

10-22-2008

# Asynchronous Decision-Making in Distributed Teams

Qing Li

Syracuse University, qli03@syr.edu

Robert Heckman

Syracuse University, rheckman@syr.edu

Eileen Allen

Syracuse University, eeallen@syr.edu

Kevin Crowston

Syracuse University, crowston@syr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts\\_all](http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts_all)

---

## Recommended Citation

Li, Qing; Heckman, Robert; Allen, Eileen; and Crowston, Kevin, "Asynchronous Decision-Making in Distributed Teams" (2008). *All Sprouts Content*. 214.

[http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts\\_all/214](http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts_all/214)

This material is brought to you by the Sprouts at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in All Sprouts Content by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact [elibrary@aisnet.org](mailto:elibrary@aisnet.org).

## Asynchronous Decision-Making in Distributed Teams

Qing Li

Syracuse University, USA

Robert Heckman

Syracuse University, USA

Eileen Allen

Syracuse University, USA

Kevin Crowston

Syracuse University, USA

U. Yeliz Eseryel

Syracuse University, USA

James Howison

Syracuse University, USA

Andrea Wiggins

Syracuse University, USA

### Abstract

Extensive use of CSCW applications can influence group decision-making practices. Unlike previous research focused on the influence of synchronous ICTs, our study examines how group decisions are made in asynchronous communication channels. Our inductive qualitative analysis of 360 decision episodes of six FLOSS projects revealed diversity in decision-making practices, which appears to be related to differences in project effectiveness and task type. We also find that standardization of procedures through CSCW tools transforms the nature of some software development work from non-routine to standard procedure.

**Keywords:** computer-supported cooperative work, open source, distributed work, decision making, virtual teams

**Permanent URL:** <http://sprouts.aisnet.org/8-9>

**Copyright:** [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

**Reference:** Li, Q., Heckman, R., Allen, E., Crowston, K., Eseryel, U.Y., Howison, J., Wiggins, A. (2008). "Asynchronous Decision-Making in Distributed Teams," Syracuse University, USA . *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems*, 8(9).  
<http://sprouts.aisnet.org/8-9>

# Asynchronous Decision-Making in Distributed Teams

Qing Li, Robert Heckman, Eileen Allen, Kevin Crowston, U. Yeliz Eseryel, James Howison & Andrea Wiggins

Syracuse University

Hinds Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244 USA

{qli03 | rheckman | eeallen | crowston | uyeserye | jhowison | awiggins}@syr.edu

## ABSTRACT

Extensive use of CSCW applications can influence group decision-making practices. Unlike previous research focused on the influence of synchronous ICTs, our study examines how group decisions are made in asynchronous communication channels. Our inductive qualitative analysis of 360 decision episodes of six FLOSS projects revealed diversity in decision-making practices, which appears to be related to differences in project effectiveness and task type. We also find that standardization of procedures through CSCW tools transforms the nature of some software development work from non-routine to standard procedure.

## Author Keywords

CSCW, Decision Making, FLOSS, Open Source Software Development

## ACM Classification Keywords

K.4.3. Computers and Society: Organizational Impacts.  
H.4.3. Information Systems Applications: Communications Applications.

## INTRODUCTION

An important stream of Computer Supported Collaborative Work (CSCW) research examines ways to support group decision-making [6]. Much of this research has focused on the influence of synchronous information and communication technology (ICT) on decision outcomes. Little prior research has studied the use of asynchronous ICTs to support group decision-making processes [1].

We examine the effects of technology on decision-making in Free/Libre Open Source Software (FLOSS) teams that work primarily through asynchronous ICTs. FLOSS is a broad term encompassing software developed and released under licenses allowing access to and use of the source code. FLOSS developers contribute from around the world,

Copyright is held by the author/owner.

CSCW'08, November 8–12, 2008, San Diego, California, USA.

rarely meet face-to-face, and coordinate activity asynchronously [7].

Software development is usually considered a non-routine task: it is unstructured, uncertain, and requires nontrivial communication and coordination among developers [3]. Understanding decision processes in these naturally occurring distributed teams may provide insight into the work practices of other types of distributed teams that depend on asynchronous ICTs for task support.

## GROUP DECISION-MAKING IN CSCW LITERATURE

Widespread use of computer-supported decision systems has generated research attention to the impact of technology on group decision-making. Synchronous and asynchronous technologies lead to different group decision-making processes from those observed in traditional face-to-face groups [4]. Although email is a commonly used tool in organizations, most prior research focuses on synchronous decision-support systems [1]. Our research contributes a longitudinal study of the asynchronous decision-making interactions that occur in six naturally occurring teams, focusing on participation patterns and processes.

## METHODS

We adopted a multiple case study methodology, primarily focused on content analysis of decision-making discussions. Developer email lists and forums were used as the data source since they are the primary communication channels for FLOSS teams. Data were collected for six FLOSS projects established in SourceForge, selected for maximum variation in project success and product complexity. Project success was measured according to Crowston et al.'s FLOSS multivariate effectiveness model, which includes downloads, page views, online activities and retention of developers [2]. Three projects develop Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems (Compiere, WebERP, Apache OFBiz) which exhibit high product complexity, and three develop Instant Messenger (IM) clients (Gaim, aMSN, Fire), which has low product complexity.

The decision episode was adopted as the primary unit of coding and analysis. A decision episode is a sequence of messages that begins with a triggering message presenting an opportunity for choice, followed by discussion and an announcement of a decision. We randomly sampled 20 decision episodes from three comparable time periods in

each project's lifetime: beginning and ending periods, comprised of the first and last twenty decision episodes as of May 2006, and twenty episodes surrounding a major release approximately halfway between the beginning and ending periods. Episodes were coded on number of messages per episode, duration of the episode (in days), and number of participants in the episode.

**FINDINGS**

Among 360 decision-making episodes, we found 258 software-modification decision episodes and 102 non-software decision episodes. Software modification (SM) episodes focus on daily technical decisions that are the primary work of the team. The second type, non-software (NS) episodes generally do not result in a change in software code, though they may exert an influence on the future of project development.

We found significant differences between SM and NS decision episodes in terms of duration, number of messages, message density (how many messages per day) and number of participants (Table 1). The NS episodes are longer, more active and attract more participants than SM episodes.

Item	Episode Type	Mean	Significance level
Duration	SM	4.11	F=1.76; df=1; p=.19
	NS	5.21	
N Messages	SM	5.60	F=14.11; df=1; p<.01
	NS	8.21	
Density	SM	2.78	F=7.11; df=1; p<.01
	NS	3.99	
N Participants	SM	3.05	F=21.99; df=1; p<.01
	NS	4.15	

**Table 1: Comparison of decision episode types.**

In comparing IM and ERP projects, we found that their participation patterns were similar for SM issues but more variance was seen in NS episodes. There were also differences in the overall participation patterns between the projects for both ERP and IM. For example, Compere required more time but fewer messages to reach a decision than any of the other projects. By contrast, aMSN's decisions were accomplished with more messages over fewer days than the other IM projects

**DISCUSSION**

The majority of FLOSS project decision opportunities (72%) focused on daily technical discussions, while the rest (28%) were more complex. We found significant differences in participation patterns between SM issues and NS issues. Generally speaking, the decisions related to software-modification were made individually, and independently. They needed less time and less coordination among developers, and the results of a decision are

presented as lines of source codes checked into CVS. However, decisions related to issues beyond the software seemed to be more complicated, uncertain and beyond an individual's capabilities. The results of these decisions will not immediately be committed into CVS, and may influence software infrastructure and project future. These issues attracted more attention from the extended community with attempts to reach group consensus.

These findings also reflect on the nature of task. Task routineness refers to the level of task variety and analyzability [5]. Routine tasks have low variety and high analyzability, while non-routine tasks require more interactions. Software development is generally considered to be non-routine, but with the use of modularity and version control technologies, FLOSS teams transformed some traditionally defined non-routine tasks into routine tasks. Daily technical decisions are often made with few interactions, and sometimes none at all.

In addition, project characteristics and audiences may affect decision-making processes. IM and ERP showed similar participation patterns in software modification decisions through standardized working procedures. In participation patterns for non-software decisions, however, significant differences were evident as IM projects were more active and energetic in these discussions than ERP projects. Additional work is needed to examine the sources of diversity in decision-making processes.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This research is supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, NSF IIS 05-27457.

**REFERENCES**

- Baltes, B.B., Dickson, M.W., Sherman, M.P. and Bauer, C.C. Computer-Mediated Communication and Group Decision Making: A Meta-Analysis. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Dec.* 87, 1(2002), 156-179.
- Crowston, K., Howison, J., and Annabi, H. Information Systems Success in Free and Open Source Software development: Theory and Measures. *Lect. Notes. Comput. Sc.* 11, 2(2006): 123-148.
- Kraut, R.E. and Streeter, L.A. Coordination in Software Development. *Commun. ACM* 38, 3(1995), 69-81.
- McLeod, P.L. New Communication Technologies for Group Decision Making. In Hirokawa, R.Y. & Poole, M.S. (Ed.) *Communication and Group Decision Making* (2nd). Sage Publications, Inc (1996), 215-224.
- Perrow, C. A. Framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 32 (1967), 194-208.
- Pinelle, D. and Gutwin, C. A Review of Groupware Evaluations. *WET ICE'00* (2000).
- Raymond, E. S. The cathedral and the bazaar. *First Monday*, 3, 3(1998).

*Editors:*

Michel Avital, University of Amsterdam  
Kevin Crowston, Syracuse University

*Advisory Board:*

Kalle Lyytinen, Case Western Reserve University  
Roger Clarke, Australian National University  
Sue Conger, University of Dallas  
Marco De Marco, Università Cattolica di Milano  
Guy Fitzgerald, Brunel University  
Rudy Hirschheim, Louisiana State University  
Blake Ives, University of Houston  
Sirkka Jarvenpaa, University of Texas at Austin  
John King, University of Michigan  
Rik Maes, University of Amsterdam  
Dan Robey, Georgia State University  
Frantz Rowe, University of Nantes  
Detmar Straub, Georgia State University  
Richard T. Watson, University of Georgia  
Ron Weber, Monash University  
Kwok Kee Wei, City University of Hong Kong

*Sponsors:*

Association for Information Systems (AIS)  
AIM  
itAIS  
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia  
American University, USA  
Case Western Reserve University, USA  
City University of Hong Kong, China  
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark  
Hanken School of Economics, Finland  
Helsinki School of Economics, Finland  
Indiana University, USA  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium  
Lancaster University, UK  
Leeds Metropolitan University, UK  
National University of Ireland Galway, Ireland  
New York University, USA  
Pennsylvania State University, USA  
Pepperdine University, USA  
Syracuse University, USA  
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands  
University of Dallas, USA  
University of Georgia, USA  
University of Groningen, Netherlands  
University of Limerick, Ireland  
University of Oslo, Norway  
University of San Francisco, USA  
University of Washington, USA  
Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand  
Viktoria Institute, Sweden

*Editorial Board:*

Margunn Aanestad, University of Oslo  
Steven Alter, University of San Francisco  
Egon Berghout, University of Groningen  
Bo-Christer Bjork, Hanken School of Economics  
Tony Bryant, Leeds Metropolitan University  
Erran Carmel, American University  
Kieran Conboy, National U. of Ireland Galway  
Jan Damsgaard, Copenhagen Business School  
Robert Davison, City University of Hong Kong  
Guido Dedene, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Alan Dennis, Indiana University  
Brian Fitzgerald, University of Limerick  
Ole Hanseth, University of Oslo  
Ola Henfridsson, Viktoria Institute  
Sid Huff, Victoria University of Wellington  
Ard Huizing, University of Amsterdam  
Lucas Introna, Lancaster University  
Panos Ipeirotis, New York University  
Robert Mason, University of Washington  
John Mooney, Pepperdine University  
Steve Sawyer, Pennsylvania State University  
Virpi Tuunainen, Helsinki School of Economics  
Francesco Virili, Università degli Studi di Cassino

*Managing Editor:*

Bas Smit, University of Amsterdam

*Office:*

Sprouts  
University of Amsterdam  
Roetersstraat 11, Room E 2.74  
1018 WB Amsterdam, Netherlands  
Email: admin@sprouts.aisnet.org