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Abstract

Component-based software engineering (CBSE) is a common approach to develop and evolve contemporary software systems. When evolving a system based on components, make-or-buy decisions are frequent, i.e., whether to develop components internally or to acquire them from external sources. In CBSE, several different sourcing options are available: 1) developing software in-house, 2) outsourcing development, 3) buying commercial-off-the-shelf software, and 4) integrating open source software components. Unfortunately, there is little available research on how organizations select component sourcing options (CSO) in industry practice. In this work, we seek to contribute empirical evidence to CSO selection. Method: We conduct a cross-domain survey on CSO selection in industry, implemented as an online questionnaire. Based on 188 responses, we find that most organizations consider multiple CSOs during software evolution, and that the CSO decisions in industry are dominated by expert judgment. When choosing between candidate components, functional suitability acts as an initial filter, then reliability is the most important quality. We stress that future solution-oriented work on decision support has to account for the dominance of expert judgment in industry. Moreover, we identify considerable variation in CSO decision processes in industry. Finally, we encourage software development organizations to reflect on their decision processes when choosing whether to make or buy components, and we recommend using our survey for a first benchmarking.
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1 Introduction

Component-based software engineering (CBSE) is an established approach to enable large-scale code reuse and rapid development. By turning systems into assemblies of components, CBSE supports software evolution by simplifying component replacement [69]. However, in contemporary software engineering, the best option might not be to internally develop the new component. For example, buying commodity software components off-the-shelf might enable a faster time to market [68]. Furthermore, outsourcing development of less critical components could save the most knowledgeable internal development resources for differentiating features [62]. Moreover, it is increasingly common that software components can be reused within software ecosystems [50]. In this work, our interpretation of the term component is inclusive, i.e., a component is any separable software part of a system, from the database to “traditional” components as usually considered in CBSE, e.g., a software package, a web service, a web resource, or a module that encapsulates a set of related functions.

A recurring strategic consideration for organizations evolving component-based systems is the make-or-buy decision, i.e., whether to develop the components internally or to acquire them from external sources. Numerous studies from decisions in the manufacturing sector exist, e.g., Kraljic, providing support for cost identification and break-even analysis [40], as well as bringing structure to the overall decision process. However, research on strategic decision making conducted in “traditional” manufacturing contexts does not necessarily apply to R&D projects, e.g., development of software-intensive systems. Kurokawa points out two main reasons [41]: First, as opposed to manufacturing projects, not only costs calculations are required for R&D projects, but also benefit calculations, i.e., an R&D organization can use acquired knowledge to generate revenue later. Second, in comparison to manufacturing, analyses of R&D make-or-buy options are subject to higher degrees of uncertainty, i.e., decisions must be made with less accurate estimates of costs and benefits.

In software engineering, the make-or-buy decisions are more complex as both making and buying are represented by several sourcing options [74]. “Making” a software component can be interpreted as traditional in-house software development. However, making can also mean developing the component as part of an open source software (OSS) strategy, making the source code available from the start with the goal to establish a community. An alternative is to carefully specify requirements and to outsource the development of the source code to an external organization, i.e., an option between “make” and “buy”. Finally, strict “buying” means purchasing a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software component [71]. However, an increasingly common alternative to buying a COTS component is to instead integrate an existing OSS component [58], e.g., in operating systems [2], mobile applications [31], and even in safety-critical development contexts [64].

Deciding which component sourcing option (CSO) to use when evolving a software-intensive system is difficult. Often several stakeholders are involved in the decision making, and they might represent conflicting viewpoints [72]. Several highly advanced decision support systems have been proposed in software engineering research, e.g., Bayesian networks [23], formalism through modeling languages [13], and process simulation models [59]. Unfortunately, there is little available research on how practitioners make software engineering decisions, and even less on how sourcing decisions are made [10]. To address this, we present an industrial survey on practitioners’ decision making in relation to choosing between CSOs when integrating components in evolving software-intensive systems. Analogous to the case survey reported by Petersen et al. [56], we simplify CSO decisions to selecting one of the four alternatives:

- In-house: The company develops the component internally. In line with the work by Badampudi et al. [10], in-house includes any distributed development (incl. offshore) and internal development by external consultants.
- Outsource: The company acquires the component from an external development organization, e.g., after bilateral contract negotiation or procurement via a competitive bidding
process. Often the source code is part of the deal.

- COTS: The company buys an existing component from a software vendor or publisher. Typically the source code is not included in the deal.

- OSS: The company integrates an existing component that has been developed as open source software, possibly by a community. The source code is publicly available and the company might have to adapt it to fit the rest of the system.

We obtained 188 responses from various roles, across different domains, confirming that the phenomenon under study indeed exists in industry, i.e., CSO selection is a recurring decision point in software engineering. Furthermore, we show that CSO decisions are dominated by expert judgment, both in the actual decision making and in the assessment of component qualities. Finally, regarding component selection, we identified that functional suitability acts as an initial filter among candidate components, then reliability is the most important quality. Our main recommendation for industry practitioners is to increase awareness of how decisions are made internally in their organizations. Hopefully, our survey can let organizations to benchmark against the state-of-practice in CSO decisions – thus enabling identification of improvements in the internal decision making processes. Finally, to meet the needs of industry practice, we call for academic researchers to focus efforts on how to support decision making that is mainly driven by expert judgment, rather than developing decision support of esoteric nature with limited practical value.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents related work on decision making in software engineering. Section 3 describes how we conducted the industrial survey, including a discussion of the main threats to validity. In Section 4, we present an overview of the results. Section 5 answers the research questions, reports from a more thorough analysis, and provides a discussion in the light of the related work. Finally, Section 6 concludes our paper and presents our plans for future work.

## 2 Related work

This section reviews related work on two types of decision making in software engineering: CSOs selection and component selection.

### 2.1 CSO selection

Badampudi et al. [10] conducted a systematic literature review on approaches to choose between architectural assets, i.e., how to make trade-offs between different sourcing options. The investigation covered decision criteria, methods for decision making, and evaluations of the decision result. Through snowballing and systematic literature search, three types of solutions were identified to support the selection: 1) usage of decision methods, e.g., simulation models, analysis of requirements dependencies, components clustering, and decision tables, 2) usage of alternative criteria such as quality criteria, and 3) usage of alternative CSOs. The review highlighted that no systematic reviews exist on the topic of CSO selection whereas the CSOs compared were mainly focused on In-house vs. COTS and COTS vs. OSS. Furthermore, Badampudi et al. [10] analyzed the factors that are used in CSO selection, but they did not discuss the decision process involved – motivate by the limited number of case studies identified in the literature. In contrast, our survey captures a broad picture of decision making and we explicitly target the decision process in one of the research questions (cf. RQ2 in Section 3.2).

As only a limited number of reported case studies exist, Petersen et al. recently presented a case survey studying 22 case studies of how practitioners choose between CSOs [56]. The CSOs identified were: 1) in-house: development is carried out within a company, 2) COTS: development
2 RELATED WORK

is based on integrating “commercial-off-the-shelf” components, which are already pre-built and source code is not open to the buyer for modification, 3) OSS: development is based on open source components, also already pre-built, but the source code is publicly available, 4) services: making use of services that are again pre-built and can be invoked over a network, e.g., web services, and 5) outsource: development is carried out by a different company than the one owning the product. One of the conclusions was that the most frequent trade-offs are carried out between in-house vs. COTS, in-house vs. outsource, and COTS vs. OSS, partly confirming the result of the Badampudi et al. study [10], and bringing forward the in-house vs. outsource option. Based on the outcome of the decisions made in Petersen et al. [56], the CSO in-house was the favorable decision option, however, the evaluation of the decision showed that many of the decisions were perceived as suboptimal, indicating the need for optimizing the decision making process and outcomes. This survey has been designed to partly overlap Petersen et al.’s case survey. The two studies differ in scope and detail, and enable both method and data triangulation – a recommended basis for knowledge discovery in software engineering [52]. The case survey discusses 22 decision cases in detail, whereas this survey collects high-level empirical data from a broad variety of respondents. Still, the RQs are similar enough to allow direct comparisons, and generalization from the 22 cases.

Several primary studies explored in-house vs. COTS CSO decisions, e.g., Brownsworth et al. [12], discussed the changes resulting from introducing COTS into the development process and presented a new process framework. These changes occur through simultaneous definition and inevitable trade-offs considering the requirements, marketplace, as well as architecture and design. The changes require not just an engineering or technical change to the typical (in-house) development process of requirements, architecture, and implementation, but also a business, organizational, and cultural change. Many new activities need to be carried out, e.g., vendor relationships establishment, COTS cost estimation, and license negotiation to leverage the benefits of a COTS marketplace. Li et al. [43] empirically identified new COTS-specific activities and roles integrated to traditional development to reduce risks and provide assistance. Two CSO processes were found popular in practice: 1) familiarity-based selection, and 2) Internet-based search with hands-on trials. In Cortellessa et al. [15], a framework was presented to support the decision to buy components or build them in-house for software architects. The framework presented is based on a non-linear cost/quality optimization model. A set of quality constraints related to delivery time and product reliability are used to estimate the amount of unit testing to be performed to build components. The main limitations of the approach were the non-straightforward instantiation of the general model to specific cases, due to the inexistent inherent analytical formulations of the non-functional aspects of the software systems, as well as the non-linearity of the variables relations in real cases.

Li et al. [45] studied decisions made during integration of COTS vs. OSS and showed significant differences and commonalities. The main rationale was to obtain shorter time to market and reduced development effort. COTS were expected to have higher quality and vendor support than OSS, whereas the no-cost needed for the source code was the main motivation for choosing OSS, as well as the open-access source code benefit. On the other hand, maintenance costs were higher for COTS, as well as the estimation of the selection effort. For OSS the level of support was found questionable. The results reported were obtained from a survey covering only 3 countries, i.e., Norway, Italy and Germany.

Considering in-house vs. outsource, Daneshgar et al. [16] discussed the factors affecting the decision process for CSOs for both SMEs and large organizations: requirements fit, cost, scale and complexity, commoditization/flexibility, time, in-house experts, support structure, and operational factors. The study further distinguished the factors for SMEs (ubiquitous systems, availability of free download, and customizable to specific government/tax regulations) and large organizations (strategic role of the software, intellectual property concerns, and risk). However, the small sample of companies investigated in the study (8 companies), limits the generalizability. Wider-scope studies are needed, including SMEs across various industries and countries. The authors also highlighted the need for associating the factors identified with appropriate KPI measures. The survey presented in this paper aims to collect data from more practitioners and companies, i.e., direct
data that are current rather than based on historical cases, to attempt confirmation of recent work by Badampudi et al. [10] and Petersen et al. [56] as well as older studies by other researchers.

2.2 Component selection

Once a component sourcing strategy has been selected, the organization needs to concretize the particular component to use. If the strategy is to do new development (either in-house or outsourcing), this will be handled in the development process chosen. However, in the case of OSS or COTS, there could be several different concrete alternatives to choose from. In practice, a particular component could fit more or less well into the overall system architecture, and hence there is also an element of architecture decision making in this. In this section, we cover first results about architecture decisions with relevance to component selection. Then, the two particular cases of choosing OSS and COTS will be detailed.

Architectural decision making contains many challenges, as discussed by Tofan et al. [65]. Based on a survey with architects in industry, they identified that dependencies between different decisions and the large business impact are major difficulties. Decisions are often unique, and the analysis requires a large effort. van Vliet and Tang [70] collected literature related to the actual decision process that architects use, and they put perspectives on the rationality of that decision making, contrasting it with naturalistic decisions that are more contextually embedded, and they conclude that the strategy chosen depends on how well-structured the problem is. They also identified sources of bias in the decision making, and discussed the phases of architectural decision making, including problem framing, design exploration, and solution identification. Axelsson [6] described a case study from the automotive industry, where the evolution of the system architecture was investigated as a result of a number of change requests. It shows how two processes interact, namely the revolutionary architecting of a brand new solution for future product lines, and the evolutionary architecting that handles smaller adaptations. The inclusion of a component into an existing architecture would be an example of an evolutionary step, which has a strong focus on interface alignment.

Relating to component selection, Ayala et al. [8] and Gerea [27] found that common steps are identification, evaluation, learning and knowledge management, use of the component, and choosing. Gerea also found that the process of selection is impacted by the component size. Larger components were selected earlier in the development life-cycle. For OSS, identification is a challenge, since there is a multitude of different places to look. Kokkoras et al. [38] attacked this problem using a federated search engine that queries a number of existing open source search facilities and aggregates the result. Once an OSS candidate has been identified, one type of analysis is to look at the business value [51]. In this approach, the net present value of the component can be compared to the discounted costs, where the value is based on the assessment of a number of non-functional properties relevant to the situation. However, this does not take into account the uncertainties that result from the ecosystem nature of OSS development, and therefore the approach is extended with a real-options analysis. Hauge et al. [29] interviewed software companies about the integration of OSS into systems. They concluded that project specific factors are more decisive than general evaluation criteria, thereby emphasizing the relation to architecture described in the previous paragraph. Also, the decisions tend to be satisficing rather than optimizing.

For COTS, Ayala et al. [8] found a gap in the processes for component selection proposed in the literature versus what is used in practice. For example, component repositories are proposed, but not often used. The process used for selection is rarely formal and rather ad-hoc in nature, which has been reported by multiple authors (cf. Ayala et al. [8]; Li et al. [44]; and Torchiano and Morisio [66]). For COTS selection Li et al. [44] found that companies use prototyping to learn about COTS. In line with Tofan et al. [65], our survey reports the major challenges practitioners face when making architectural decisions, and, similar to Ayala et al. [8] and Gerea [27], we also attempt to capture the nature of the decision process. However, our work is primarily targeting CSO selection rather than component selection.
3 Research Methodology

This section describes the design of the survey, the instrument evaluation, the data collection, the data analysis, and the main threats to validity.

3.1 Survey Design

We designed a structured cross-sectional web-based survey [37] and implemented it using the Querous Survey Platform¹. A survey method allows for reaching a large number of respondents from geographically diverse locations [61] and enables both automation in data collection and flexibility in analysis [22]. We selected the Querous Survey Platform because it supports a more advanced question control flow compared to what is offered by simpler solutions such as Google Forms and SurveyMonkey.

The questionnaire consisted of a mix of closed-end and open-end (free-text) questions. The closed-end questions were of the following types: 1) select one option, 2) select multiple options (any number, up to three options, or up to five options), and 3) Likert scales. Definitions and clarifications were provided for those parts of the questionnaire for which there was a risk of misinterpretations. All questions included either an “Other” option with a free-text field or an “N/A” option. The final version of the questionnaire, containing 26 questions referred to as Q1-Q26, is available in the Appendix. Note that we designed the survey to allow also partial answers, i.e., any dropouts that at least answered Q9 contributed data to the subsequent data analysis phase.

Figure 1 shows an overview of the questionnaire. Our target respondents were practitioners involved in CSO decision making in industry, including roles in strategic management (e.g., CTOs), product planning (e.g., product managers), operational management (e.g., project manager), and software architecture. As the target population is large and highly heterogeneous, we included a relatively large demographics section (Q1-Q8) to enable a detailed characterization of the respondents. We collected 1) the role, 2) working experience, and 3) level of education of the individual respondents, and 1) domain, 2) maturity and 3) size of the respondents’ organizations, as well as the nature of their software development processes, i.e., whether they are traditional plan-driven processes or rather adhering to agile practices.

The demographics section was followed by a pivotal question on which CSOs respondents consider (Q9), i.e., which of the four CSOs (In-house, outsource, COTS, and OSS). The subsequent questions Q10-Q13 only appeared to the respondent as a clarifying free-text question if the corresponding CSO was not selected, e.g., “What is the main reason for you not to consider the option OSS?” (cf. “optional path” in Figure 1).

The next section of the questionnaire (Q14-Q22) collected the backbone data of the study. Q14 is a closed-end question for which any number of options could be selected. Q15 and Q16 are not part of the analysis in this paper, but for transparency and completeness they can be found in the appendix. Q17-Q19 are closed-end questions with up to three, any, and one possible selection, respectively. Q20 is a mandatory free-text question regarding the most important challenge involved in CSO decisions. Finally, Q21 is a single Likert item followed by Q22 as a free-text clarification if (and only if) “Strongly agree” or “Strongly disagree” is selected (i.e., an “optional path” in Figure 1). Finally, the questionnaire concluded by a section of closing questions related to contact information and follow-up studies (Q23-Q25).

3.2 Research Questions

The goal of our survey is to understand how CSOs and individual components are selected in industry. More specifically, we contribute knowledge to architectural decision making [65], by

¹http://www.querous.com/
Figure 1: Overview of the questionnaire. The numbers under the closed questions show whether one, three, or any number of options could be selected. Note that Q15-Q16 are not part of the analysis in this paper.
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decomposing the goal into three specific Research Questions (RQs). Table 1 lists the RQs and which questions in the questionnaire that address them. The questions were designed taking related work on decision making into consideration. We adopted and adapted information from prior work as follows:

RQ1 The main CSOs considered in industry [10, 56] are used in Q9-Q13.

RQ2 The roles involved in decision making [72, 55] are used in Q14 and the nature of the decision process [9] influenced the Likert scale in Q17 and questions Q20-Q23.

RQ3 We used the classification of software quality from the international standard ISO/IEC 25010 [32] in Q18.

3.3 Survey Instrument Evaluation

We evaluated the questionnaire in two stages. In the first stage, the entire Orion research team2 reviewed the questions. In addition, we invited an external senior software engineering researcher, a native English speaker, to particularly review the questions from a language perspective. We refined the survey instrument based on the feedback, covering wording, readability, understandability, and potential ambiguities. After the first stage, the questionnaire was implemented in the Querous survey platform.

In the second evaluation stage, we invited 15 colleagues from our partner networks to act as test pilots. We asked these pilot respondents, of which a handful had worked as senior product developers or managers in industry, to measure the time needed to complete the questionnaire, and to provide feedback on any unclear questions. The feedback from the pilot respondents led to the removal of 2 questions to ensure that 10-15 min would be sufficient to complete the survey. Moreover, some of the replies entered in “Other” categories by the pilot respondents were used to refine the answer options. The final version of the questionnaire consisted of 26 questions, organized according to Figure 1.

Table 1: Mapping between research questions and questionnaire questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Mapping to Questionnaire Questions</th>
<th>Designed based on previous work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Q9-Q13</td>
<td>Badampudi et al. [10], Petersen et al. [56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>Q14, Q17, Q20-Q2</td>
<td>Wnuk [72], Papatheocharous et al. [55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>Q18-Q19</td>
<td>ISO/IEC 25010 [32]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2http://orion-research.se/participants.html
3.4 Data Collection

We opted for an inclusive approach and used convenience sampling [57] to elicit as much information from industry practitioners as possible in relation to CSO and component selection. Previous empirical studies have suggested that both technical and management roles are involved in the decisions under study [56, 72, 55]. The roles identified in our previous work include: software management, software development, external support, software testing or quality control, customers, experts, legal, sales, software design and architecture, and subcontractors (component providers). The multitude of roles confirms that an inclusive approach is the most suitable for this survey, as our aim is to collect opinions from a broad spectrum of decision makers and industry representatives, i.e., the target population [18].

Data collection started on January 14th of 2016 and finished on August 31st of 2016. The majority of the responses was collected during January and February. The main source of population and the support for recruitment strategy [18] was the Orion project team that was tasked to send direct invitations to industry partners, focusing on software architects and product managers, but we also asked those industry partners to circulate invitations within their organizations. Moreover, we advertised the survey on social media, e.g., Twitter and several LinkedIn and Facebook groups related to software engineering and in particular software architecture.

We kept track of the origin of the responses by sharing five separate invitation links, i.e., one per academic partner in the Orion project: Blekinge Institute of Technology, RISE SICS AB, and Mälardalen University, one for the pilot responses, and one link for open invitations, e.g., LinkedIn, Twitter, and Facebook. The advantages of using LinkedIn in software engineering surveys have been discussed in the literature, e.g., Galster and Tofan [25], and include increased subject heterogeneity and the possibility to reach a population for which no centralized bodies of professionals exist. In total we collected 353 responses; 296 responses through direct invitations and 39 through open invitations, 15 pilot responses, and three undefined responses, i.e., responses that the Querous platform failed to track.

3.5 Data Analysis

We started the analysis by filtering out invalid answers, i.e., nonsense or careless responses. All filtering steps were done by the first author and validated by the third author. In total we obtained 353 responses, of which 152 were complete (152 out of 353, 43%). As most of the responses from the test pilots were collected from respondents belonging to the target population, we agreed to keep all but two (collected from test pilots mainly inspecting the language). Regarding the partial responses, we decided to keep all that at least completed Q9, i.e., the question on which CSOs are considered, resulting in 188 remaining responses. The average completion time for respondents that completed the whole questionnaire, and that did not make any interruptions (less than 30 min completion time, 130 out of 150, 87%), was 13 minutes and 31 seconds.

After the filtering, we analyzed all “Other” answers from closed-end questions, i.e., answers containing free-text, to investigate whether any answers should be consolidated with the existing possible options for the questions (i.e., Q1-Q4, Q9, Q14 and Q18-Q20). We decided to consolidate 13 answers for Q1 (respondents’ roles), three answers for Q4 (respondents’ domains), and two answers for Q18 (quality attributes), but this did not introduce any new answer options. As for the filtering steps, all merging operations were suggested by the first author and validated by the third author.

We conducted a number of statistical analyses within this study to answer the RQs. For the demographics section (Q1-Q8) contingency tables were used to explore frequency data [24]. All the results from the tables were depicted with bar charts. Chi-square of independence was performed to test the variety of the sizes of the different contingency tables, as well as more than one type of null or alternative hypotheses. The threshold value for p was 0.05 [3].
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3.5.1 Qualitative Analysis

For the free-text survey results (Q10-Q13, Q21, and Q23), coding analysis was performed, inspired by grounded theory [63] through the five step process depicted in Figure 2. Step 1 was an exploratory analysis of collected quotes performed by one researcher. From the analysis, 125 quotes were extracted containing information that could help us draw conclusions about CSO and component decisions.

Step 2 was coding of the extracted quotes from the dataset, which we denote \( D = P(q') \) where \( q' \) is a subset of quotes in the dataset. The coding was performed by one researcher incrementally by formulating representative codes (c) from the quotes \( Q \subseteq D \). Each code was formulated based on the semantics of the quotes and aimed to summarize/synthesize key concepts of the results such that a code c could be added to the set of codes C (c \( \in \) C). The codes were then applied to the quotes and documented, for traceability, as pairs (c, q), in a spreadsheet together with the following information:

1. The name of the code (cf. Figure 3).
2. A rationale for the code to motivate its value for the study.
3. Which quotes, associated with respondents and identified by line numbers, the code was applied to in the dataset.
4. How many times the code was applied to quotes.
5. An example quote from the dataset.

The distribution of applied codes to quotes ranged from a minimum of 1 to 23 (average 4.92) codes. Codes that were only applied once were primarily used in the grounded theory analysis to support higher level conclusions. In contrast, codes that were applied often were rather considered key results from the study.

Figure 3 shows all codes identified in the study. The greater-than sign (>) represents that the code to the right is subsumed under the code to the left, i.e., we introduce hierarchical sub-codes. For example, learnability is considered a sub-code of usability, but we still represent the concepts with separate codes.

Step 3 involved result verification, aiming at evaluating the correctness of the extracted codes (c \( \in \) C) and evaluate the completeness of \( P(c) = C \). This was achieved by two authors, other than the original creator of the codes, analyzing a set of quotes \( q \subseteq Q \subseteq D \) that encapsulated the original
set of codes ($\forall c \in C$). The two authors' codes $C_1$ and $C_2$ were then compared against the original set of codes $C$ ($\left( C_1 \cup C_2 \right) = C$) based on their semantic equivalence. Semantic analysis was required, instead of syntactical analysis, as the detailed wording used by each author differed. For instance, the two authors denoted the original code “politics” as “politics/people” and “bureaucracy”, respectively – but referred to the same phenomenon, i.e., the internal politics associated with the asset origin selection. Step 3 verified 36 out of the 37 original codes, but “branding/marketing” was removed since it was only extracted by the original author. We refer to these 36 verified codes as the “final codes”.

Step 4 was a semantic analysis of the application of the final codes. Two authors selected any number of appropriate codes among the final codes for a set of 36 well chosen quotes from the paper. The motivation behind this step was that there would be a considerable overlap between the original creator of the codes and the two authors if the codes were suitably and properly defined. We found that this overlap (i.e., identical coding) was 54% and 52% for the two authors, respectively when compared to the original author’s coding. As the number of possible combinations for 36 quotes and 36 codes is very high, we considered this a successful verification step of the codes representativeness. Further, it showed support for the original author’s coding as it was similar to how the other authors coded the quotes.

Step 5 was to verify the correctness of the original application of the final codes, i.e., the pairing of codes and quotes (c,q) in the final analysis. The original creator of the codes and another author, not involved in the previous verification steps, both applied the final and verified codes ($C$) on a subset of 10 quotes ($q_{10} \subseteq Q \subseteq D$) from the dataset. The results of the coding, i.e., pairing of $C$ on $q_{10}$ by the two authors, resulted in two paired sets $A_1 = (C, q_{1}')$ and $A_2 = (C, q_{2}')$, for which we calculated interrater agreement using Cohen’s Kappa. Step 4 was successful, as we obtained an acceptable Kappa value of 0.62 where 0.5-0.7 is considered good, whilst greater than 0.7 is considered excellent. This result indicated that the coding scheme was suitable and usable for further grounded theory analysis, i.e., to join codes on a higher level of abstraction to draw more general conclusions.
3.6 Threats to Validity

The population under study, i.e., practitioners involved in architectural decision making in component-based software evolution, is large and highly heterogeneous. For a start, a frequently used estimate of the number of software developers is 21 million, originating in the Global Developer Population and Demographic Study by the Evans Data Corporation\(^3\). However, GitHub recently presented data that suggest this number to be a considerable underestimate\(^4\). Moreover, not only software developers are involved in software engineering decision making (cf. Fig 8), but a mix of perspectives representing management, testing, business, legal etc. Consequently, we assume that the size of the population under study is in the magnitude of 100s of millions, i.e., any practical computations of sample sizes could regard the population as infinite. Under these circumstances, the importance of determining the appropriate sample size is dwarfed by the importance of selecting a representative sample.

Our survey was not designed to make strong quantitative conclusions about the general population of practitioners involved in CSO decisions, but rather to identify larger trends. We relied on a non-probabilistic method referred to as accidental sampling [47], i.e., we recruited respondents based on convenience – in line with most software engineering surveys [17]. Surveys based on convenience should be used to explore relationships between categories of respondents and their corresponding development contexts. Although our survey uses accidental sampling, we introduced additional structure by distributing separate links to the questionnaire among our invitees, e.g., to track the number of respondents personally invited vs. social media invitees. The demographics reported in Section 4.1, in particular related to Q2 and Q3, suggests that the convenience sampling we applied was successful.

We continue by discussing the four types of survey validity presented by Kitchenham and Pfleger [37]. Face validity is an estimate of whether a survey appears to measure a certain criterion, typically established by lightweight reviews. We achieved this by developing the questionnaire in a joint effort, including reviews by all participants in the ORION research project\(^5\). Face validity is a starting point, an initial sanity check, that should be met before the more comprehensive content validity is targeted.

Content validity concerns how much a measure represents every single element of a construct. In our case, we needed to ensure that our questionnaire covered all aspects of CSO decisions in industry. However, there is a trade-off between the length of the questionnaire and the coverage. We used an instrument evaluation with pilot runs, as described in Section 3.2, to find a feasible right balance. As a consequence, some aspects related to CSO decisions were intentionally left out, as well as combinations of the four options (i.e., in-house, outsource, COTS, and OSS). We list three aspects that could be further explored in future work. First, offshoring is not considered at all, a phenomenon in many cases directly influence both in-house development and outsourcing alternatives. Second, our study does not attempt to cover any aspects of product-line engineering approaches, although such strategies might clearly affect CSO decisions and component selection. Third, we did not include any explicit questions related to software ecosystems, which could be major driving factors in decisions regarding OSS.

Construct validity refers to how an operational definition of a variable actually reflects the true theoretical meaning of a concept. The major threat to our study is whether our inquiry about previously experienced CSO decisions truly reflects a phenomenon in industry. We addressed this by developing the questionnaire in a joint research effort with several senior researchers followed by a pilot run with a handful of selected respondents. Our initial construct captured CSO decisions and component selection as two separate activities, but our construct evolved during the study. Our data analysis suggested that the respondents interpreted the questions somewhat differently. In many cases, the two decisions are intertwined; the most appropriate component is selected.

\(^3\)https://evansdata.com/reports/viewRelease.php?reportID=9
\(^4\)http://bit.ly/2hD76go
\(^5\)http://orion-research.se/
regardless of its CSO. To mitigate this threat, we let RQ1 address CSO decisions and we opened up RQ2 and RQ3 to instead discuss component selection in more general terms. Another threat to construct validity is our simplified description of the OSS option, i.e., integrating an existing OSS component. It could be argued that this reflects a naive and immature view on open source development, as it is increasingly common for organizations to develop new components in-house, but under an OSS license from the start [4] – such development would qualify as both in-house and OSS in our questionnaire. However, we believe that we captured all such examples through the mix of closed and open questions. We observed that several respondents appeared proud of the OSS strategies of their organizations, and thus more eager to explain the details in free text.

Finally, criterion validity deals with the ability of a measurement instrument to distinguish respondents belonging to different groups. Our questionnaire collected self-reported assessments and opinions, an approach that might introduce certain biases. Respondents may exaggerate issues in their organizations to make their situation seem worse, or they may under-report the severity to minimize their problems. Furthermore, respondents might provide answers that are incorrect, especially regarding questions with limited subjectivity. In our questionnaire, we believe that the biggest threat is related to the self-assessment of agility, a phenomenon that is known to be hard to evaluate [34]. We use the statement in Q8 (“My organization is more agile than plan-driven”) to distinguish respondents, but we did not triangulate this self-reported agility assessment beyond analyzing the respondents’ open question replies.

4 Results – From a Bird’s Eye View

This section presents the results from our survey, and an analysis of the 188 responses.

4.1 Demographics

Figure 4 shows the roles of the individual respondents. Roughly a third of the respondents primarily associate themselves as product developers (62 out of 188, 33.0%), reflecting that the number of developers outnumbers other roles in industry. The second largest group of respondents are software architects (39 out of 188, 20.7%), which appears promising given our goal to better understand architectural decision making. Other roles represented by ten or more respondents are strategic management, product planning, quality assurance, and end-user perspective. Overall, the respondents represent a wide variety of roles involved in decision making.

Figures 5 and 6 show the respondents’ working experience and education level, respectively. A majority of the respondents reported 10 or more years of working experience (136 out of 188, 72.3%). Twenty-six respondents had more than 25 years of working experience (26 out of 188, 13.8%), and 20 respondents can be considered juniors with 0-4 years of working experience (20 out of 188, 10.6%). Most of the respondents had received Master degrees (98 out of 188, 52.1%), followed by PhD degrees (37 out of 188, 19.7%), and Bachelor degrees (31 out of 188, 16.5%). We conclude that our survey covers the viewpoints of senior engineers in the software engineering industry, i.e., Q2 and Q3 confirm that our sampling strategy was successful.

Figure 7 illustrates the wide variety of domains covered by the survey (note, however, that respondents could select any number of domains). The domain selected most frequently is by far “Computer [Software]”. Other well-represented domains include telecommunications, engineering/architecture, automotive, mobile application, consulting, finance, and Internet/eCommerce.

The final part of the demographics section addressed the respondents’ organizations. As a proxy for the maturity, Q6 asked for how many years the respondents’ companies had offered products or services to the market. Figure 8 shows that sixty out of 188 respondents (31.9%) stated “25 years or over”. On the other side of the scale, 44 respondents answered “0-4 years” (44 out of 188, 23.4%), representing companies new to the market. The median answer was “10-14 years”. Figure 9
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Figure 4: Roles of the respondents.

Figure 5: Working experience of the respondents.

Figure 6: Education level of the respondents.
Figure 7: Overview of the respondents’ domains.

depicts the size of the business units in which the respondents work. The most common size of the respondents’ units is 5-19 co-workers (54 out of 188, 28.7%), but as many as 39 respondents (39 out of 188, 20.7%) work in companies that do not appear to break down to smaller business units, instead they have more than 500 co-workers.

Finally, our questionnaire gauged whether the respondents’ development organizations adhere to an agile development methodology or rather traditional process models, e.g., waterfall development. As reported in Figure 10, Q8 requested the respondents to select the level of agreement to the statement “my organization is more agile than plan-driven”. A majority of the respondents (109 out of 188, 58.0%) agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, while 26 out of 188 (26.6%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, note that only 10 respondents strongly disagreed compared to 43 that strongly agreed. While our survey covers all levels of agility, we acknowledge that a larger fraction of the respondents adhere to agile practices.

4.2 Which CSOs are typically considered in industry? (RQ1)

Figure 11 shows which CSOs are typically considered in industry, i.e., the answers to the branching question Q9. A strong majority of the respondents (164 out of 188, 87.2%) consider in-house development when choosing between CSOs. The second and third most common CSOs are OSS (113 out of 188, 60.2%) and COTS (99 out of 188, 52.7%), respectively. We note that both OSS and COTS are considered in more than half of the responses. Outsourcing is the least commonly considered CSO, but still frequently considered as a viable option (68 out of 188, 36.2%). In contrast to the case survey by Petersen et al. [56], our study suggests that OSS often is considered when practitioners compare CSOs when evolving a software-intensive system, i.e., we report 60.2% whereas Petersen et al. reported 11.3%. A possible explanation is that our sample has a larger representation from the domains mobile applications and Internet/e-commerce, which are known to frequently use OSS [53, 11]. Another explanation, partly related, is that the case survey by Petersen et al. [56] draws conclusions on older decision cases, whereas OSS has matured considerably in the last decade.

A majority of the respondents report that they typically consider two or more CSOs when adding
Figure 8: Organizations’ time on the market.

Figure 9: Number of co-workers in the respondents’ business unit.
Figure 10: Self-reported agility of the respondents’ development organizations.

Figure 11: The CSOs considered by the respondents. Number of CSOs selected by the respondents: One CSO = 51, Two CSOs = 51, Three CSOs = 53, and Four CSOs = 33.
new components (137 out of 188, 72.9%). This confirms that the decision scenario pictured in the Orion research project⁶ indeed is relevant to industry practitioners. The two CSOs that most frequently co-occur in decisions are in-house and OSS (97 times) and in-house and COTS (92 times), followed by in-house and outsource (59 times). However, roughly a quarter of the respondents typically consider only one CSO (51 out of 188, 27.1%), i.e., fifty-one respondents state that there is no comparing of CSOs in their organizations. Among these, 33 out of 51 (64.7%) respond only in-house development, 12 out of 51 respond only OSS components (23.5%), five respond only outsourcing, and one respondent answered only COTS.

Each time a respondent did not select one of the CSOs, the questionnaire proceeded with a free-text question on why the CSO was not considered. Results showed a variety of different reasons that could be divided into three key aspects: 1) management, 2) functional, and 3) quality-oriented, i.e., aspects that affect the feasibility of the candidate components, and in turn what CSOs were considered. Aspects associated with management included the cost of the component, the cost of its adoption and cost of component management, but also political factors, e.g., that OSS may not be allowed due to licensing issues. This conclusion is supported by statements like: “Mostly legal issues regarding contracts, sourcing partners and SLA”, “We don’t know quality of complex open source. We don’t know how long open source will be maintained” and “It can be hard to compare the time and costs in developing something of our own with the monetary costs in purchasing a finished product. Open source software is often the best of both worlds since you get something working but can still add features yourself”. These answers also suggest that many companies are not aware what parts of their product are commodity and therefore can be obtained from OSS source and what parts should be kept proprietary and therefore internally developed [46].

Next, the functional aspects of a component seem to be particularly important aspects for a decision maker to consider. This analysis varies from component to component and can prohibit the use of a certain CSO if the functionality is not good enough or if the component is not open source. This conclusion is supported by statements such as: “Our key factor is to correctly determine the strategic importance of the component, e.g., deciding where in the life-cycle it is and how quickly we believe the functionality will be commodity vs. differentiating” as well as the following statement; “Acquiring technical knowledge needed to evaluate alternatives, and allocate resources to prototype concept proofs of concept or prototypes to test alternatives.”, which refers to the technical knowledge required to understand the viability of a certain asset.

Finally, the qualities are crucial since they are used to determine which component that is chosen in the end, mentioned explicitly by 40 out of 188 of the respondents (21.3%). Hence, in the selection process, components of similar functionality are first identified and then the qualities of these components are weighed against one another to determine which one to select in the end. As expected, the functionality is considered first to ensure that the component at all can fulfill the decision maker’s needs. This conclusion is supported by statements like: “We test the product (asset) by integrating it with our product and calculate different function points and check performance. On the basis of the data collected from such tests a decision is made.” and “Is it reliable and compatible with our product or not?”

As such, a general chain of decision making steps can be inferred, namely: 1) identification of components that follow the managerial and political guidelines of the organization, 2) identification of components of suitable functionality to fulfill the organization’s needs, and, finally, 3) comparison of the quality aspects of the candidate components to acquire the one with the best fit for the organizational needs. Our results suggest that the component selection and the CSO selection are intertwined, i.e., any candidate component that is identified through the three steps can be selected, regardless of its CSO.

⁶www.orion-research.se
4.3 What is the nature of the decision process when selecting CSOs and components? (RQ2)

Figure 12 shows the roles (or perspectives) involved in the CSO decision process. The two roles most frequently involved are product development (118 out of 188, 62.8%) and system view/architecture (115 out of 188, 61.2%). Also product planning and maintenance/evolution perspectives are often involved in the decisions, 91 out of 188 (48.4%) and 85 out of 188 (45.2%), respectively. Our results show that all of the roles presented as options to Q14 are relevant to CSO decisions, as even the least frequent answer (internal business perspective) is involved in 18.1% of the answers (34 out of 188). Furthermore, our list appears to be rather comprehensive as the number of other answers is low (12 out of 188, 6.4%).

Q17 is a Likert scale consisting of five Likert items related to the character of the CSO decision process. Figure 13 presents the answer distribution of the 164 remaining respondents, i.e., 24 respondents had dropped out. While the CSO decision processes in industry appear to vary, some general trends can be seen.

Roughly the same amount of respondents agrees (48 out of 164, 29.3%) and disagrees (41 out of 164, 25.0%) to whether the CSO decision process is systematic (cf. Figure 13a). Forty-six out of 164 respondents (28.0%) neither agree nor disagree. Only 26 out of 164 respondents (15.9%) have strong opinions on the statement. Consequently, our results suggest that some organizations have a decision process in place while others do not; few companies appear to have rigid processes established for CSO decisions, in line with previous studies on component selection [66, 44, 8].

Figure 13b shows that CSO decision processes in industry are mainly based on expert judgment, as a clear majority agrees; Seventy-two out of 164 agree (43.9%) and 44 out of 164 strongly agree (26.8%), but only 12 out of 188 (7.3%) of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree. In line with several other software engineering studies [5, 35, 56], expert judgment is the dominant approach. On the other hand, Figure 13c shows a contrasting view: almost half of the respondents consider the decision process to be based on collected data; seventy-seven out of 164 agree (47.0%) and 15 out of 164 strongly agree (9.1%). We interpret this as follows: expert judgment dominates
CSO decisions in industry, but the experts inform themselves based on data collected within the organizations. Consequently, the typical CSO decision process in industry seems to be based on a data-driven approach to expert judgment.

Figure 13d shows that CSO decision processes can be both democratic and authoritarian – The same number of respondents agreed (or strongly agreed) and disagreed (or strongly disagreed) to the statement (59 vs. 59), and 42 out of 164 (25.6%) neither agreed nor disagreed. Regarding the transparency of the decision process, there is a slight positive tendency; Figure 13e shows that 77 out of 164 (47.0%) agree (or strongly agree) to decision being transparent, whereas 37 out of 164 (22.6%) disagree (or strongly disagree). Clearly, the perception of group involvement and transparency in CSO decision processes is diverse.

Figure 14 shows the lead-time needed to reach a CSO decision. The sub-plots represent answers from the 153 remaining respondents concerning the minimum time, the average time, and the maximum time, respectively. Fifty-one respondents out of 153 (33.3%) report that the average lead-time for a CSO decision is less than one month, making it both the mode and the median. Both longer and shorter average times are common in industry though; sixty-nine out of 153 (45.1%) respondents report less than three months or longer lead-times, and 29 respondents (19.0%) answered less than a week or even less than one day.

A majority of the respondents answers that the minimum lead-time is less than one week (85 out of 153, 55.6%), forty-seven respondents (30.7%) even say the minimum time is less than one day. Regarding the maximum lead-time, more than one year is the most frequent answer, reported by 42 out of 153 respondents (27.5%). A majority of the respondents (81 out of 153, 52.9%) selected alternatives corresponding to lead-times of the magnitude of months, i.e., less than three months, less than six months, or less than one year. Seventeen percent of the respondents (26 out of 153) claim that the maximum lead-time for CSO decisions is less than 1 month, possibly explained by less complex system development or leaner decision processes. Wnuk et al. [73] reported that increased product complexity lead to longer decision lead-times.
Q20 is a free-text question about what makes CSO decisions challenging. These challenges are aligned with the reasons why certain CSOs are chosen. Hence, the challenges are associated with the three archetypes of managerial-, functional- and quality-oriented aspects of the components. Examples of challenges that were stated include impact of a component on the security and safety of the system, impacts on certification of the system, availability of source code, amount of information available about the component(s), business goals, and more. Hence, there were many challenges reported in the survey but these challenges are also diverse and vary across different types of companies and domains. Due to the diversity it is difficult to determine any general challenges for certain contexts, which will instead require more detailed research in future work. These, stated challenges, are aligned with statements such as, “Many options and it is hard to predict what we need long term”, “Decision making structures in companies”, “Lack of knowledge how complex it will be to write/adjust the software to our needs”, “Prediction of cost and suitability” and “Uncertainty about the best alternative for the job, sometimes it is not possible to do a deep analysis of each alternative, and you end up doing superficial decisions”.

Figure 15 shows 152 responses to the Likert item addressing the statement “The final decision you make in your company on which component to select agrees with what your analysis showed to be the best option.” A majority of the respondents (96 out of 152, 63.2%) agree or strongly agree that the decision follows the analysis. While several respondents neither agree nor disagree to the statement, only 14 out 152 (9.2%) disagree with the statement. Also, not a single respondent strongly disagrees. Our results indicate that decisions are made in line with what is recommended by analyses.

For respondents selecting “Strongly agree” to Q21, a free-text question appeared, requesting a motivation. Qualitative analysis of these responses showed that most companies had agreement because of their structured decision-process and often some type of democratic decision, supported by quotes such as “It have not been any big debates about it”, “We prepared the choice through a formal process with a form that assists the decision. This form removes personal aspects and puts technical requirements that support in fact a complex decision”, “Unless someone can make a spectacular argument for an alternative, the team usually goes with what was democratic-ishly (sic!) selected”. Alternatively, expert judgment was used in the decision making that made it final, supported by quotes such as “I am an empowered expert and free to make strategic decisions
for the software”, “We always use expert opinions and prototyping; agility is part of our company values”. Hence, once a decision was taken, it was considered final and “the best” decision even though the decision process was stated as quite different.

4.4 What qualities are the most important when selecting components? (RQ3)

Figure 16 shows the most important quality attributes, as defined by ISO/IEC 25010, when making CSO decisions and component selection [32]. Functional suitability is of the highest importance, selected by 113 out of 188 respondents (60.1%), followed by reliability (79 out of 188, 42.0%) and maintainability (64 out of 188, 34.0%). On the contrary, portability was only selected by 14 out of 188 (7.4%) of the respondents.

Figure 17 presents how the ISO quality attributes are estimated prior to CSO decisions. Most organizations use internal expert judgment (128 out of 188, 68.1%), clearly the dominant approach used in industry. Five other common estimation methods appear to be equally common: previous experience (89 out of 188, 47.3%), perform measurements (83 out of 188, 44.1%), prototype component (81 out of 188, 43.1%), perform pre-study (80 out of 188, 42.6%), and read up on subject (79 out of 188, 42.0%). Considerably less frequent estimations methods are asking source providers, asking component users, and external expert judgment; All selected in less than 25% of the responses. As only three respondents selected “Other”, the options provided by Q19 appear to be comprehensive. Moreover, our results show that all estimation methods are actually used in industry. Thus, our study both corroborates and expands findings from Li et al. [44], i.e., prototyping is used in COTS selection, but also in component selection from other CSOs.

5 Results – Statistical Analysis and Discussion

This section presents statistical analyses of the results and discusses the implications these findings have on software engineering research and practice.
Figure 16: The most important quality attributes in the CSO decision process.

Figure 17: How quality attributes are estimated prior to CSO decisions.
5 RESULTS – STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Which CSOs are typically considered in industry? (RQ1)

Most importantly, our results confirm the presence of the software engineering phenomenon under study: CSO selection, i.e., an extended make-or-buy decision. As reported in Section 4.1, most companies consider more than one CSO when evolving component-based systems – and if only one CSO is considered, the company typically develops all components in-house. Furthermore, our survey indicates that OSS and COTS are equally common CSOs in component-based software evolution.

Our findings confirm Badampudi et al.’s conclusion that the four CSOs in-house, outsource, OSS, and COTS are compared in practice [10]. However, while their work showed that the academic literature focuses on in-house vs. COTS and COTS vs. OSS, our work suggests that both in-house vs. COTS and in-house vs. OSS are frequently compared in industry. Also compared to Petersen et al. [56], our survey reveals a higher prevalence of OSS in industry.

On top of these findings, we identify a number of patterns among the respondents; all of the findings reported below are statistically significant, but we remind the reader that “agility” was self assessed by the respondents, as discussed in Section 3.6. First, agile companies are more likely to consider more than one CSO compared to plan-driven companies ($p<0.01$). However, agile companies are less frequently considering outsourcing ($p<0.05$), concurring with the analysis provided by Turk et al. [67]: “agile development provides limited support for subcontracting”. In contrast, Jalali and Wohlin [33] presented a more recent systematic literature study that shows that outsourcing indeed is used in agile development contexts. Our survey shows that outsourcing is instead a more common CSO alternative for companies with mature products and large business units – as one could expect, small organizations appear to rarely have the resources to orchestrate outsourcing initiatives.

On the other hand, agile companies are more inclined to consider OSS ($p<0.05$). The tendency to consider OSS is not restricted to agile organizations though, as OSS is generally more popular in companies with product offerings less than a decade old. Note, however, that our survey also suggests that many mature companies consider OSS – 22 out of 60 respondents from companies with products on the market for 25+ years reported considering this CSO. We conclude that OSS has permeated software engineering contexts of various nature, attracting both young start-ups and mature companies.

5.2 What is the nature of the decision process when selecting CSOs and components? (RQ2)

Our results show that the process for CSO and component selection in industry varies considerably. Roughly the same proportion of respondents report an ad hoc decision process as a decision process of systematic nature. On the same note, CSO decisions in industry are driven by expert judgment, corroborating findings from Petersen et al. [56]. Not only does expert judgment dominate the actual decision process, but also the assessment of the alternative options. On the other hand, a majority of the respondents also claim that the decision process is based on collected data, adhering to calls to make software engineering decisions based on empirical evidence [20]. Note, however, that our work does not organize decision making into phases as proposed by Badampudi et al. [9], i.e., decision preparation, decision initiation, and decision making. Thus, it is possible that certain phases of the decision making process are more data-oriented than others. Moreover, while the respondents’ emphasis on both expert judgment and data at first might appear contradictory, we argue that it motivates efforts to complement expert judgment-based decision processes with historical data, e.g., by providing easy access to analogous cases stored in a knowledge repository [14]. Future work should take into consideration the nature of decision making in industry, and propose applicable decision support that can be integrated in contemporary ways of working – otherwise there will be no industry adoption.
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We highlight a number of findings related to involvement in decision processes. First, in line with the distribution of answers for the ad hoc/systematic question, roughly the same number of respondents claim that the decisions are democratic as authoritarian. As one could expect, agile organizations with developers involved in the decision making more frequently report their process as democratic. On the other hand, developers' self-perception of involvement does not necessarily reflect reality. We observed that developers are more likely than other respondent roles to report that “developers are involved in the decision making” (p < 0.05). One explanation could be that the developers tend to overestimate their involvement in CSO decisions, i.e., that developers experience an illusion of democracy. Another possible explanation is that the developers feel involved as they are active in collecting information during the decision preparation, but other roles do not believe that activity qualifies as involvement in the actual decision making. A third explanation, partly related, could be that developers and the other roles are involved in different phases of the decision making, thus other roles are not fully aware of the developers’ involvement. The last two explanations are in line with the different phases of decision making described by Badampudi et al. [9], but future work is needed to confirm whether developers’ involvement tends to be restricted to early phases.

Another finding we want to highlight in relation to RQ2 regards the agreement between the preparatory analysis and the final decision. We expected to find a discrepancy, i.e., many respondents reporting that the suggestions from analyses are not followed in the actual decision. Such a discrepancy would resonate with previous work stressing political factors in software engineering [42], e.g., in cost estimation [49] and complex systems engineering [36]. Instead, we found that most respondents agree that the final decisions follow the recommendations from analyses – again developers stand out by agreeing more than other roles (p < 0.05). Our conclusion is that CSO decisions are not held back by internal politics, it appears that organizations indeed make decision in line with the results from the analyses.

5.3 What qualities are the most important input to the decision process? (RQ3)

We conclude that functional suitability is the single most important quality in CSO decisions, essentially acting as the deal-breaker. If a component available from a particular origin does not meet the requirements regarding functional suitability, the corresponding CSO alternative is effectively removed as an alternative. This finding was consistent across all respondents, i.e., no matter which CSOs are considered, regardless of organization size, development methods, and maturity of the company: functional suitability acts as an initial filter in the decision making. After the initial screening phase based on functional suitability, reliability is the second most important quality in CSO decisions. Other qualities that typically are central to CSO decisions are maintainability, performance, and security. Our findings corroborate results from a literature study by Sentilles et al. [60], investigating the most important qualities in the automotive domain. The authors report that cost is the most important, followed by performance and reliability/safety. While we do not consider cost in our survey, as it is no quality according to ISO 25010, our respondents report a similar ranking of qualities. Moreover, two recent surveys have ranked quality attributes in OSS. The 2017 GitHub Open Source Survey [26], collecting data from 5,500 randomly sampled respondents representing 3,800 GitHub repositories, reports that users primarily value stability and security, followed by user experience, compatibility, and transparency. LibreOffice replicated the survey among their users, collecting 1330 answers, showing that the most important quality is stability, followed by compatibility, user experience, and security. We note that neither of the OSS surveys presented performance as an alternative option, that reliability was referred to as stability, and that maintainability was captured in other terms such as customizability and support. Taking all results into consideration, we conclude that reliability appears to be the universally most important quality of software regardless of domain. Furthermore, security awareness permeates software engineering in general, although not ranked as high by Sentilles et
We show that component qualities are primarily estimated using expert judgment. The least common estimation methods both require human interaction: interviewing users of the component and directly asking the source provider. In general, software engineering recommendations on how to evaluate software components are technically oriented rather than human-oriented, i.e., more guidelines for experimentation and mathematical modelling such as Goševa-Popstojanov and Trivedi [28] have been published than high-level assessment frameworks such as Kontio [39]. Our survey shows that respondents working in large business units more frequently ask the source providers about the quality characteristics of a component (p < 0.05). This indicates that there is a higher degree of trust between large development organization and their suppliers. As large business units typically exist in mature companies, it is likely that long-lasting business relations enable more direct and transparent communication. Furthermore, companies that recently released products or services to the market more often use prototyping to estimate component qualities (p < 0.05). One possible explanation could be that young companies already are used to develop prototypes, thus prototyping also with candidate components is a natural approach.

We report four statistically significant differences identified in our study. First, organizations that estimate components’ 1) performance and/or 2) reliability on average have longer decision lead-times (p < 0.05). These are reasonable findings, as performance testing is known to be challenging [75], and a component’s reliability inevitably grows with increased testing times [48] – a high reliability target, necessitates prolonged time in the testing phase.

Second, agile companies report longer decision lead-times on average (p < 0.05). As faster time-to-market is one of the expected benefits of agile development methods [21, 30], the slower decision processes are somewhat counter-intuitive. On the other hand, researchers have previously highlighted that software architecture might deteriorate when agile development is introduced [19, 1] – which could explain the slower architectural decision making identified in our survey.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

A recurring strategic consideration for organizations evolving component-based systems is the make-or-buy decision, i.e., whether to develop the components internally or to acquire them from external sources. In software engineering, make-or-buy decisions are more complex than in traditional manufacturing, as both the make and buy options are represented by several sourcing options and have long-term implications in terms of maintenance and evolvability. In this work, we focus on four component sourcing options (CSO): 1) in-house development, 2) outsourced development, 3) buying commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software, and 4) integrating existing open source software (OSS).

We present an industrial survey on practitioners’ decision making in relation to choosing between CSOs for adding components in evolving software-intensive systems. We obtained 188 responses from various roles involved in development of software-intensive products and services across different domains. As there are few previous studies on CSO selection, we contribute novel input to an understudied software engineering challenge, manifested in the answers to the research questions below.

RQ1 Our survey confirms that CSO selection constitutes a recurring decision point in software engineering. All four CSOs are frequently considered in industry; in-house is the most common, in turn followed by OSS, COTS, and outsourcing. Furthermore, most companies consider more than one CSO when evolving component-based systems.

RQ2 We show that the processes for CSO and component selection in industry varies considerably. Ad hoc decision processes are about as common as systematic counterparts. Irrespective of systematism, component decisions in industry are driven by expert judgment. On the other
hand, most decision processes are complemented by collected data. Moreover, authoritarian and democratic decision processes appear to be equally common in industry, but many different roles are involved in both cases.

RQ3 We conclude that functional suitability is the single most important quality in component decisions. Once a component’s functional suitability has been determined, other qualities are estimated. Reliability is the second most important quality, followed by maintainability, performance, and security. Due to consistency across domains and contexts, our results suggest that functional suitability and reliability are universal qualities that make components more likely to be selected.

Our research has several implications for research and practice. First, we show that any solution-oriented work on decision support has to account for the dominance of expert judgment in industry – or end up as yet another academic construct collecting imaginary dust in a digital library. Second, we observe a wide variety of decision processes – not at all surprising given the heterogeneous contexts experienced by the survey respondents. Future research should further explore contextual differences, as a single decision process will not rule them all. Instead, to really make an impact in industry, researchers should focus efforts on solutions tailored for specific contexts rather than global solutions. Third, we found that organizations adhering to agile development require longer lead-times to make architectural decisions. While this finding is in line with previously reported determinants of the agile movement, i.e., the coexistence of agile and architecture, we call for additional explanatory research on why architectural decisions are reached slower in agile organizations. Fourth, our survey shows that decision are based on data, but further research is needed to understand what types of data are used, how they are used, and how the data are translated into the actual decisions.

From the perspective of an industrial practitioner, our survey might encourage self-reflection. Hopefully, our study can motivate organizations to take a step back and consider their own decision processes. We believe there is a value in simply increasing awareness of how decisions are made, and our survey can enable a benchmarking against the overall community. Along the same lines, we recommend organizations to explicitly cover CSO and component decisions in retrospective meetings and post-mortem analyses. Only by bringing the decision processes to the surface, assessment and improvement activities can commence. Finally, also related to process improvement, development organizations might benefit from augmenting internal metrics initiatives to encompass also CSO and component decisions, incl. lead-times and decision rationales. While it by no means is trivial, software reuse will remain an engine for software engineering projects – thus CSO and component decisions will inevitably be key concepts.

In the ORION project, we will continue our research on efficient and effective decision making in component-based software engineering. First, we aim to enable organizations to better support their decisions-making processes by collecting data or evidence relevant to their architectural decisions with the GRADE taxonomy [55] and canvas [54], possibly through direct interaction with partner companies during agile retrospective meetings in the field, or through focus groups in a more controlled setting. Second, we will continue developing COACH [7], with a particular focus on creating a lightweight decision support tool that can be easily integrated into a decision process dominated by expert judgment. Moreover, motivated by the fact that decisions are also complemented by data (cf. Figure 13c), we will continue our efforts to make previous decisions useful [14], either by case-based reasoning or more advanced pattern matching techniques. Finally, we have initiated detailed investigations of a handful of development contexts. At the moment, we study component selection in the automotive domain and sourcing strategies in public sector development at government agencies in Sweden. As a final deliverable of the ORION project, we plan to collect all findings and solutions in a comprehensive and accessible body of knowledge for state-of-the-art decision making in component-based software engineering.
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Appendix

Tables 2-4 show the questions of the web-based questionnaire. The questions were either closed, i.e., multiple choice, Likert scale (or single Likert item), distribute $100 or open-ended, i.e., with free-text answers. Note that Q15 and Q16 are presented for the sake of completeness, despite not being analyzed as part of this study.

Table 2: The demographics section of the questionnaire, Q1-Q8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your current role?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>How many years of working experience do you have?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>What is the highest level of formal education you have received?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>In which domain(s) do you primarily work?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Please provide a brief description of the product or service that is the principal focus of your work.</td>
<td>Free-text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>For how many years has your company had this product or service category on the market?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>How many co-workers do you have in the business unit in which you work?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>&quot;My development organization is more agile than plan-driven.&quot;</td>
<td>Likert item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The main part of the questionnaire, Q9-Q24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>What options do you typically compare when choosing to add/replace a new component to your product? [Inhouse, Outsource, COTS, OSS]</th>
<th>Multiple choice, select one or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10-Q13</td>
<td>What is the main reason for you not considering the option &lt;from Q9&gt;?</td>
<td>Free-text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>When choosing between the options &lt;from Q9&gt;, which roles/perspectives are involved in the decision making?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>When choosing between the options &lt;from Q9&gt;, what information is the most important input to the decision process?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one to five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Given the options you selected as the most important in the previous question, please indicate their relative importance by distributing 100 points across the alternatives.</td>
<td>Distribute $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>a) &quot;... we follow a systematic decision process.&quot; b) &quot;... our decision process is mainly based on expert judgment.&quot; c) &quot;... our decision process is based on data we collect.&quot; d) &quot;... the final decision is democratic rather than authoritarian.&quot; e) &quot;... the decision process is transparent.&quot;</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>When choosing between the options &lt;from Q9&gt;, which quality attributes are the most important to consider?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one to three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Regarding the quality attributes &lt;from Q18&gt;, what methods do you use to collect or estimate information about them?</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>How long is the typical lead-time needed to reach a decision in selecting a component (i.e., choosing between &lt;from Q9&gt;) for your product? a) Minimum lead-time b) Typical lead-time c) Maximum lead-time</td>
<td>Multiple choice, select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>When choosing between the options &lt;from Q9&gt;, what are the main factors that make a decision challenging?</td>
<td>Free-text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>&quot;The final decision you make in your company on which component to select agrees with what your analysis showed to be the best option.&quot;</td>
<td>Likert item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>(If strongly agree/disagree to Q22) Please explain the reason for your answer to the previous question.</td>
<td>Free-text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>If you would like to receive our final report at the end of the study, please provide your email address.</td>
<td>Free-text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The concluding part of the questionnaire, Q25-Q26.

| Q25 | If you entered an email address in the previous question, would you be willing to answer follow-up questions related to the topic of this survey? | Yes/No                           |
| Q26 | Finally, is there anything else you would like to add before submitting the survey?                                         | Free-text                         |