from 2000 to 2024.
- Specific search terms (“open source” OR “open source software”) AND (“motivation” OR “contribution challenges” OR “social dynamics impact” OR “interest” OR “contribution barriers”) within titles or descriptions.
- Prioritization of publications from leading information systems conferences and journals. Ex: ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, Journal of Systems and Software,...

These search terms were employed to address the three research questions which are categorized in the table 2.

| Category | Search terms                                   |
|----------|--|
| 1        | OSS motivation and all synonyms                |
| 2        | Social dynamics impact on OSS and all synonyms |
| 3        | Contribution barriers of OSS and all synonyms  |

Table 2: Specific categories of search terms

### 5.1.2 Data source

To identify relevant literature, I executed the search strings across multiple databases. Each database was queried with the complete set of search strings, yielding varying results. In some instances, identical search strings produced an overabundance of results, while in others, they returned no results. Databases with no results were excluded from further analysis. The selected databases and their corresponding result counts are presented in the following table 3.

| Database       | Category 1      | Category 2     | Category 3      |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Google Scholar | 244 000 results | 17 800 results | 175 100 results |
| Springer       | 623 results     | 161 results    | 327 results     |
| IEEE           | 396 results     | 68 results     | 48 results      |
| Science Direct | 4 200 results   | 97 results     | 15 results      |

Table 3: Initial search results from scientific databases

### 5.1.3 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

To maintain a focused and methodologically review, I used inclusion and exclusion criteria to pinpoint studies aligned with my research questions. These criteria served as a consistent filter for all potential sources. The specific criteria are outlined below, and they were applied to every study retrieved from the selected databases.

#### Inclusion:

- Accessible: The research paper must be accessible and downloadable either through LUT Academic Library or online database.
- Peer-Reviewed: The paper should be published in a reputable, peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings. This ensures the quality and credibility of the research.
- Relevant to research questions: The paper must directly address the specific research questions at hand.
- Methodology transparency: The reasearch and data collection methodologies must be metioned.

#### Exclusion:

- Irrelevant content: Exclude papers that deviate significantly from my research questions or lack a clear connection to the area of study.
- Older papers (released before 2000) ought to be disregarded.

- Papers having fewer than four pages were removed.
- Papers cannot be accessed
- Papers were not written in English
- Papers topic were about open source but in hardware, economy, environment,... but not software

#### 5.1.4 Study selection

A further procedures were taken for the final paper selection after applying the inclusion/exclusion criteria to each of the resultant papers.

- Review the title, keyword, abstract, description for filtering
- Excluding duplicated studies.
- Ranking research papers by the number of times they've been cited and relevant to search term by search engine.

The initial search across various databases yielded approximately 500,000 potentially relevant papers. Due to resource constraints, the review process was limited to 50 papers per database. Following the application of inclusion and exclusion criteria, along with further selection procedures, a final set of 20 relevant and suitable articles was identified for this SLR. These papers are listed in table 4, with full details provided in the Appendix 1. The paper selection process is displayed in the figure 7

The figure 8 depicts the collaboration network between authors of 20 selected papers for a systematic literature review on open-source software motivation, social impact, and challenges. The circles represent authors, and the connecting lines indicate co-authorship on a paper. The size of a circle corresponds to the number of papers an author has co-authored within the dataset. Steinmacher and Igor appears to be the most prolific author in this dataset, having co-authored papers with several other researchers.

## 5.2 Review conducting

### 5.2.1 Extract the data

An essential stage in an SLR is data extraction. It entails the meticulous collection of precise and pertinent data from the research articles that I have selected for the review. Finding important data points that support the research questions is the first step in this procedure, which also involves methodically arranging the data to make analysis and synthesis of the results easier. The information that will be taken from each paper is as follows:




Figure 7: Process of selecting papers for SLR

- Title
- Abstract
- Authors
- Publication date
- Database
- Keyword
- Research method
- Data collection method
- Answers to research questions
- Conclusion

| Publisher               | Number of articles | Authors   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Elsevier                | 6                  | Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder (2007); Choi & Pruett (2015); Li, Tan & Teo (2012); Oreg & Nov (2008); Steinmacher, Silva, Gerosa & Redmiles (2015); Wu, Gerlach & Young (2007) |
| AISNET                  | 1                  | Ke & Zhang, P. (2008)   |
| IEEE                    | 3                  | Ye & Kishida (2003); Gerosa, Wiese, Trinkenreich, Link, Robles, Treude & Sarma (2021); Zhang, Yuxia (2024)  |
| ResearchGate            | 1                  | Zhao, Shengyu (2024)  |
| Springer                | 3                  | Steinmacher, Conte, Gerosa & Redmiles (2019); Fershtman & Gandal (2007); Hannemann & Klamma (2013) ; Hannemann & Klamma (2013)  |
| ACM                     | 3                  | Steinmacher, Conte, Gerosa & Redmiles (2015); Guizani, Chatterjee, Trinkenreich, May, Noa-Guevara, Russell & Sarma (2021) ; Hannebauer & Gruhn (2017)                       |
| Informa                 | 1                  | Roberts, Hann & Slaughter (2006)  |
| Taylor & Francis Online | 1                  | Alexander Hars (2002)   |
| EASST                   | 1                  | Freeman (2007)  |

Table 4: Selected papers for SLR

### 5.2.2 Synthesis

To systematically analyze the extracted data, I formed two distinct groups (see Table 5) based on their focus:

- Group 1: addressing interrelated research questions: This group delves into both research questions 1 and 2. Interestingly, a significant portion of papers addressing question 1 also provide answers to question 2. This overlap suggests a potential relationship between these two research questions. Group 1 comprises a total of 12 carefully selected papers.
- Group 2: exclusive focus on research question 3: This group offers a concentrated exploration of research question 3, without addressing the other research areas. Group 2 contains a total of 5 papers, ensuring a targeted examination of this specific question.




Figure 8: Collaboration relationship between authors of selected papers for SLR

| Research question | Article ID   |
|-------------------|--|
| 1                 | A05, A06 , A08 , A09, A10, A11, A12, A13, A15, A16, A17, A18 |
| 2                 | A05, A06, A07, A09, A10, A12, A13, A16, A17, A18, A19, A20   |
| 3                 | A01, A02, A03, A04, A14                                      |

Table 5: Data synthesis

## 6 Review reporting

The selection process resulted in 20 papers, which were categorized using Wieringa's classification scheme (Wieringa et al., 2006). The following categories were relevant to this study:

- Evaluation Research: Practical implementation and assessment of techniques or solutions, with a focus on investigating the outcomes.
- Validation Research: Examination of novel techniques in a controlled environment, typically a laboratory setting, before practical implementation.
- Solution Proposal: Presentation of a solution to a problem, highlighting its advantages, with a higher level of abstraction than validation research.
- Philosophical Paper: Introduction of a new perspective on existing concepts by structuring the field through a taxonomy or framework.
- Experience Paper: Narration of the author's personal experience, detailing what happened and how it occurred in practice.
- Opinion Paper: Expression of the author's personal viewpoint on a specific issue, without relying on related work or research methodologies.

The types of contributions were categorized as follows:

- Model: Introduction of a new model or framework to address a specific problem.
- Method: Presentation of a new method or technique to solve a problem.
- Metric: Introduction of a new metric or evaluation criterion to assess the performance of a system or solution.
- Process: Description of a new process or workflow to improve efficiency or productivity.
- Tool: Introduction of a new tool or software application to facilitate a specific task or process.

Here is a systematic map of the selected papers, categorized by research type, contribution type and research question:

The table 6 presents a breakdown of research on various aspects of open-source software motivation, categorized by research methodology. The primary areas of interest are the factors motivating developers, the influence of social dynamics, and the obstacles to contribution. A significant majority of the studies (16 out of 20) employed evaluation research methods,

primarily contributing models and methods to analyze these topics. While a few studies proposed solutions (3) or aimed to validate existing research (1), the emphasis on evaluation research indicates a strong focus on understanding and assessing the current landscape of open-source contributions.

|                          | Evaluation Research  | Solution Proposal | Validation Research | Total |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Motivation of developers | Model: P05, P09, P10, P13, P15, P16, P17, P18. Method: P08, P11, P12 | Process: P06      |                     | 12    |
| Social dynamics impact   | Model: P20. Metric: P07  |                   | Metric: P19         | 3     |
| Contribution barriers    | Model: P01, P04, P14   | Model: P02, P03   |                     | 5     |
| Total                    | 16   | 3                 | 1                   | 20    |

Table 6: Systematic map of selected papers

### 6.1 RQ1: Primary motivation for developers contributing in open source

The primary aim of this research is to uncover the reasons why developers participate in OSS projects. Each study chosen for this analysis was examined for any empirically identified or assessed motivations, such as career advancement, skill development, altruism, or enjoyment. By understanding these motivations, I hope to gain insights into what drives individuals to contribute to OSS projects and how this knowledge can be used to foster greater participation and collaboration in the future.

A visual depiction of the quantity of published articles on the different incentives that encourage developers to contribute to open source software projects can be seen in the chart 9. The amount of articles devoted to each motivation is shown on the x-axis, while the motivations are grouped along the y-axis.

The data reveals a diverse range of motivations, with social factors emerging as prominent drivers of participation. The most extensively researched motivations, Signaling/Recognition (11 articles) and Play Value (10 articles), highlight the importance of social recognition and the inherent enjoyment developers derive from contributing to OSS projects. Personal Interest, Altruism and Ideology, and Learning also receive significant attention in the literature,



with 8 articles dedicated to each. These motivations underscore the multifaceted nature of developer engagement, encompassing personal passions, a desire to contribute to the greater good, and the pursuit of knowledge and skill development.

Conversely, the least explored motivations are Role Transformation and Improving Software Quality, with only 2 articles each. This disparity suggests that while the existing literature acknowledges the potential impact of these motivations, they remain relatively understudied compared to social factors.

The diversity of motivations highlighted in the chart underscores the complexity of the open-source community. It is evident that developers are driven by a combination of social, personal, ideological, and career-oriented factors. This nuanced understanding is crucial for organizations and communities seeking to attract and retain developers. Tailored strategies that address the diverse motivations of developers are essential for fostering a thriving and sustainable open-source ecosystem.

Moreover, the chart reveals the need for further research into less-explored motivations, such as Role Transformation and Improving Software Quality. A deeper understanding of these motivations could provide valuable insights into how to incentivize contributions that directly enhance the quality and impact of OSS projects.




Figure 9: Number of articles mentioning each motivation

### 6.1.1 Intrinsic motivations

My exploration of developer motivation in open-source software projects begins with intrinsic motivations, the internal drivers that fuel participation for personal satisfaction rather than external rewards. This encompasses a broad spectrum of factors, including: play value, the inherent enjoyment derived from the coding process; community engagement, the sense of belonging and collaboration found within OSS projects; learning, the opportunity to develop new skills and expand technical knowledge; personal interest, the desire to work on projects that align with individual passions; altruism and ideology, the belief in contributing to a greater good and supporting the open-source philosophy; need for autonomy, the freedom to work independently and creatively; and reciprocity/introjected regulation, the desire to contribute back to the community and maintain a sense of personal responsibility for the project's success. I will delve deeper into each of these intrinsic motivations in the following sections, examining their unique influence on developer behavior within the OSS landscape.

#### 1. Play value

In contrast to traditional software development, which often prioritizes external rewards like monetary compensation and career advancement, OSS projects offer a unique space where play value emerges as a central driving force. Play value, in this context, encapsulates the inherent enjoyment, intellectual stimulation, and creative fulfillment developers experience through the act of programming and problem-solving (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; Ye & Kishida, 2003; Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Choi & Pruett, 2015; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Ke & P. Zhang, 2008; Alexander Hars, 2002; Oreg & Nov, 2008). Let's examine why this is such a powerful motivator.

For many developers, OSS represents a playground for experimentation and innovation. Unburdened by strict commercial deadlines or rigid specifications, they are free to explore novel ideas, test unconventional approaches, and engage in the iterative process of building software purely for the intrinsic satisfaction it provides. The act of turning concepts into functional code can be deeply rewarding.

OSS communities often tackle complex technical problems that demand creative solutions. Developers who are drawn to intrinsically motivating challenges revel in the opportunity to dissect intricate issues, devise elegant workarounds, and optimize code performance. This continuous learning process creates a sense of mastery and accomplishment that fuels further engagement.

Commercial software development typically necessitates compromises – feature trade-offs, adherence to proprietary standards, and prioritization of market demands over pure technical

curiosity. In contrast, OSS projects offer developers a liberating space to exercise their technical creativity without external pressures. This autonomy nourishes problem-solving and innovation for its own sake.

The collaborative aspect of OSS can itself be a form of play. Engaging with fellow developers, brainstorming solutions, exchanging knowledge, and contributing to a shared creation can be intellectually stimulating and enjoyable. This connection fosters a playful sense of experimentation and discovery within the community.

## 2. Community engagement

The act of conceptualizing the open-source community as a metaphorical family, united in pursuit of shared objectives, can be a powerful catalyst for developer participation (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; Zhao et al., 2024; Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Ke & P. Zhang, 2008; Alexander Hars, 2002). This collaborative environment fosters contributions aimed at communal advancement, even when they may not yield immediate personal gain for the individual developer. Participation in open-source projects can be fueled by a profound sense of belonging and an alignment of personal values with those of project teams and the open-source movement at large.

The chart 10 underscores the complex interplay of motivations that drive developer participation in open-source projects. While social factors are paramount, career considerations and political beliefs also play a significant role. This diversity of motivations highlights the need for a nuanced understanding of the open-source community and tailored strategies to attract and retain developers.




Figure 10: As a proportion of all contributors to OSS, developers by motivation class (Ghosh et al., 2002)

Additionally, a conviction regarding the inherent value of open-source code, paired with a perceived responsibility to contribute to the free and OSS ecosystem, serves as a significant motivator for developers. Cultivating a sense of belonging and fostering a shared purpose within the community or project team can thus be instrumental in empowering individuals to become active participants and contributors in the open-source software development landscape.

### 3. Learning

Research consistently identifies learning as a primary impetus for individuals to actively engage in OSS communities (Ye & Kishida, 2003; Zhao et al., 2024; Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Wu, Gerlach & Young, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Choi & Pruett, 2015; Alexander Hars, 2002; Oreg & Nov, 2008). OSS projects present multifaceted learning environments; developers are drawn to the inherent opportunities to acquire knowledge from the systems themselves, to collaborate and gain insights from fellow community members, and to reciprocally disseminate their own expertise.

Participation within OSS communities extends beyond the purely technical exchange of knowledge, encompassing a rich social dimension. By directly engaging in open-source projects, developers immerse themselves in a collaborative network of peers, often spanning skill levels and expertise. This fosters a dynamic learning ecosystem where individuals benefit from informal mentorship opportunities, observing problem-solving approaches employed by more experienced contributors, and receiving constructive feedback that accelerates their professional growth.

Moreover, the act of contributing to a shared knowledge base empowers developers and reinforces self-efficacy. The potential for continuous self-development, the pursuit of mastery, and the ability to give back to a community dedicated to knowledge-sharing serve as profound and enduring sources of motivation for many software contributors.

### 4. Personal interest

Some developers get involved in open-source projects due to a personal interest in the subject matter or a desire to address a specific need or problem. This intrinsic motivation is driven by a passion for the technology, a curiosity about the project's objectives, or a personal connection to the software's utility. Developers who are personally invested in the project's success are more likely to contribute actively and engage with the community (Ye & Kishida, 2003; Zhao et al., 2024; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Choi & Pruett, 2015; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Ke & P. Zhang, 2008; Alexander Hars, 2002)

The concept of the “personal itch,” as articulated by Eric S. Raymond, illuminates a key motivator for developer participation in OSS projects (Holtgrewe, 2004). Individuals often engage in OSS development to address a specific problem or augment functionality that directly aligns with their personal or professional needs. The desire to create a solution that may not otherwise exist, driven by this personal necessity, serves as a potent catalyst for engagement.

Furthermore, the inherent intellectual challenge of solving complex programming problems stands as a significant motivator for developers seeking to contribute to open-source initiatives. The opportunity to grapple with intricate coding puzzles, apply problem-solving strategies, and ultimately contribute to the solution can be deeply fulfilling for those driven by a passion for programming.

The sense of creativity fostered within the OSS landscape is another powerful draw. Developers are empowered to express their ingenuity, explore innovative solutions, and continuously hone their skills through the development of tools or solutions that serve their own requirements or those related to their work. This blend of personal utility, creative expression, and continuous learning establishes a compelling environment that attracts and sustains developer involvement.

## 5. Altruism and ideology

OSS development thrives in part due to the contributions of individuals motivated by altruism and ideological convictions (Zhao et al., 2024; Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024; Wu, Gerlach & Young, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Ke & P. Zhang, 2008; Alexander Hars, 2002; Oreg & Nov, 2008). This section explores these factors and their influence on developer participation. A significant driver for many developers is the inherent satisfaction derived from assisting others. Contributing to open-source projects allows them to directly improve software used by a wider community. This collaborative environment fosters a sense of purpose, as developers witness the positive impact of their work on others.

Many developers are drawn to the core principles of open-source software, including transparency, collaboration, and the democratization of technology. Participation allows them to contribute to a development model that emphasizes open access and fosters a sense of community. Additionally, developers can be motivated by a desire to create software that benefits the greater good by being freely available and readily modifiable. This aligns with their altruistic desire to contribute to society and maintain strong social bonds.

Altruism and ideological alignment with open-source principles play a vital role in propelling

developer participation. Both the satisfaction of helping others and the commitment to open-source ideals create a compelling environment that attracts and retains developers within the OSS ecosystem.

## 6. Autonomy

The OSS environment provides a platform where developers can exercise a high degree of autonomy, making it particularly attractive to those valuing self-determination. The ability to select projects of interest, dictate their involvement, and contribute independently fulfills the intrinsic need for autonomy. This freedom to innovate and pursue solutions without rigid constraints becomes a compelling motivator, drawing developers who seek a sense of control and ownership over their contributions (Ke & P. Zhang, 2008).

Unlike traditional software development environments that might be constrained by rigid hierarchies or top-down management styles, the open-source model empowers developers to chart their own path. They can choose to focus on areas that align with their passions, explore new technologies, or experiment with novel approaches without the need for constant external approval. This sense of agency and self-direction is deeply fulfilling for those who thrive in environments where their initiative and creativity are valued.

## 7. Reciprocity and introjected regulation

Open-source communities thrive on a powerful sense of reciprocity. Developers who have directly benefited from freely available open-source software often feel a deep-seated obligation to give back, fueling their participation and ensuring the continued growth of the ecosystem. This desire to repay the community for the invaluable resources they've received becomes a motivating force (M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012).

Additionally, introjected regulation plays a role in influencing developer behavior. The internalization of expectations can lead to feelings of pride, guilt, or shame regarding contributions to open-source projects. This desire to maintain a positive self-image, live up to personal standards, and avoid negative emotions can significantly drive participation as developers strive to meet both their own expectations and those they perceive the community holds.

### 6.1.2 Extrinsic motivations

Beyond the intrinsic factors explored in the previous chapter, extrinsic motivations also play a significant role in driving developer participation in open-source projects. This chapter delves into these external factors, including the potential for signaling skills and experience

to potential employers, garnering recognition and building reputation within the open-source community, and potentially obtaining external rewards such as monetary compensation or job opportunities.

I will also examine how extrinsic motivators can intersect with a developer's desire to improve software quality. Contributions to high-profile projects can serve as a powerful signal of competence, while active participation may lead to opportunities to collaborate with skilled developers and gain valuable experience. Furthermore, I will explore the concept of role transformation: how continued involvement in the open-source landscape can elevate a developer's standing, potentially opening doors to leadership roles, consulting positions, or job offers within companies heavily invested in open-source technologies.

### 1. Signaling and recognition

Participating in OSS projects allows developers to publicly showcase their abilities and commitment (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; Ye & Kishida, 2003; Zhao et al., 2024; Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Wu, Gerlach & Young, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Choi & Pruett, 2015; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Roberts, Hann & Slaughter, 2006; Alexander Hars, 2002; Oreg & Nov, 2008). Within the highly competitive software development field, OSS contributions provide concrete evidence of a developer's abilities, enhancing their reputation and potentially unlocking new opportunities. Open-source involvement demonstrates not only technical skills but also a dedication to the broader community and a drive for innovation.

Open-source projects offer developers a platform to display their talents to potential employers, boosting their professional standing. Unlike traditional resumes or interviews that provide a more limited view, OSS contributions offer real-world proof of a developer's capabilities. Employers often see active participation as indicative of both technical skill and the ability to collaborate effectively in a team setting.

The recognition garnered from fellow developers within the open-source community serves as a powerful motivator. The open-source model promotes collaboration, transparency, and continuous improvement, resulting in a space where contributions are acknowledged and celebrated. This validation from peers acts as a potent incentive for developers to further advance their skills and continue making meaningful contributions to projects they're passionate about.

Participating actively in open-source projects helps developers establish solid professional reputations and establish themselves as authorities in their area. Respect is earned by devel-

opers in the community via regular, excellent contributions, perceptive analysis, and positive engagement. Their professional status is enhanced by this acknowledgment, which also opens up new opportunities for networking, cooperation, and career advancement. In the end, using their open-source work as a portfolio serves the interests of the developer as a whole as well as the individual developer.

## 2. Improving software quality

Many developers participate in open-source projects to create superior software that is available to a larger audience and benefits the community (Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Roberts, Hann & Slaughter, 2006). Open-source development encourages collaboration among developers with diverse backgrounds who share knowledge and work towards shared objectives. By utilizing the combined intelligence and resources of the community, developers create robust, reliable software that addresses the changing needs of users across various industries and fields. This democratization of software development ensures innovative solutions are freely available for anyone to use, modify, and share.

Through involvement in open-source projects, developers access and contribute to software that caters to their specific needs and preferences, often surpassing proprietary options. Unlike closed-source software, which may have proprietary limitations and licensing costs, open-source projects offer greater flexibility and transparency. Developers can freely examine, adjust, and improve the code as needed, empowering them to create tailored solutions that are more efficient, secure, and adaptable. This collaborative and iterative approach to software development not only promotes innovation but also fosters a sense of ownership and pride among contributors, motivated by the collective impact of their work on the wider community.

## 3. External rewards

While publicly discussions often prioritize the significance of intrinsic motivations, extrinsic rewards such as promotions, financial incentives, increased compensation, and professional advancement remain potent drivers of developer participation in open-source projects (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; Ye & Kishida, 2003; Zhao et al., 2024; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Roberts, Hann & Slaughter, 2006; Alexander Hars, 2002; Oreg & Nov, 2008). Tangible rewards hold substantial appeal, particularly for those who utilize open-source involvement as a strategic tool for career development and financial gain. Within a highly competitive labor market emphasizing demonstrable skills and practical experience, active open-source contributions tangibly augment a developer's professional credentials and enhance their overall marketability.



Developers may be drawn by the potential financial returns derived from open-source participation, such as new job opportunities or consulting contracts. By establishing a visible record of expertise and successful contributions, developers attract the attention of companies or clients who value their skills, potentially leading to lucrative positions. Beyond traditional employment, open-source involvement can serve as a foundation for supplementary income streams, such as consulting services, training workshops, or speaking engagements, which cultivate both financial rewards and professional recognition.

Furthermore, the pursuit of career advancement and professional distinction strongly motivates developers to engage with open-source projects. Establishing oneself as a thought leader or subject matter expert within the community cultivates opportunities for leadership positions, mentorship roles, or invitations to esteemed conferences and industry events. The visibility and reputation fostered through such contributions heighten a developer's standing and create new pathways for professional growth and development. Ultimately, while intrinsic motivations undeniably fuel enthusiasm and dedication, extrinsic rewards remain indispensable in attracting and sustaining long-term participation in open-source initiatives.

A study examining the dynamics of paid and volunteer open-source developers within the Rust project has revealed significant disparities in their contribution behaviors (Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024). Notably, core developers who receive compensation demonstrate a higher frequency of contributions compared to volunteers 11. This suggests that financial incentives may play a role in driving sustained engagement.




Figure 11: How often paid and volunteer developers contribute to Rust project (Yuxia Zhang et al., 2024)

Moreover, commits from one-time paid developers tend to be larger in scope, potentially encompassing more impactful code changes than those of one-time volunteers. This highlights a possible correlation between compensation and the magnitude of contributions. Peripheral paid developers exhibit a higher inclination towards implementing new features compared

to unpaid contributors. This trend underscores how financial incentives might influence not only the quantity but also the innovative nature of contributions within the open-source ecosystem.

Collectively, these findings illustrate the complex dynamics of mixed-motivation OSS projects. Understanding these distinctions is crucial for project maintainers seeking to effectively leverage the collaborative potential of both paid and volunteer contributors, ultimately strengthening the sustainability of OSS projects.

#### 4. Role transformation

One of the defining characteristics of OSS projects is the transformation of roles. Unlike traditional software development models, where users and developers occupy distinct positions, OSS communities blur these lines. Anyone, from seasoned developers to individuals with technical curiosity, can become a contributor. This inclusive nature fosters a sense of ownership and empowers users to actively shape the project's evolution. The potential to transition from user to developer offers a compelling incentive for participation, fostering a community where everyone's voice is valued, and diverse perspectives are encouraged (Ye & Kishida, 2003; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005).

The progression of OSS systems and communities throughout time is depicted in figure 12. The responsibilities of developers and users become more entwined as projects expand and mature. Users who use the program for work-related or personal purposes at first may become active contributors in the future out of a desire to improve the project, take care of certain issues, or impart their knowledge to the community. This shift in position is evidence of the cooperative spirit of open-source development, where users are empowered to influence the software they use and contribute to a common goal of advancement and innovation.




Figure 12: How open-source software systems and communities grow together (Ye & Kishida, 2003)

Moreover, the opportunity to directly fulfill user needs is a key motivator for developers contributing to open-source projects. Regardless of whether these needs stem from professional or personal pursuits, developers within the OSS community are driven by a desire to create software that tackles real-world challenges and improves user experiences. This direct link between developers and users fosters a collaborative atmosphere where both sides gain from shared knowledge and a commitment to ongoing enhancement.

## 6.2 RQ2: Impact of social dynamics

In addition to investigating the motivations of developers, this research also examined the significant influence of social dynamics on the participation of developers in open-source projects. Through a comprehensive analysis of 13 pertinent studies selected from a pool of over 20 papers, this research has yielded several key findings. These findings highlight the multifaceted nature of developer engagement in open-source initiatives and underscore the importance of social interactions in shaping participation patterns. The subsequent sections will elaborate on these findings, providing a nuanced understanding of the interplay between individual motivations and social forces within the open-source software development ecosystem.

### 6.2.1 Community interaction

The level of interaction within an open-source community is a significant determinant of developer participation. Active communication channels, encompassing forums, mailing lists, and chat platforms, provide essential avenues for collaboration, knowledge sharing, and mutual assistance. These interactions foster a sense of community and belonging, encouraging developers to actively engage with the project and contribute their expertise. Conversely, projects with limited or ineffective communication channels may struggle to attract and retain contributors, as developers may feel isolated or lack the necessary support to make meaningful contributions (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Freeman, 2007).

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that developers derive substantial satisfaction from collaborative endeavors and the opportunity to assist others within the open-source ecosystem. Collaboration and teamwork are not merely instrumental means to achieve project goals but are also intrinsically rewarding for developers. The sense of community engendered by open-source projects, along with the opportunity to interact with peers and contribute to a shared endeavor, are integral to the ethos of open-source software development.

The establishment of robust communication infrastructure and feedback mechanisms is paramount

for sustaining active developer participation. Clear, transparent, and efficient communication facilitates the resolution of technical issues, the exchange of innovative ideas, and the coordination of efforts among team members (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012). Moreover, constructive feedback loops enable developers to learn from each other, refine their skills, and enhance the quality of their contributions. Cultivating a supportive and communicative environment fosters a sense of camaraderie and shared purpose, thereby augmenting developer engagement and productivity.

The integration of social features within open-source platforms, such as mechanisms for connecting individuals seeking assistance with those willing to provide it, can substantially enhance community interactions and support. The open-source ethos is intrinsically predicated on collaboration and the open exchange of knowledge, and social platforms facilitate these interactions by creating virtual spaces for developers to connect, communicate, and collaborate. The sense of belonging to a community of like-minded individuals fosters camaraderie, mutual assistance, and a shared sense of purpose, all of which contribute to sustained engagement and project success.

In order to encourage engagement and retention in open-source communities, it is imperative that seasoned developers be present and eager to assist beginners. Mentorship programs enable inexperienced developers to overcome obstacles, learn new skills, and blend in with the community by offering them priceless advice, support, and encouragement. This knowledge transfer across generations is critical to the long-term viability and expansion of open-source initiatives. Open-source communities may draw and keep a wide range of contributors by creating a warm, accepting atmosphere that values knowledge sharing and mentoring. This ensures the ongoing creativity and vitality of the open-source software ecosystem.

### 6.2.2 Networking opportunities

Novice contributors often transition their initial motivations towards career-oriented goals, leveraging open-source projects as a portfolio to showcase their skills to potential employers (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021). Participation in these projects offers invaluable networking opportunities, fostering connections with industry professionals and paving the way for career advancement (Wu, Gerlach & Young, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012). By demonstrating their expertise and building a reputation within the open-source community, developers can attract job offers, consulting opportunities, and further professional development. Moreover, the open-source environment allows developers to gain experience with diverse technologies, tools, and methodologies, broadening their skillset and making them more adaptable to the evolving demands of the tech industry.

Open-source projects serve as a platform for developers to connect with industry peers, experts, and potential employers (Wu, Gerlach & Young, 2007; M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012). These connections can lead to collaborations on new projects, expanding professional networks and opening doors to career growth opportunities. The collaborative nature of open-source projects allows developers to establish relationships with like-minded individuals, fostering a supportive community that encourages knowledge sharing and mutual growth. Additionally, engaging with established open-source communities can provide developers with exposure to industry best practices, coding standards, and project management methodologies, further enhancing their professional capabilities.

Open-source projects are inherently collaborative environments, providing developers with ample opportunities to share knowledge, learn from others, and enhance their skills. The exchange of ideas, feedback on code, and exposure to diverse perspectives within the community foster continuous learning and skill improvement. Through interactions with other developers, mentorship, and exposure to new ideas and technologies, developers are motivated to stay engaged and contribute to the project's ongoing success (Bitzer, Schrettl & Schröder, 2007; Ye & Kishida, 2003; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012). This culture of continuous learning and knowledge sharing also helps developers stay abreast of the latest trends and innovations in the tech industry, ensuring their skills remain relevant and in demand.

### 6.2.3 Community culture and support

Engaged and supportive open-source communities act as a catalyst for developer contributions by offering assistance, constructive feedback, and a sense of belonging. This collaborative atmosphere nurtures knowledge sharing, mutual support, and a strong sense of community among developers. Ultimately, positive social interactions and a supportive environment within these communities drive increased motivation and sustained engagement among developers. (Wu, Gerlach & Young, 2007; Choi & Pruett, 2015; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012; Ke & P. Zhang, 2008).

Social coding platforms have revolutionized the open-source landscape, shifting the culture from its traditional hacker-centric roots to a more inclusive, collaborative community. By lowering barriers to entry, these platforms have made open-source projects more accessible and welcoming to newcomers, regardless of their technical expertise (Ye & Kishida, 2003; M. Gerosa et al., 2021). They foster a sense of belonging and encourage participation through features like issue tracking, discussion forums, and code review tools, promoting knowledge sharing and collaborative problem-solving. This cultural shift has not only broadened the pool of contributors but has also led to more diverse perspectives and innovative solutions

within the open-source ecosystem.

Roles within OSS communities are dynamic and fluid, allowing members to assume greater responsibilities by contributing meaningfully to projects. As individuals transition between roles, they actively influence the social dynamics and structure of the community, ultimately driving its evolution (Ye & Kishida, 2003). This flexibility enables OSS communities to adapt and thrive in response to the evolving needs of projects and the diverse contributions of their members.

Open-source platforms that promote collaboration and offer diverse avenues for appreciation, ranging from formal accolades to informal gestures like awarding stars to projects, significantly enhance the sense of belonging and recognition among community members. Active engagement in these communities allows developers to gain recognition for their contributions, cultivate a positive reputation, and establish a personal brand within the wider developer community (M. Gerosa et al., 2021; Li, Tan & Teo, 2012).

The paper “OpenRank Leaderboard: Motivating Open Source Collaborations Through Social Network Evaluation in Alibaba” presents a study conducted to explore the impact of the OpenRank Leaderboard on open source collaborations within Alibaba’s projects (Zhao et al., 2024). The research methodology involved a mixed-methods approach, including case studies, surveys, analysis of project metrics data, semi-structured interviews, and thematic coding. The study focused on seven open source projects initiated by Alibaba, aiming to investigate how gamified leaderboards can motivate collaboration and drive innovation in software development.




Figure 13: A screenshot of the interface of the OpenRank Leaderboard in May, 2024

Through the implementation of the OpenRank Leaderboard, the study found that developers were motivated to engage in more transparent communication, leading to improved collaboration behavior and a better community atmosphere. The leaderboard incentivized developers to make smaller, independent Pull Requests (PR) and avoid direct commits to the repository, ultimately enhancing the quality of code contributions and fostering continuous improvement within the projects. The research also highlighted the role of the leaderboard in promoting healthy competition among developers, encouraging sustained engagement, and driving innovation within the open source projects.

The findings of the study indicated that the OpenRank Leaderboard effectively evaluates and steers developers' contributions, leading to positive behavioral changes and enhanced collaboration habits. Developers expressed a favorable perception of using graph network algorithms for contribution evaluation, with many acknowledging the alignment of rankings with their community perceptions and the value of combining results with community incentive operations. Overall, the study contributes valuable insights into the impacts and perceptions of using leaderboards as a gamification mechanism in company-led open source projects, emphasizing the importance of social network evaluation in motivating open source collaborations and driving innovation in software development.

### 6.3 RQ3: Contribution barriers

Beyond examining the motivations and social dynamics that propel developer participation in open-source projects, this research also delved into the barriers hindering their contributions. Through an analysis of five selected studies, several key challenges were identified that impede developer engagement and limit their ability to contribute effectively. The following sections will explore these barriers in detail, providing a comprehensive overview of the obstacles developers face in the open-source software development landscape. Based on a previous study by Mariam (Guizani et al., 2021), the barriers to contribution were categorized into three main categories: technical challenges, social challenges, and process challenges. Each category encompasses distinct obstacles that hinder developer participation and require targeted interventions to overcome.

The chart 14 illustrates the obstacles individuals encounter when contributing to open source software projects which was found in 5 papers. The most frequent challenges revolve around social interaction, lack of timely responses or support, and technical difficulties, each occurring four times. Feeling intimidated or shy, cultural differences, and uncertainty about where to begin are also notable challenges, each happening twice. Other obstacles like submission procedures, governance compliance difficulties, unmet expectations, reception issues, inadequate or outdated projects, and prior technical experience are less common, each occurring

once.




Figure 14: Barriers to contributing to open-source software projects

### 6.3.1 Technical challenges

A significant technical barrier to open-source contribution is the lack of technical background and domain expertise among potential contributors. Without a foundational understanding of the project's technological underpinnings, whether it's a specific programming language, framework, or software architecture, individuals may struggle to effectively engage and contribute to its development. Additionally, a lack of domain expertise in the subject matter the project addresses can hinder understanding of the problem space and the proposed solutions, making it difficult to provide meaningful contributions.

The diversity of programming languages used within and across open-source projects presents another challenge. Many projects utilize multiple languages for different components, and the open-source ecosystem as a whole encompasses a vast array of programming languages. Contributors often need to familiarize themselves with these languages to effectively understand and modify code, which can be daunting and time-consuming, particularly for those with limited programming experience or those accustomed to a single language.

Becoming a contributing member of an OSS project often entails acquiring project-specific skills, a process that can span months to a year. This temporal investment is highlighted in Bird et al. (2007) analysis of three OSS projects, where the median duration for newcomers to submit their initial patch and subsequently gain acceptance was revealed. This underscores the significant commitment required to successfully integrate into and contribute to OSS






Figure 15: The background of the 223 developers from Apache Software Foundation (ASF) (Guizani et al., 2021)

projects. The figure 16 illustrates the time required to learn skills particular to a project, emphasizing the steep learning curve faced by newcomers.

| OSS project | Median time after the first email to the mailing list until ... |                            |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|
|             | ... first patch submission                                      | ... first patch acceptance |
| Postgres    | 2. month  | 3. month                   |
| Apache      | 2. month  | 10. month                  |
| Python      | 6. month  | 13. month                  |

Figure 16: Time required to learn skills particular to a project (Bird et al., 2007)

Discrepancies in technical skills and knowledge backgrounds among contributors can create a challenging environment for newcomers (Steinmacher, Silva, et al., 2015; Guizani et al., 2021). Open-source projects often attract individuals with varying levels of expertise, from seasoned developers to those just starting their coding journey. Navigating a project with such diverse skill levels can be intimidating, making it difficult for newcomers to find their footing, ask questions without feeling inadequate, and contribute meaningfully (Hannebauer & Gruhn, 2017).

Inadequate or outdated project documentation further compounds the challenges faced by contributors. Clear, comprehensive, and up-to-date documentation is crucial for understanding the project's codebase, workflow, and contribution guidelines. It serves as a roadmap for new contributors, guiding them through the project's intricacies. Without well-maintained

documentation, newcomers may struggle to locate the correct areas for modification, understand the reasoning behind existing code, and follow established conventions, ultimately hindering their ability to contribute effectively to the project’s development.

### 6.3.2 Social challenges

Effective communication is paramount in the open-source landscape, yet it is often fraught with challenges that can impede participation and collaboration. Limitations in the available communication tools, such as reliance on text-based platforms or asynchronous communication channels, can hinder real-time interaction and create misunderstandings. Additionally, diverse communication styles among members, ranging from direct and concise to more elaborate and nuanced, can lead to misinterpretations and impede the development of shared understanding. Moreover, conflicting viewpoints and disagreements within the community, while natural, can escalate into unproductive debates that alienate newcomers and create an unwelcoming environment (Steinmacher, Conte, et al., 2015).




Figure 17: Social barriers from Steinmacher’s study (Steinmacher, M. Gerosa, et al., 2019)

The social dimension of open-source projects is equally crucial, as it fosters a sense of belonging and encourages collaboration. However, newcomers often encounter difficulties establishing connections with project members, particularly in large and established communities. This can lead to feelings of isolation and a lack of mentorship or guidance, making it challenging to navigate the project’s intricacies and identify suitable contribution opportunities. Moreover, if newcomers perceive a lack of responsiveness or support from existing members, their enthusiasm may wane, and they may ultimately abandon their efforts (Stein-

macher, Silva, et al., 2015; Steinmacher, Conte, et al., 2015; Steinmacher, M. Gerosa, et al., 2019; Guizani et al., 2021; Hannebauer & Gruhn, 2017).

The responsiveness of the community is a critical determinant of newcomers' experiences and long-term engagement. When individuals feel that their questions are ignored, their contributions are not acknowledged, or their efforts are not valued, they may become demotivated and disengage from the project. Conversely, timely feedback, recognition, and support can boost morale and encourage continued participation. Therefore, fostering a culture of responsiveness and inclusivity is essential for attracting and retaining new contributors.

Cultural aspects, often overlooked but equally significant, can also create barriers for newcomers seeking to integrate into the project community. Different cultural backgrounds and norms can lead to varying expectations regarding communication styles, decision-making processes, and interpersonal interactions. These differences can create misunderstandings and misinterpretations, hindering the establishment of rapport and trust between newcomers and existing members. Additionally, the initial reception and onboarding process for newcomers can significantly impact their experience and willingness to contribute. A welcoming and supportive environment, with clear guidelines and mentorship opportunities, can make a substantial difference in fostering a sense of belonging and encouraging long-term participation.

### 6.3.3 Process challenges

Embarking on a journey to contribute to open-source projects can often feel like navigating a complex maze. The path is riddled with challenges, particularly for newcomers who are unfamiliar with the unique ecosystem of each project. Understanding the specific workflow, which can vary significantly between projects, is a critical first step. This includes grasping the nuances of branching strategies, pull request etiquette, and the overall development cycle. Additionally, mastering version control systems like Git, with its array of commands and concepts, can be a steep learning curve.

Guizani et al. (2021) highlighted significant process challenges faced by developers contributing to Apache Software Foundation (ASF) projects. The research revealed that developers encounter complexities in understanding and following the contribution process, from becoming a committer to getting their contributions accepted. Additionally, the study identified the process of adding new committers as bureaucratic and tedious, further complicating the onboarding experience. These process challenges are illustrated in figure 18 along with other barriers faced by developers contributing to ASF projects.

In corporate settings, product development teams often adhere to a rigid process, like Agile or




Figure 18: Challenges faced by developers contributing to ASF projects (Guizani et al., 2021)

Scrum, with clear roles, responsibilities, and hierarchies. Conversely, open-source projects operate more flexibly, with contributors often taking on diverse roles. This lack of formal structure can be challenging for newcomers, who may find it difficult to identify decision-makers, understand governance, or navigate informal power dynamics within the community.

Adherence to coding standards and contribution guidelines is another significant hurdle. Each project has its own meticulously crafted conventions and best practices, often accumulated over years of development. Failing to comply with these standards can lead to rejected contributions or frustrating delays in getting changes merged. For newcomers, who are still acclimating to the project's culture and technical requirements, this can be a discouraging experience.

Compounding these challenges is the frequent lack of comprehensive and user-friendly onboarding materials. While some projects may boast extensive documentation, it is often not tailored for newcomers or may be outdated, leaving crucial information buried or irrelevant. The absence of step-by-step tutorials that walk newcomers through the contribution process, clear explanations of the project's architecture and codebase, or readily available

mentorship programs can leave them feeling lost and overwhelmed. This lack of guidance not only discourages potential contributors but also hinders their ability to make meaningful contributions, ultimately depriving the project of valuable talent and fresh perspectives.

Moreover, developers may find certain open-source projects terrifying due to their immense scale and intricacy. With vast codebases, numerous contributors, and a long history of development, it can be difficult to know where to start or how to make a meaningful impact. The lack of a structured onboarding process, coupled with the fear of making mistakes or not understanding the project's intricacies, can create a sense of paralysis and prevent newcomers from taking that crucial first step.

## 7 Conclusion

The research explores the intricate world of developing open-source software, concentrating on the various incentives that encourage participation in these initiatives. A comprehensive study of existing data was conducted, utilizing Kitchenham's methodology as a guide to identify the many factors influencing developer involvement through a methodical assessment. This research examines the social impacts, issues, and underlying motivations of the open-source software community by examining a carefully selected set of twenty pertinent papers. The thesis seeks to fill in theoretical gaps, clarify the nuances of developer behavior in open-source projects, and establish a foundation for future studies in this dynamic and always evolving field.

### 7.1 Finding

The thesis reveals a multifaceted array of motivations, both intrinsic and extrinsic, that propel developers to participate in open-source projects. These motivations serve as critical drivers in shaping the level of involvement and commitment demonstrated by developers within collaborative software development endeavors.

The study also highlights how social factors have a significant influence on developer engagement. Encouraging involvement and project success are largely dependent on variables like the caliber of community contacts, the accessibility of networking possibilities, and the general feeling of belonging within the community. Therefore, fostering these social contexts is essential to encouraging long-term involvement and attaining the best possible results in the open-source community.

The last research question addresses the obstacles and difficulties that open-source project developers face. These challenges may be of a technological, social, or procedural nature. The study highlights the resilience and flexibility of developers in maintaining ongoing engagement despite obstacles encountered by analyzing the tactics and solutions they have utilized to overcome these issues.

By delving into the interplay between technology and human behavior, this research highlights the pivotal role of human elements in shaping the adoption, utilization, and evolution of open-source software. Understanding these human factors, including motivations, social dynamics, and challenges, is essential for developing effective software product management strategies and fostering innovation within the software development landscape.

## 7.2 Implications

The insights derived from this study offer significant implications for software product management and open-source software development. By elucidating the diverse motivations that drive developer participation, software product managers can refine their strategies to attract and retain high-performing individuals within their organizations. Recognizing the pivotal role of social dynamics in open-source projects can empower managers to cultivate collaborative environments that nurture creativity, innovation, and knowledge sharing among team members, ultimately enhancing productivity and project outcomes.

Furthermore, this research sheds light on the barriers and challenges that developers encounter in open-source projects, providing valuable information for software product managers to develop targeted interventions. These interventions may encompass training initiatives, resource allocation, or mentorship programs aimed at empowering developers to overcome technical hurdles, enhance communication skills, and navigate the complexities inherent in open-source development. By addressing these challenges proactively, managers can create a more supportive and inclusive environment that fosters developer growth and maximizes their contributions.

Apart from its pragmatic consequences for software product management, this investigation also acts as a stimulant for subsequent investigations within the domain of open-source software development. Through pointing out the shortcomings of existing research and theoretical models, it opens the door to more investigation into the complex interactions between difficulties, social dynamics, and motives that influence developer behavior in open-source projects. Building on these results, future research may create more detailed and nuanced models that better capture the nuances of developer interaction, providing a deeper knowledge of this dynamic environment and more useful guidance for creating a successful open-source community.

## 7.3 Limitations

While this study offers valuable insights, it's important to consider some factors that might influence its broader application. The literature review, while thorough, focused on a specific selection of articles, which could mean some relevant studies and perspectives were unintentionally overlooked. In order to fully comprehend developer motives in open source, future study could examine a larger variety of sources.

The findings of this study may also have limited generalizability, as they are based on a particular set of articles and studies. The diverse range of motivations and experiences across open-source projects and communities might not be fully captured. Future research could

use a more inclusive approach, looking at a broader selection of projects and using different research methods to ensure a more representative sample.

The systematic literature review methodology, while providing a structured approach, might not fully capture the nuances and complexities of developer motivations. Additional research methods, such as interviews or surveys, could offer valuable insights into the personal experiences and perspectives of developers, adding depth to my understanding of the factors that drive their involvement.

It's also important to acknowledge the possibility of subjectivity in the interpretation of results and conclusions. Despite efforts to minimize these influences, my viewpoints might have unintentionally affected the analysis and interpretation of the data. Future studies could incorporate strategies to enhance objectivity and transparency, such as using standardized coding techniques or involving multiple coders.

Finally, it's worth noting that the open-source landscape and developer motivations are constantly evolving. The conclusions drawn from this research might be influenced by the time-frame in which the literature review was conducted. Future studies could revisit these questions periodically to track changes and trends in developer motivations over time.

## 7.4 Future work

There are many chances for me to learn more about this intricate environment in the future when I do research on developer incentives in the open source software development space. Longitudinal studies could track the evolution of developer motivations over time, revealing how external factors like technological advancements or shifts in community dynamics influence participation. Cross-cultural analysis could shed light on the impact of cultural norms and values on engagement, highlighting the universality or cultural specificity of motivational factors.

In-depth qualitative interviews with developers would offer rich insights into their personal experiences, motivations, and challenges, complementing existing research and providing a more nuanced understanding of their behavior. Behavioral studies, drawing from economics and psychology, could investigate the decision-making processes and behavioral patterns within open-source communities, uncovering the cognitive processes underlying motivation and informing effective community management strategies.

Further exploration into the influence of gender and diversity factors on developer participation is crucial for addressing inclusivity challenges and fostering a welcoming environment for all. Examining the effectiveness of various incentive structures, from recognition



programs to monetary rewards, could offer valuable insights into motivating sustained contributions. Additionally, investigating the role of community dynamics, leadership styles, and governance structures could reveal how these factors shape developer motivations and engagement, informing strategies for creating collaborative and thriving communities.

The impact of emerging technologies on developer motivations and participation warrants further exploration. Understanding how advancements like blockchain or artificial intelligence influence the open-source landscape can guide the development of projects that align with evolving developer interests. Additionally, investigating the influence of educational initiatives, such as coding boot camps and mentorship programs, can shed light on how early exposure to open-source software fosters long-term engagement and contributes to a sustainable talent pipeline.

Finally, addressing the ethical considerations associated with developer motivations, such as data privacy, security, and community responsibility, is essential for ensuring sustainable and responsible software development practices. Through the pursuit of these many study paths, I aim to improve not only my comprehension of the intricate dynamics present in open-source communities but also cultivate an open-source ecosystem that is more inventive, diverse, and morally grounded.

## References

- Alexander Hars, Shaosong Ou (2002). Working for free? Motivations for participating in open-source projects. In: *International journal of electronic commerce* 6.(3), pp. 25–39.
- Belshaw, Doug (Apr. 2020). *10 reasons why people contribute to open source*. URL: <https://blog.weareopen.coop/10-reasons-why-people-contribute-to-open-source-d13b86b1e9d3>.
- Berman, Jules J (2013). *Principles of big data: preparing, sharing, and analyzing complex information*. Newnes.
- Bird, Christian et al. (2007). Open borders? immigration in open source projects. In: *Fourth International Workshop on Mining Software Repositories (MSR'07: ICSE Workshops 2007)*. IEEE, pp. 6–6.
- Bitzer, Jürgen, Schrettl, Wolfram & Schröder, Philipp JH (2007). Intrinsic motivation in open source software development. In: *Journal of comparative economics* 35.(1), pp. 160–169.
- Blind, Knut et al. (2021). The impact of Open Source Software and Hardware on technological independence, competitiveness and innovation in the EU economy. In: *Final Study Report. European Commission, Brussels, doi 10, p. 430161*.
- Choi, Namjoo & Pruett, Joseph A (2015). The characteristics and motivations of library open source software developers: An empirical study. In: *Library & Information Science Research* 37.(2), pp. 109–117.
- Chua, Bee Bee, Zhang, Ying, et al. (2020). Applying a systematic literature review and content analysis method to analyse open source developers' forking motivation interpretation, categories and consequences. In: *Australasian Journal of Information Systems* 24.
- Developers, TensorFlow (2022). TensorFlow. In: *Zenodo*.
- DiBona, Chris & Ockman, Sam (1999). *Open sources: Voices from the open source revolution*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- Fielding, Roy T. & Kaiser, Gail (1997). The Apache HTTP server project. In: *IEEE Internet Computing* 1.(4), pp. 88–90.
- Fink, Martin (2003). *The business and economics of Linux and open source*. Prentice Hall Professional.
- Fitzgerald, Brian (2006). The transformation of open source software. In: *MIS quarterly*, pp. 587–598.
- Freeman, Stephanie (2007). The material and social dynamics of motivation: Contributions to Open Source language technology development. In: *Science & Technology Studies* 20.(2), pp. 55–77.
- Fuggetta, Alfonso (2003). Open source software—an evaluation. eng. In: *The Journal of systems and software* 66.(1), pp. 77–90. ISSN: 0164-1212.

- Gerosa, Marco et al. (2021). The shifting sands of motivation: Revisiting what drives contributors in open source. In: *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, pp. 1046–1058.
- Ghosh, Rishab A et al. (2002). Free/Libre and Open Source Software: Survey and Study FLOSS. Final Report. In: *International Institute of Infonomics, University of Maastricht, Maastricht, The Netherlands*.
- Greiler, Michaela, Herzig, Kim & Czerwonka, Jacek (2015). Code ownership and software quality: a replication study. In: *Proceedings of the 12th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. MSR '15. Florence, Italy: IEEE Press, pp. 2–12. ISBN: 9780769555942.
- Guizani, Mariam et al. (2021). The long road ahead: Ongoing challenges in contributing to large oss organizations and what to do. In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction 5*.(CSCW2), pp. 1–30.
- Gusenbauer, Michael & Haddaway, Neal R. (2020). Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. In: *Research Synthesis Methods* 11.(2), pp. 181–217. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378>. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jrsm.1378>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jrsm.1378>.
- Hannebauer, Christoph & Gruhn, Volker (2017). On the relationship between newcomer motivations and contribution barriers in open source projects. In: *Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Open Collaboration*, pp. 1–10.
- Häußge, Gina (n.d.). *A Dev's Guide to Open Source Software Licensing*. <https://github.com/readme/guides/open-source-licensing>.
- Holtgrewe, Ursula (2004). Articulating the speed (s) of the Internet: The case of Open Source/Free Software. In: *Time & Society* 13.(1), pp. 129–146.
- Jacobides, Michael G (2020). Regulating Big Tech in Europe: why, so what, and how understanding their business models and ecosystems can make a difference. In: *Available at SSRN 3765324*.
- Ke, Weiling & Zhang, Ping (2008). Motivations for participating in open source software communities: Roles of psychological needs and altruism. In: *PACIS 2008 Proceedings*, p. 76.
- Kitchenham, Barbara (Aug. 2004). Procedures for Performing Systematic Reviews. In: *Keele, UK, Keele Univ.* 33.
- Lakhani, Karim R & Wolf, Robert G (2005). Why hackers do what they do: Understanding motivation and effort in free/open source software projects. In.
- Laurent, Andrew M St (2004). *Understanding open source and free software licensing: guide to navigating licensing issues in existing & new software*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."

- Li, Yan, Tan, Chuan-Hoo & Teo, Hock-Hai (2012). Leadership characteristics and developers' motivation in open source software development. In: *Information & Management* 49.(5), pp. 257–267.
- License, GNU General Public (1989). Gnu general public license. In: *Retrieved December 25*, p. 2014.
- Loeliger, Jon & McCullough, Matthew (2012). *Version Control with Git: Powerful tools and techniques for collaborative software development*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- Madison, Michael J (2003). Reconstructing the software license. In: *Loy. U. Chi. Lj* 35, p. 275.
- Moreno, Ernesto & Muffatto, Moreno (2006). *Open Source: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. World Scientific Publishing Company. URL: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lut/detail.action?docID=1679623>.
- Oreg, Shaul & Nov, Oded (2008). Exploring motivations for contributing to open source initiatives: The roles of contribution context and personal values. In: *Computers in human behavior* 24.(5), pp. 2055–2073.
- Raj, Pethuru, Venkatesh, Veeramuthu & Amirtharajan, Rengarajan (2013). Envisioning the cloud-induced transformations in the software engineering discipline. In: *Software Engineering Frameworks for the Cloud Computing Paradigm*, pp. 25–53.
- Roberts, Jeffrey A, Hann, Il-Horn & Slaughter, Sandra A (2006). Understanding the motivations, participation, and performance of open source software developers: A longitudinal study of the Apache projects. In: *Management science* 52.(7), pp. 984–999.
- Saltzer, Jerome H (2020). The origin of the “MIT license”. In: *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing* 42.(4), pp. 94–98.
- Schweik, Charles M & English, Robert C (2012). *Internet success: a study of open-source software commons*. MIT Press.
- Sinclair, Andrew (2010). License profile: Apache license, version 2.0. In: *IFOSS L. Rev.* 2, p. 107.
- Srinath, KR (2017). Python—the fastest growing programming language. In: *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology* 4.(12), pp. 354–357.
- Stallman, Richard (n.d.). *Why Open Source Misses the Point of Free Software*. <https://www.gnu.org/philosophy/open-source-misses-the-point.html>. GNU Project - Free Software Foundation.
- Statista (Sept. 2021). *Infographic: How Big Tech Contributes to Open Source*. URL: <https://www.statista.com/chart/25795/active-github-contributors-by%20employer/>.
- Steinmacher, Igor, Conte, Tayana, et al. (2015). Social barriers faced by newcomers placing their first contribution in open source software projects. In: *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social computing*, pp. 1379–1392.

- Steinmacher, Igor, Gerosa, Marco, et al. (2019). Overcoming social barriers when contributing to open source software projects. In: *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 28, pp. 247–290.
- Steinmacher, Igor, Silva, Marco Aurelio Graciotto, et al. (2015). A systematic literature review on the barriers faced by newcomers to open source software projects. In: *Information and Software Technology* 59, pp. 67–85.
- What is free software?* (n.d.). <https://www.gnu.org/philosophy/free-sw.html>. GNU Project - Free Software Foundation.
- Wieringa, Roel et al. (2006). Requirements engineering paper classification and evaluation criteria: a proposal and a discussion. In: *Requirements engineering* 11, pp. 102–107.
- Wu, Chorng-Guang, Gerlach, James H & Young, Clifford E (2007). An empirical analysis of open source software developers' motivations and continuance intentions. In: *Information & Management* 44.(3), pp. 253–262.
- Ye, Yunwen & Kishida, Kouichi (2003). Toward an understanding of the motivation of open source software developers. In: *25th International Conference on Software Engineering, 2003. Proceedings*. IEEE, pp. 419–429.
- Zhang, Yuxia et al. (2024). How Are Paid and Volunteer Open Source Developers Different? A Study of the Rust Project. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–13.
- Zhao, Shengyu et al. (2024). OpenRank Leaderboard: Motivating Open Source Collaborations Through Social Network Evaluation in Alibaba. In.

## Appendix 1 Selected articles and papers for SLR

Table 7: Articles and papers selected for SLR.

| Article ID | Title  | Authors  | Y.O.P |
|------------|--|--|-------|
| A01        | A systematic literature review on the barriers faced by newcomers to open source software projects       | Steinmacher, I., Silva, M. A. G., Gerosa, M. A., & Redmiles, D. F.   | 2015  |
| A02        | Social barriers faced by newcomers placing their first contribution in open source software projects     | Steinmacher, I., Conte, T., Gerosa, M. A., & Redmiles, D.  | 2015  |
| A03        | Overcoming social barriers when contributing to open source software projects                            | Steinmacher, I., Gerosa, M., Conte, T. U., & Redmiles, D. F.   | 2019  |
| A04        | The long road ahead: Ongoing challenges in contributing to large oss organizations and what to do        | Guizani, M., Chatterjee, A., Trinkenreich, B., May, M. E., Noa-Guevara, G. J., Russell, L. J., ... & Sarma, A. | 2021  |
| A05        | Intrinsic motivation in open source software development   | Bitzer, J., Schrettl, W., & Schröder, P. J.  | 2007  |
| A06        | Toward an understanding of the motivation of open source software developers                             | Ye, Y., & Kishida, K.  | 2003  |
| A07        | OpenRank Leaderboard: Motivating Open Source Collaborations Through Social Network Evaluation in Alibaba | Zhao, Shengyu  | 2024  |

|     |   |  |      |
|-----|---|--|------|
| A08 | How Are Paid and Volunteer Open Source Developers Different? A Study of the Rust Project  | Zhang, Yuxia   | 2024 |
| A09 | Why hackers do what they do: Understanding motivation and effort in free/open source software projects  | Lakhani, K. R., & Wolf, R. G.  | 2005 |
| A10 | An empirical analysis of open source software developers' motivations and continuance intentions  | Wu, C. G., Gerlach, J. H., & Young, C. E.  | 2007 |
| A11 | The shifting sands of motivation: Revisiting what drives contributors in open source  | Gerosa, M., Wiese, I., Trinkenreich, B., Link, G., Robles, G., Treude, C., ... & Sarma, A. | 2021 |
| A12 | The characteristics and motivations of library open source software developers: An empirical study  | Choi, N., & Pruett, J. A.  | 2015 |
| A13 | Leadership characteristics and developers' motivation in open source software development   | Li, Y., Tan, C. H., & Teo, H. H.   | 2012 |
| A14 | On the relationship between newcomer motivations and contribution barriers in open source projects  | Hannebauer, C., & Gruhn, V.  | 2017 |
| A15 | Understanding the motivations, participation, and performance of open source software developers: A longitudinal study of the Apache projects | Roberts, J. A., Hann, I. H., & Slaughter, S. A.  | 2006 |
| A16 | Motivations for participating in open source software communities: Roles of psychological needs and altruism                                  | Ke, W., & Zhang, P.  | 2008 |

|     |  |                             |      |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|------|
| A17 | Working for free? Motivations for participating in open-source projects  | Alexander Hars, S. O.       | 2002 |
| A18 | Exploring motivations for contributing to open source initiatives: The roles of contribution context and personal values | Oreg, S., & Nov, O.         | 2008 |
| A19 | Community dynamics in open source software projects: Aging and social reshaping  | Hannemann, A., & Klamma, R. | 2013 |
| A20 | The material and social dynamics of motivation: Contributions to Open Source language technology development             | Freeman, S.                 | 2007 |