

Open Source Software Communities

Kevin Carillo

Concordia University, Canada

Chitu Okoli

Concordia University, Canada

INTRODUCTION

Open source software (OSS) development has continued to appear as a puzzling and enigmatic phenomenon and has drawn increasing attention as its importance has grown. Relying upon an alternative way to develop and to distribute software, open source communities have been able to challenge and often outperform proprietary software by enabling better reliability, lower costs, shorter development times, and a higher quality of code (Raymond, 2004). Behind the software is a mass of people working together in loose coordination, even portrayed as a rowdy marketplace (Raymond, 2001, p. 1):

No quiet, reverent cathedral-building here—rather, the Linux community seemed to resemble a great babbling bazaar of differing agendas and approaches ... out of which a coherent and stable system seemingly emerges only by a succession of miracles.

More precisely, the people behind open source projects have been defined as: “Internet-based communities of software developers who voluntarily collaborate in order to develop software that they or their organizations need” (von Krogh, 2003, p. 14). In contrast to the sacred cathedral-like software development model that gave birth to most commercial and proprietary systems, such bazaar-like communities seem to have based their success on a pseudo-anarchic type of collaboration and developers’ interaction (Raymond, 2001). However, in spite of the apparent disorganization of these bazaars, a closer look distinguishes common values and norms that rule them, specific roles that can be identified, similar motives shared by people, and practices that follow patterns. This article highlights key aspects of what forms the communities that support these projects.

Definition of Open Source Software

The basic definition of OSS as expressed by the Open Source Initiative (www.opensource.org) goes beyond the notion of free code. It encompasses broader issues such

as distribution and licensing that stipulate free exchange and modification rights of source code (OSI, 1997):

- Free redistribution of source code
- Free redistribution of compiled (binary) programs
- Derived works must be permitted
- Integrity of the author’s source code
- No discrimination against persons or groups
- No discrimination against fields of endeavor (e.g., commercial and military uses must be permissible)
- Mandatory distribution of open source license
- License must not be specific to a product
- License must not restrict other software’s licenses
- License must not restrict redistribution to a particular delivery technology

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OPEN SOURCE PHENOMENON

During the 1960s and 1970s, scientists and engineers in academic and corporate laboratories freely shared, exchanged and modified the software they produced. However, by the early 1980s, software was increasingly shifting from its original shared nature to becoming increasingly commercialized, with licenses that forbade the free sharing of source code. In 1983, Richard Stallman left MIT to found the Free Software Foundation (FSF) with the principle aim of defining and diffusing legal mechanisms and conceptual principles of “free software” (Hars & Ou, 2001; West & Dedrick, 2001). “Free” here refers to freedom, the liberty to do whatever desired with the software. Hence, free software in the open source sense is distinct from “freeware”, which is software sold at no price. In fact, one of the explicit rights given to users of “free software” is the right to sell it commercially. It is noteworthy that most OSS is freeware (provided at no charge), but most freeware is not open source (the source code is not provided, and users are forbidden from modifying the program code even if they could).

Stallman’s publication of the GNU Manifesto (1985) allowed him to communicate his ideological insights about

the nature of software (von Krogh, 2003), and he convinced developers to join him in the GNU Project, whose primary goal was—and still is—the creation of a Unix-like free operating system. (“GNU” is a recursive acronym meaning, “Gnu’s Not Unix”.) Accompanied by the continuous improvements of networking capabilities and of the Internet, this major step signaled the beginnings of open source practices organized through the formation of virtual communities. In 1989, the Free Software Foundation released the GNU General Public License (GPL) in order to ensure the preservation of certain freedoms in the copies and derivative works of a piece of software. The GPL assures these freedoms via the copyleft mechanism, which permits free copying, modification, and distribution of software, with the condition that any distributed derivative works explicitly accord others the same rights.

In 1991, Linus Torvalds, a 21-year-old Finnish programmer, created Linux, a kernel for a Unix-based operating system that uses the operating system tools created by the GNU Project. Since then, this multi-user/multitasking platform has met tremendous success and is known for being powerful, fast, efficient, stable, reliable, and scalable (Edwards, 1998). In 1999, a survey estimated that the GNU/Linux operating system (popular known simply as “Linux”) was the operating system of more than 30% of Internet server sites. A recent release of the kernel (Linux 2.2.10) credits 190 key developers, though the total number of contributors was estimated to be around 1,200 (Dempsey, Weiss, Jones, & Greenberg, 2002; Stewart & Ammeter, 2002).

In 1998, Bruce Perens and Eric Raymond of the Open Source Initiative pointed out that the mistrust of many traditional firms towards the GPL was in Stallman’s term “free”, which is not very a attractive idea to the business world (von Krogh, 2003)—conventional wisdom says that you get what you pay for. Thus, they tried to refocus what they rebranded as the “open source” software movement by primarily focusing on the economic and engineering superiority of the “open source” approach to software development, in contrast to FSF’s more philosophically antagonistic approach towards “source-hoarding”. In response to their positive marketing, the term “open source” has become the preferred terminology for this approach. Other major open source projects have followed Linux’s success, including the Apache Web server (started in 1995) and the Mozilla Internet suite project (started in 1999 when Netscape released its Communicator suite as open source; Mozilla released the Firefox Web browser and Thunderbird e-mail client at the end of 2004).

PROFILE OF OPEN SOURCE COMMUNITIES

Lee and Cole (2003, p. 51) defined a virtual community as “a cyberspace supported by computer-based information technology, centered upon communication and interaction of participants to generate member-driven contents, resulting in a relationship being built up.” OSS development communities have been defined as groups of loosely connected programmers, who use the Internet as a medium for collaboratively developing, improving, and disseminating software (O’Reilly, 1999), and are recognized as a particular genre of virtual community (Ljungberg, 2000) and as virtual organizations (Crowston & Scozzi, 2002), which are characterized by: group members with a shared interest or goal; geographical distribution; and use of information and communication technology to communicate and manage interdependencies (Ahuja & Carley, 1998). They have been classified as communities of transaction (Hagel & Armstrong, 1997) and as “task-and goal-oriented” communities; that is, “communities striving to achieve a common goal by way of cooperation” (Stanoevska-Slabeva & Schmid, 2001).

Ideology and Values

One of the main emphases in OSS communities is the social interaction among participants through electronic communication. Rheingold (1993, p. 5) defines virtual communities as “social aggregations that emerge from the Net when enough people carry on public discussions long enough, with sufficient human feeling, to form webs of personal relationships in cyberspace”. This definition highlights the creation of relationships among people. As a consequence, the participants of an OSS community share a set of common values, and they adhere to the same ideology: the OSS culture.

The most commonly accepted view of OSS communities’ culture has been proposed by Raymond (2001) in his landmark paper, “The Cathedral and the Bazaar”, where he characterizes it as a “gift culture”, as opposed to an “exchange culture”. Exchange cultures are based on *scarcity* whereas gift cultures rely on *abundance*. Raymond argues that in gift cultures, social status is determined “not by what you control, but by what you give away”. Bergquist and Ljungberg (2001) have empirically demonstrated that such giving values and behaviors enable social relationships to be created and maintained in virtual environments. Assuming any ideology is a common set of shared norms, values and beliefs among the members of

3 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/open-source-software-communities/18102

Related Content

Quality of Knowledge in Virtual Entities

Cesar Analide, Paulo Novais, José Machado and José Neves (2008). *Virtual Technologies: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1360-1367).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/quality-knowledge-virtual-entities/30989

Encouraging Research through Communities of Practice

Sandra Corlett, Patricia Bryans and Sharon Mavin (2006). *Encyclopedia of Communities of Practice in Information and Knowledge Management* (pp. 157-162).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/encouraging-research-through-communities-practice/10484

The Epistemology of Skill and Knowledge Development to Teach Portuguese in a Virtual Learning Environment

Stella Kyprou Hadjistassou (2019). *Virtual Reality in Education: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 714-733).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-epistemology-of-skill-and-knowledge-development-to-teach-portuguese-in-a-virtual-learning-environment/224727

A Proposed Grayscale Face Image Colorization System using Particle Swarm Optimization

Abul Hasnat, Santanu Halder, Debotosh Bhattacharjee and Mita Nasipuri (2017). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 72-89).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-proposed-grayscale-face-image-colorization-system-using-particle-swarm-optimization/169936

VR Presentation Training System Using Machine Learning Techniques for Automatic Evaluation

Yuto Yokoyama and Katashi Nagao (2021). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 20-42).

www.irma-international.org/article/vr-presentation-training-system-using-machine-learning-techniques-for-automatic-evaluation/290044