

Open Source Software and Innovation in the Software Development Industry – Draft

Nathalie Rosalind Tate

Oakland University

## Abstract

abstract text

## Open Source Software and Innovation in the Software Development Industry – Draft

Open source software is software where the source code is freely available. Although the exact restrictions vary between open source licenses, most allow for users to edit and redistribute the software. One question raised by the rise of open source software (OSS) is how it compares to proprietary software with regard to innovation in the software industry, where “innovation” is defined as a holistic metric that considers the amount of new software and code commits, bug reports, and bug fixes to existing software, as well as the perceived quality and usability of said software.

The main divide between proprietary software and OSS, other than the availability of the source code, is the price: Proprietary software frequently must be purchased, while OSS is usually provided for free. This price difference makes it easier to monetize proprietary software and is a large factor in the popularity of proprietary software.

### **Literature Review**

Atal and Shankar (2014) compares how price competition and differences in software quality vary between two markets: one in which two proprietary software firms are competing and one in which a proprietary software firm competes against an open source software (OSS) firm. The authors utilized a statistical model to compare the two types of markets. The models compare software quality and price competition. Although OSS is often free, the authors factored in an “effort cost” when determining the price competition. The findings of the model were that a proprietary firm competing against an OSS firm may have either higher or lower profits than a proprietary firm competing against another proprietary firm, depending on the price competition from the OSS firm. The price competition depends on the effort cost of the OSS, the degree to which consumers value quality, and the degree to which the consumers of the OSS contribute to the production of the OSS. The proprietary firm had the highest profits when the price competition from the OSS firm was low, but the consumers were better-off with lower price competition. The

authors also found that OSS had low value for users who valued quality in their software, but that it may have high value for users who did not value quality (Atal & Shankar, 2014).

Howison and Bullard (2016) discusses the visibility of software used and mentioned in biology literature. The authors compiled a “balanced and representative sample” of biology literature and analyzed the content by looking for mentions of software. Once found, the mentions were “coded” according to a coding scheme defined by the authors. The coding scheme contained information about the mentioned software: if the mention was cited, if the mentioned software was easily identifiable and findable, if the source code was available, and if the author of the software granted permission for others to edit it. The authors found that they had access to 79% of the mentioned software, 47% was available for free, 32% allowed access to the source code, and 20% allowed users to modify the code. The authors concluded that the manner in which software was mentioned and cited in scientific literature are “varied and appear relatively ad hoc.” The authors end with a call for more research (Howison & Bullard, 2016).

Sacks (2015) utilizes a statistical model to examine competition between a firm that produces proprietary software and a community that produces OSS. The author’s findings are that the firm will cater to the less technologically savvy and the community will cater to those who are more technologically capable. In the presence of competition from the community, the firm targets “even less technologically savvy individuals”. Furthermore, the author notes that the “real price” of software has two factors: the purchase price and the opportunity cost of learning how to use it. Additionally, the author comments on how proprietary firms can benefit from “R&D spillover” from permissively licensed OSS projects (Sacks, 2015).

Widenius and Nyman (2014) discusses the “business of open source software”. The authors discuss possible business models that allow an individual or corporation to profit from OSS. These business models include: “Support contracts and services”, where one only supplies support for the software; “Open core”, where the core software is OSS but the

peripheral software and extensions are closed source; “Business source”, where the software is maintained under two licenses with a time delay; “Dual licensing”, where the software is maintained under a proprietary license and a strong copy-left license, so customers who cannot or chose not to comply with the terms of the copy-left license must buy the software; and “Software as a service”, where the application software is OSS, but the server it communicates with is closed source. (Widenius & Nyman, 2014).

Xing (2014) examines the effects of both free and commercial OSS on proprietary software. The author used a statistical model to compare two different hypothetical markets: one where proprietary software only competes with free OSS and another where proprietary software competes against both free and commercial OSS. The model considered differences in usability between OSS and proprietary software, as well differences in functionality and user technical ability. The authors findings were that the introduction of commercial OSS to the market can decrease the price of proprietary software and increase social welfare without necessarily decreasing the market share of the proprietary software. A market in which proprietary software only competes against free OSS, however, may lead to higher prices and lower social welfare (Xing, 2014).

## **Methods**

## **Results**

## **Discussion**

Atal and Shankar (2014) and Sacks (2015) both compare a market where two proprietary firms compete to one in which a proprietary firm competes with a not-for-profit OSS firm. An important difference is that while Atal and Shankar (2014) considers an “effort cost” to producing OSS (Atal & Shankar, 2014, p. 334), Sacks (2015) instead consider a “learning cost” to using it (Sacks, 2015, p. 271). An effort cost is the cost for the developers to produce the software. The reasoning here is that as the OSS is free, the developers are not paid and therefore incur a net loss in producing the software. While this

is certainly true in some cases, it fails to account for paid OSS developers or OSS developers who genuinely enjoy their work. <possibly bring up primary research here> The learning cost on the other hand is the cost for the user of the OSS to learn how to use it. This is also certainly true in many, but not all cases. Sacks (2015), however, accounts for this in their model by acknowledging that any two users may have drastically different learning costs. Sacks (2015) also considers R&D spillover from OSS communities into proprietary firms, which is an advantage of their model over Atal and Shankar (2014)'s.

That both Atal and Shankar (2014) and Sacks (2015) both only consider free OSS is significantly disadvantageous for both models. Xing (2014) on the other hand, considers the effects of both free and for-profit OSS on proprietary software. Like Sacks (2015), Xing (2014) also considers a learning cost for the users of the OSS, but the model neither considers an effort cost nor R&D spillover. <discuss findings of Xing (2014), Atal and Shankar (2014), Sacks (2015)>

## References

- Atal, V. & Shankar, K. (2014). Open source software: Competition with a public good. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 42(3), 333–345. doi:10.1007/s11293-014-9426-2
- Howison, J. & Bullard, J. (2016). Software in the scientific literature: Problems with seeing, finding, and using software mentioned in the biology literature. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(9), 2137–2155. doi:10.1002/asi.23538
- Sacks, M. (2015). Competition between open source and proprietary software: Strategies for survival. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 32(3), 268. doi:10.1080/07421222.2015.1099391
- Widenius, M. & Nyman, L. (2014). The business of open source software: A primer. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 4(1), 4. Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com>
- Xing, M. (2014). The impact of commercial open source software on proprietary software producers and social welfare. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 7(5), 1183–1196. doi:10.3926/jiem.1260