

## Motivation and Satisfaction of Software Engineers

Journal:	<i>Transactions on Software Engineering</i>
Manuscript ID	TSE-2017-12-0372.R1
Manuscript Type:	Regular
Keywords:	D.2.9.e Organizational management and coordination < D.2.9 Management < D.2 Software Engineering < D Software/Software Engineering, D.2.9.i Programming teams < D.2.9 Management < D.2 Software Engineering < D Software/Software Engineering, K.6.1 Project and People Management < K.6 Management of Computing and Information Systems < K Computing Milieux, Work motivation, Job Satisfaction

# Motivation and Satisfaction of Software Engineers

César França, Fabio Q. B. da Silva, Helen Sharp

**Abstract— Context:** The proper management of people can help software organisations to achieve higher levels of success. However, the limited attention paid to the appropriate use of theories to underpin the research in this area leaves it unclear how to deal with human aspects of software engineers, such as motivation and satisfaction. **Objectives:** This article aims to expose what drives the motivation and satisfaction of software engineers at work. **Methods:** A multiple case study was conducted at four software organisations in Brazil. For 11 months, data was collected using semi-structured interviews, diary studies, and document analyses. **Results:** The Theory of Motivation and Satisfaction of Software Engineers (TMS-SE), presented in this article, combines elements from well established theories with new findings, and translates them into the software engineering context. **Conclusion:** The TMS-SE advances the understanding of people management in the software engineering field and presents a strong conceptual framework for future investigations in this area.

**Index Terms—** Work motivation, Job satisfaction, Human resource management, Software Engineering

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Software engineering can be described as a social-intensive activity, because beyond the technical aspects extensively studied in this field, there is a diversity of human [1] and social [2] aspects that may affect the performance of software engineers at work. A naïve account of software engineering work would tend to see human and technical aspects separately: the former including forms of interaction, behaviours, and organisation of people, while the latter addressing the use that individuals and teams make of technologies, methods, processes and tools for software development. However, in practice, it is difficult to disentangle the way people do things from the methods, techniques, and computing technologies they use [3].

One of these human aspects, the motivation of software engineers, is *“reported to have the single largest impact on productivity and software quality management, and continues to be undermined and problematic to manage”* [4, p. 10:2]. This paper presents a theory of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers (TMS-SE), developed initially from previously existing theories and enhanced and adapted for the software engineering context.

Motivation and job satisfaction have been objects of study for a long time, in many different fields [5]. In software engineering, in particular, they have been studied for more than thirty years [6]. In the last ten years, these phenomena have increasingly attracted attention from the software engineering community, due to previous research that claimed that a proper management of motivation and satisfaction at work could help software organisations

achieve higher levels of productivity, and avoid human resource turnover, budget overflow, and delivery delays [7][8]. All these impacts represent relevant contributions to the overall success of software development projects [9][10].

Researchers in the organisational behaviour field have identified such a wide range of inter-connected factors and phenomena that it is challenging to reach an unequivocal understanding of what can be useful to the management of work motivation and job satisfaction. Therefore, over time, several theories of work motivation and job satisfaction have been developed, evaluated, questioned, and evolved, through a continuous cycle of interaction between theoretical and empirical research work. Some of these theories have been dismissed, such as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory [11], while others have endured, such as the Job Characteristics Theory [12].

However, there are two main reasons to question whether the existing theories of work motivation and job satisfaction developed in other fields are applicable in a software development environment. First, in the past, researchers have shown that software engineers hold in common specific personal characteristics, and what influences their work motivation and job satisfaction is likely to be different from other professionals [6]. Second, research has argued that software engineering work challenges even ongoing theories of motivation and satisfaction, because of its knowledge-intensive nature, bringing unexplored aspects that drive the behaviour of professionals in this field [13].

Nevertheless, the number of studies on this topic is relatively small, and it is only possible to find a few attempts to evaluate work motivation or job satisfaction theories or models in software engineering contexts. In addition, studies on motivation and satisfaction of software engineers are characterized by little concern with an

- C. França is with the Department of Computing of the Federal Rural University of Pernambuco - UFRPE. Rua Dom Manoel de Medeiros, s/n, Dois Irmãos, 52171-900, Recife/PE.  
E-mail: cesar@franssa.com.
- F. Q. B. da Silva is with the Centre of Informatics, Federal University of Pernambuco - UFPE, Cidade Universitária - 50740-560 - Recife/PE.  
E-mail: fabio@cin.ufpe.br

adequate use of well-established theories to underpin their research designs [4]. And, empirical studies in this area are still concentrated in developed countries, so aspects such as international cultural differences challenge the transferability of their results to other countries.

All these issues, together, prevent the accumulation of knowledge, leaving still unclear several theoretical and practical aspects of work motivation and job satisfaction in the software context and, although some advance has been achieved, all research effort so far represents only an *"unconnected body of work"* [4].

The aim of this research is to generate a sensible and contemporaneous understanding of how the work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers are influenced by workplace factors, and how these phenomena influence their work-related behaviour. For that purpose, we followed a process of building theory from case study research, suggested by Eisenhardt [14][15]. A multi-case study was carried out in four software engineering settings, in Recife, Brazil. For 11 months, rich data was independently collected in those organisations, by means of semi-structured interviews, diary studies, and document analyses. Then, a cross-case comparison was carried out, leading to the theory of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers (TMS-SE). Finally, the emerging theory was compared against similar and conflicting evidence from studies available in the literature.

The theory presented in this article builds on the understanding from Locke [16] that work motivation and job satisfaction are distinguishable phenomena, with distinct antecedents and outcomes. Job satisfaction refers to pleasurable emotions in reaction to the job, signalled mainly by the individuals' happiness at work, and influences attitudes towards the organisation (intention to stay, attendance, and others). Work motivation, in contrast, refers to the desire to work, is signalled by individuals' attitudes toward the work (engagement and focus), and directly influences individual work performance.

This theory contributes to the state of art in three complementary ways. First, it advances the knowledge on this topic by providing a solid framework through which the available knowledge in this field is integrated and evaluated. Second, it enlightens the management of software engineers by clarifying what aspects of the work and the workplace are relevant to work motivation and job satisfaction of this specific type of professional, as well as by pointing out practical challenges attached to the software development practices. Third, it suggests areas worthy of further investigation, serving as a basis for future research in this area.

The rest of this article is organised as follow: Section 2 reviews the concepts of work motivation and job satisfaction as represented in the most frequently cited theories of motivation. Then, in Section 3, a historical view of the research on motivation and satisfaction in software engi-

neering is presented, as well as the current state of art and research gaps. The research method, data collection and analysis procedures are carefully explained in Section 4, as well as the research strategy and the threats to validity and reliability of our research design. Section 5 reports the results of the individual cases, the cross-case analysis, and then the TMS-SE. In Section 6, the TMS-SE is compared to the previous existing literature on this topic, and presents reflections about the challenges for software engineering practice. Finally, Section 7 presents some concluding remarks, and enumerates suggestions for future research endeavours.

## 2 A BRIEF HISTORY OF RESEARCH ABOUT WORK MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION

According to Steers et al [5, p. 379], if it was possible to effectively synthesize the different concepts of motivation, they would have a common characteristic: *"They are all principally concerned with factors or events that energize, channel, and sustain human behaviour over time."* Job satisfaction, in contrast, has been defined as *"complex emotional reactions to the job"* [16]. Although the phenomena are connected, two critical characteristics make work motivation different from job satisfaction. First, motivation is future oriented, while satisfaction is past oriented [17], i.e. motivation is antecedent of performance, while satisfaction is a consequence of work events, including performance. Second, work motivation is about individuals' perception of the work and its intrinsic characteristics, while job satisfaction is about the perception of a broader set of elements present in the job, including but not limited to the work itself.

The definitions of work motivation and job satisfaction have stimulated researchers from several fields, resulting in different competing and complementary theories [18]. Table 1 shows an overview of the most relevant theories of work motivation and job satisfaction found in the technical literature.

Locke [16] developed an extensive theoretical study to redefine the construct of job satisfaction. Since his definition was presented in 1969, it has become a consensus between academics from the organisational behaviour field [19] Locke suggests that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are complex emotional reactions to the job. Such emotions are dependent upon an interaction between the person and his/her environment through the biological functions of cognition (sensations, perception), evaluation (consciously or subconsciously selection among alternative life-enhancing actions) and regulation (one's judgment of values). Job satisfaction is defined, thus, as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values.

Table 1 - Overview of work motivation and job satisfaction theories

Theory	Conceptual system	Empirical Support
Hierarchy of Needs Theory [40]	It is not possible to find an explicit definition of motivation and satisfaction in his articles. However, he implies a semantic difference between the words motivation, which refers to a state of need, and satisfaction, which refers to a state of no need.	Maslow does not present any data. Because of the difficulty in interpreting and operationalizing its concepts, the testability of this theory is limited [99]. Therefore, empirical assessments show generally weak or no support [86].
Motivation-Hygiene Theory [100]	It states that satisfied people are more productive, and job satisfaction is activated by two independent sets of factors: motivators (or satisfiers) are the primary cause of job satisfaction, and hygiene factors (or dissatisfiers) identified as primary cause of job dissatisfaction.	He shows no evidence on the relation between satisfaction and productivity [101]. Results are consistently supported only when Herzberg's basic methodology is used, including his classification scheme [102].
Expectancy Theory [83]	Satisfaction given by the convergence between subjective expectations and actual outcomes of an action. Motivation is the process of deciding whether an effort to perform a specific action is worthier than its available alternatives, and it is guided by the maximization of satisfaction experiences.	Empirical evaluations generally supported the predictive power of the expectancy theory in laboratory studies, but not in real settings given the existence of excessive uncontrollable factors [103][104].
Goal Setting Theory [36]	Motivation is the willingness to strive for the goals of a particular organisation. The four elements that represent motivated behaviour in the Goal Setting theory are: Direction: goals direct attention and action; Effort: the amount of effort mobilized in proportion to the perceived requirements of the goal or task; Persistence: directed effort extended over time; Strategy development: the development of strategies or action plans for attaining one's goals.	There have been more than 500 studies of goal setting conducted by Locke, his colleagues, and others [105]. This is the longest stable theory of performance and task motivation, with the largest amount of empirical work supporting its claims.
Job Satisfaction Theory [16]	Job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the subjective appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values, providing these values are congruent with or help to fulfil one's basic needs. Subjective means pertaining only to individuals. Value is that which one acts to gain and/or to keep. Need refers to objective requirements to an organism wellbeing	Locke describes several empirical studies testing the existing correlation between subjective value-discrepancy and grades of job satisfaction. The results revealed a very similar level of correlation (+.70, +.69, -.61, -.81, and -.72 at $p < .01$ ).
Job Characteristics Theory [20]	Internal work motivation refers to "being turned on to one's work because of the positive internal feelings that are generated by performing well". Satisfaction is the degree to which the employee is happy with the job, or with specific aspects of the job.	This theory has found support on tests with more than one thousand people working on more than one hundred different jobs from real organisations, but relying on correlational instead causal analyses [75].

While the concept of job satisfaction has stabilized over time around the ideas of Locke, the understanding of work motivation has been less clear. Some of the motivation theories presented in Table 1 focus on motivation from a general decision-making process approach, that

guide the rational choice of a determined behaviour, while other theories are interested in describing what aspects of the workplace may make people more or less "turned on" to work. All these theories are equally constrained by the approach they choose to take when looking at the motivation phenomenon.

In this research, we are specifically interested in software engineers' activity. Given that individuals motivated to work will perform at their best possible, we set out to investigate what elements of a software engineering workplace motivate these individuals to work.

One of the long-lasting approaches of work motivation refers to the motivating characteristics or potential of work related tasks, based on the ideas of Hackman and colleagues. According to Hackman's definition, work motivation refers to being turned on to one's work because of the positive internal feelings that are generated by performing well [20]. It is the individuals' willingness to work hard and well [12]. Hackman found three psychological states that are critical in determining if a person is internally motivated [20]:

- *Experienced Meaningfulness*. The degree to which the employee experiences the work as inherently meaningful, as something that counts in his/her own system of values [21].
- *Experienced Responsibility*. The degree to which the individual feels personally accountable and responsible for the results of the work he/she performs.
- *Knowledge of Results*. The degree to which the individual has confident knowledge about how well he/she is performing.

Hackman's Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) suggests therefore that the simultaneous presence of these three psychological states results in a set of favourable personal and work outcomes, such as work motivation and work performance. The JCT also identifies five objective characteristics of jobs that, when present, increase the chances that an employee will experience the three psychological states and, through them, shape the personal and work outcomes [21].

Experienced Meaningfulness is shaped by three job characteristics:

- i. *Skill Variety* is the degree to which the job requires a number of different activities in carrying out the work, which involve the use of a number of different skills and talents of the individual. Work that stretches one's skills and abilities invariably is experienced as more meaningful than work that is simple and routine.
- ii. *Task Identity* is the degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work, doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome. Putting together an entire product or providing a complete unit of service is inherently more meaningful than being responsible for only a small part of the work.
- iii. *Task Significance* is the degree to which the work has a substantial impact on the lives of other people, whether in the immediate organisation or in the external environment. An activity that is

consequential for the psychological or physical wellbeing of others is experienced as more meaningful than is work that makes little difference to anyone else.

Experienced Responsibility is shaped by the amount of autonomy the job provides:

- iv. *Autonomy* is the degree to which the work is structured to provide the employee with substantial freedom, independence, and discretion in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out.

Knowledge of Results is shaped by the degree to which carrying out job-specified work activities provide the individual with direct and clear feedback:

- v. *Feedback* is the information about the effectiveness of his/her performance. When someone receives information about his/her performance from the work itself (e.g., when a salesperson closes a deal and receives payment from a customer), that feedback is direct and immediate and, therefore, contributes substantially to his/her overall knowledge of results about work outcomes.

Then, jobs high on the five core dimensions were described as having high Motivation Potential Score.

Notice that other aspects related to factors external to the job (known elsewhere as extrinsic motivators [37]) are not regarded as constituents of work motivation according to Hackman's theory.

In the late 90's, Ambrose and Kulik [22] observed that research in the organisational behaviour field replaced interest in the construct "motivation" with other easier-to-measure performance outcomes, so that motivation was "*moving backstage as a largely unmeasured, but still theoretically relevant, mediating variable*" [22, p. 280]. However, in face of recent changes in the nature of work, such as more employees performing knowledge work, the central construct of motivation has recovered relevance, and continued effort should be placed on defining and measuring motivation.

### 3 MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION IN SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

The influence of general human aspects on individual and collective performance of software engineers has been recognized since the early days of software engineering [1][2][23][24].

In the software engineering field, the seminal work of Couger and Zawacki [6] has brought light to the issue that computer personnel could be a distinctive group from the average population, regarding individual needs and, for this reason, what motivated software engineers was likely to be different from what motivated the population in general.

Couger and Zawacki [6] carried out a nationwide survey in the United States, which was replicated over a decade in several countries such as Austria [25], Israel and Singapore [26], Australia [27], Hong Kong [28], Finland [29], Spain [30], Japan [31] and Egypt [32]. That effort ac-

Table 2 - Typology of studies interested in Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction

Group	Type	Instances*
Group A: empirical studies explicitly interested in job satisfaction	Type A1: papers focused on antecedents of job satisfaction.	PS005, PS007, PS016, PS065, PS102, PS105, PS116, PS120, PS134
	Type A2: papers focusing on intention to leave/stay in an organisation, as outcomes of job satisfaction.	PS007, PS014, PS036, PS037, PS045, PS050, PS052, PS066,PS076, PS086, P095, PS097, PS120
Group B: empirical studies that treat motivation as a decision-making process	Type B1: papers focused on reasons for choosing IT as a career	PS123, PS124
	Type B2: papers focused on reasons for developing open source software	PS090, PS113, PS115, PS118, PS119, PS140
	Type B3: papers focused on reasons for choosing an open source software to work for	PS113, PS115, PS136
	Type B4: papers focused on reasons for doing a specific task (e.g. refactoring)	PS131
Group C: empirical studies interested in work motivation	Type C1: papers focused on the antecedents of work motivation	PS016, PS056, PS100
	Type C2: papers focused on assumed outcomes of work motivation (performance, productivity, proactive behaviour)	PS005, PS091, PS099,PS101
Group D – theoretical accounts	Type D1: theoretical papers focused on work motivation of software engineers	PS001, PS006, PS024, PS029, PS033, PS034, PS043, PS046, PS058, PS075, PS107, PS112, PS129

*\*see the list of the SLR primary studies (PS) on Appendix B*

cumulated enough data to argue that:

- i. Software engineering settings generally suffered from a low level of feedback, which was later explained by the fact that software engineers have specific personality traits that limit their social interactions [26][33][34];
- ii. Regardless of the cultural differences, populations of software engineers from all over the world exhibited similarities regarding their high growth needs (GNS) [35];
- iii. Although job characteristics had some influence over the software engineers’ motivation, other work-place factors should also be accounted in the equation, such as goal contents [36]. However, Couger and colleagues did not provide details on why or how other theories would add to the study of software engineers’ work motivation.

After Couger and Zawacki’s study, motivation kept being systematically studied in software engineering. Since then, researchers have addressed the problem of how to deal with the motivation of software engineers in several complementary ways. Two literature reviews [7][8] searched relevant sources in software engineering, and systematically selected 140 studies about motivation and job satisfaction published in this field between 1980 and 2010. These reviews listed several factors that represent hypothetical motivators, demotivators, characteristics of software engineers, and outcomes of motivation.

Based on the results of the literature review, Sharp et al. [37] noticed that the pre-existing models of motivation in software engineering were being developed in isolation. Then, they delivered a proposal for an integrating model of motivation in software engineering, the MOCC model

(acronym for Motivators, Outcomes, Characteristics and Context). This is an abstract, holistic model that enables researchers and practitioners to have a better understanding of the landscape of motivation, and provides a coherent framework for integrating research findings [37]. The MOCC model stands currently as the most relevant recent advance about the motivation of software engineers.

The systematic reviews and the MOCC model present a reasonable overview of factors that have been studied in this area. The number of studies on this subject has consistently increased overtime, authors are from at least 30 different countries, research focusing on emerging contexts such as agile methods and open source represent an important portion of the studies in the 2000’s. In addition, studies often present empirical data with actual practitioners.

However, there is a gap in the theoretical underpinning of these studies, which prevents the accumulation of knowledge in this area. In order to be able to integrate different studies, learn from the differences, and advance our knowledge on this issue, we have to make sure that research efforts at least address the same phenomena. Nevertheless, there is no single notion of “work motivation” in software engineering research. From the 140 studies covered in the two literature reviews [7][8], it is clear that these articles deal with a range of different objects of study (Table 2), from choosing IT as a career, to reasons for not leaving the organisation. In this article, in particular, we are interested in motivation to perform.

In addition, from the 67 empirical papers found in this list, only 35 effectively show evidence that support their claims (Table 2 – Groups A to C), while the remaining papers are loose in their treatment of motivation or satis-

faction, referring to other studies or to general knowledge, without clear evidence. Theoretical papers (Table 2 – Group D) generally argue about the importance of creating strategies to cope with the motivation of software engineers, present argumentation structures aiming to defend individual opinions of the authors, or propose improvements on existing models and theories without any empirical support.

It is even possible to notice a paradox in those studies based on the idea that software engineers are different from other professionals: they rely mainly on theories developed in other fields to underpin their recommendations about how to deal with software engineers' motivation. Often, theoretical studies call for clarifications about the antecedents of work motivation of software engineers.

Moreover, a significant part of the SLR studies (40/140) do not explicitly mention any theory of motivation or satisfaction. It does not mean that the remaining portion of studies have properly used a theory. Only seven papers effectively used the theory to either test or discuss the empirical findings. Notice, for example, that there are only three papers focusing on the antecedents of work motivation for software engineers (Type C1), two of which ([38][39]) are not underpinned by any classical theory of motivation. Thus, as Hall et al. [4, p.10:25] concluded: *"studies of motivation in software engineering (...) should be more rigorously based on existing theory."*

Other studies (Type C2) assume outcomes such as performance or productivity, and use them as proxies to draw conclusions about work motivation or job satisfaction. However, it is not possible to infer from these studies how those factors are responsible for the work motivation or job satisfaction of software engineers. According to Maslow [40], human behaviour is determined by a set of antecedents, of which motivation represents only one.

Roznowski and Hulin [41, p. 124], suggests that all there is to know about job satisfaction is already known. This is borne out by the fact that the studies explicitly interested in antecedents of job satisfaction in software engineering fit perfectly in those of Locke's classification scheme (see Table 3).

Work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers in the context of agile methods, and more recently in the context of distributed software development (DSD) practice, are two common focal problems. Šteinberga [43] and Šteinberga and Šmite [44] are mainly concerned with employee turnover resulting from lack of job satisfaction of software engineers in the context of off-shore projects, because of the additional complexity that globally distributed projects bring to managers. El Khatib et al. [45], in contrast, focus on the subjective characteristics of DSD practice that influence work motivation and, as a consequence, performance.

In terms of practical effects of motivation and satisfaction over performance, Graziotin et al. [46] reported a quasi-experiment containing evidence that happy software developers performed better at solving problems than non-happy developers; but found no difference between them when it comes to creativity tasks. They conclude by calling for further studies to understand why that happens.

With respect to theoretical frameworks, other recent papers such as De Farias Junior et al. [47] and Hernández-Lopez [48] underpin their work with outdated theories, such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The use of these theories is discouraged in the organisational behaviour field, partly because of their limited validity and partly because of the large amount of knowledge that has been developed after these theories were first delivered [49].

Finally, we have not been able to effectively answer research questions related to work motivation and job satisfaction in software engineering because of a lack of an appropriate theoretical framework. Given the growing relevance of the problem, and based on the limitations of the state of art pointed out in this Section, in the next Section we present our methodological approach, designed to advance and consolidate our current knowledge in this area, and further to contribute towards closing the gaps related to this problem.

## 4 METHODS

### 4.1 Design of the research method

In this research, we are interested in building a theory of work motivation and job satisfaction that accounts for specific characteristics of software engineering work. We built this theory based on the understanding of how individual software engineers experience work motivation and job satisfaction, and why certain combinations of workplace factors lead to more or less motivated behaviour and job satisfaction. The following research question guided the investigation: **How do workplace factors influence the work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?**

Workplace factors here refer not only to job characteristics but also to any other constituent element of the worklife that exhibits a relationship with the two constructs being studied.

Given the current state of the art described in the previous section, we believe that a new theory of work motivation and job satisfaction for software engineers that explicitly separates these two factors would represent a substantial contribution to research and practice. For the former, a theory would expand our knowledge of the investigated phenomena and also show directions for further research. For the latter, a theory may offer guidance to managers and individuals about how to build and sustain a better work environment.

In pursuit of this new theory of motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers, we followed the roadmap proposed by Eisenhardt [14] to build theories from multiple case study research. Eisenhardt and Graebner [15] comment that *"Theory building from case studies is an increasingly popular and relevant research strategy that forms the basis of a disproportionately large number of influential studies"*. In our research, case studies are understood as *"in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system"* [50], focused on *"understanding the dynamics present within those settings"* [14]. Based on Eisenhardt's [14] suggested procedure, a research protocol

Table 3 - What is known about Job Satisfaction factors in software engineering

Factors	What the literature says*
The work itself	Seven studies [P005, P016, P102, P105, P116, P120, P134] support the relationship between the characteristics of the work (autonomy, identity, variety, significance, and feedback) and job satisfaction of software developers. The relationship between autonomy and satisfaction is disputed in two articles [P102, P116], the relationship between task identity and job satisfaction was not supported in two [P005, P065]. P065 also found no support for the effects of task significance and feedback over job satisfaction.
Pay & Benefits	Three articles provide evidence showing that both a good salary [P016, P134] and a good variable remuneration [P102] relates to the job satisfaction of software engineers.
Recognition	Two articles [PS016, PS102] support the relationship between recognition and job satisfaction of software engineers.
Promotion	Three papers [PS016, PS105, PS120] support the relationship between opportunities for promotion and job satisfaction. In only one study [P102] was this relationship not supported.
Working conditions	Only one paper [PS016] addressed the relationship between working conditions and job satisfaction, and found support for this relationship in the data. If the relationship between the developer and the users is included in this category, then there is another study [P102] that supports it.
Company	One study [P016] finds a positive relationship between job security and job satisfaction, while another study [P102] does not. In the second article, the authors asked the participants from what job aspects they get most satisfaction. Therefore, it is understandable that job security, being a hygienic factor, does not appear in their list.
Supervisors	Four studies [PS005, P065, PS120, PS134] support the relationship between satisfaction with supervisory behaviour and job satisfaction.
Co-workers	Sense of belonging appears related to job satisfaction in one article [P120], while working with other people in a team appear related to job satisfaction in two other [P102, P134].
The self	<i>None</i>

*\*see the list of the SLR primary studies (PS) on Appendix B*

was designed to collect and make sense of data from four independent holistic case studies from a selection of organisations. Eisenhardt’s [14] process is summarized in the following set of ordered activities:

1. **Getting started:** involves defining research question(s) and selection of constructs of interest;

2. **Selecting Cases:** comprises defining the population of interest and selection strategies to assure theoretical sampling;

3. **Crafting instruments and protocols:** regards the choices for data collection methods, design of instruments, strategies for triangulation of evidence, participation of multiple investigators and the documentation of the research protocol;

4. **Entering the field:** concerns the actual data collection, as well as the overlap between data collection and analysis, to allow adjustments in the data collection;
5. **Analyzing data:** includes the within-cases analyses to gain familiarity with data and preliminary theory generation, and the cross-case pattern search to look at evidence through multiple lenses;

6. **Shaping hypotheses:** concerns an iterative tabulation of evidence for each emerging construct, to find hypothesized relationships between the constructs of the emerging theory, and then test them back against the data from the individual cases;

7. **Enfolding literature:** comprises comparing the emerging theory with similar and conflicting literature to build internal validity, raise theoretical level, and sharpen generalizability;

8. **Reaching closure:** achieve theoretical saturation when possible.
- In the following paragraphs, our implementation of each step is properly detailed.



*Getting started.* The research design in the present work established two a priori constructs of interest: job satisfaction and work motivation. In the beginning, we were interested in understanding how workplace factors affected the motivation of software engineers, and what the perceived outcomes of motivation were. In [51], we reported a meta-ethnographical synthesis [52] of two case studies. In that work, motivation and satisfaction were considered as a single construct as perceived by the study participants, which has been a common practice in previous research on motivation in the software engineering field (see Section 3).

However, the more sophisticated understanding of work motivation and job satisfaction that we acquired from that experience, led us to question whether participants from different cases had a consistent understanding of the terms “motivation” and “satisfaction” or were they in fact expressing their opinions and experiences about several other distinct phenomena (see [53] for more details).

After that, we decided to reanalyse the data with a more up to date and consistent theoretical framework, and selected the following two theories to approach our constructs of interest: (1) Hackman’s Job Characteristics Theory, which defines work motivation as “*being turned on to one’s work because of the positive internal feelings that are generated by performing well*”; and (2) Locke’s Job Satisfaction Theory, which defines job satisfaction as the “*pleasurable emotional state resulting from the subjective appraisal of one’s job*” (see Section 2 for a more detailed discussion on these theories).

To accommodate this new frame of mind, we needed a precise empirical basis, to enable us to identify clearly the data chunks in which participants were talking about work motivation or job satisfaction, and to discard more easily anything that wasn’t relevant, thus assuring theoretical consistency with the constructs in question. Therefore, we adopted three more specific questions to guide our reanalysis of the data from the case studies:

**RQ1. Which behavioural descriptors characterise the work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?**

**RQ2. Which workplace factors influence the behavioural descriptors of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?**

**RQ3. What are the outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?**

This approach addressed any potential inconsistencies in the participants’ understanding because we could use the answer for RQ1 to establish an empirical basis to enable the investigation of RQ2 and RQ3.

*Selecting Cases.* In the first level of sampling, cases to be investigated were selected. The rationale for choosing cases based on Yin’s [54] replication logic was used here. In the cases level, we sought variation in sizes of organisations (large and small, having respectively more and fewer than 50 workers), and in their business nature (private/public). In Brazil, the contractual rules are different between private and public organisations and we wanted to collect views from both perspectives. A similar overall context is important to enable the integration of findings,

so the four chosen participant organisations are from Recife, in Brazil.

Then, in the second level of sampling, participants and other sources of data needed to be sampled within each case. We aimed for a good coverage of age, background, education, years of employment in the organisation, participation in different projects in the organisation, and work on different activities in software development and maintenance, to ensure a potentially fertile sample.

*Crafting instruments and protocols.* The non-observable nature of work motivation and job satisfaction as internal states, led us to the decision to use interviews. However, as Sohn et al. [55] highlight, interviews rely on participants’ memories and there is always the risk of the interviewee not remembering something relevant to the research. Therefore, our interviews were complemented with diary data, collected right in the moment when relevant events happen. All data collection was conducted in Brazilian Portuguese, with the premise that it is easier to express opinions, feelings, and emotions in one’s native language. Finally, we mined organisational documents related to human resources and norms that regulate employee-organisation relationships to verify and corroborate evidence raised in interviews and diary studies about organisational characteristics and policies. The instruments for collecting data in the interviews and in the diary studies are detailed below.

- **Interview scripts:** A semi-structured interview script was used, composed of open-ended questions. The questions were initially based on the dimensions of the MOCC model (motivators, outcomes, characteristics and context) [37]. It was then expanded to include questions aimed at exploring experiences, behaviour, opinions, values, feelings, knowledge and background, all of which are indicative of motivation and job satisfaction. The script was designed in a funnel format [56], beginning with general questions and moving towards more specific ones. All positive questions (e.g. ‘what do you like about...?’) had a corresponding negative one (e.g. ‘what do you dislike about . . .?’). The guide was pre-tested with two pilot interviews and minor changes were identified to improve the interview guides, such as better wording of some questions. Therefore, the final version of the script had 43 questions, a sample of which is in Table 4.
- **Diary Study:** A diary study is a data collection method in which “participants are asked to record their daily activities on a pre-structured log form” [57]. It is a way to understand participant behaviour and intent, in situ, which minimizes the effects of observers or interviewers on participants [58]. Diary data was collected for a period of two weeks. At the beginning of each week, our selected participants received a blank notepad (paper), which they annotated with information about any event that affected (positively or negatively) their motivation or satisfaction at the moment the event occurred; At the end of every workday, participants completed an on-line form, with a list of all relevant events in that

day, and provided detailed information about how and why the events affected their work. The notepad information acted as an aide memoire for events to enter in the online form.

Table 4 - Examples of interview questions translated to English (original ones were in Brazilian Portuguese (PT\_br))

Q1. Tell me about yourself, your education, professional trajectory, etc.
Q2. Why did you decide (or what has brought you) to work as a software engineer?
...
Q12. Among your daily activities, what are those you like most?
Q13. What is it about these activities (Q12) that makes you like them the most?
...
Q36. What does the organisation do, or offer, to stimulate the software engineers' motivation?
Q37. How do these actions/offers affect your particular work?
...
Q40. What could the organisation do (but currently does not do) to stimulate the software engineers' motivation?
Q41. Projecting your career five years towards the future, what do you hope you will be doing?
...
Q43. What does the term motivation mean to you?


*Entering the field.* Over a period of one year between 2010 and 2011, four Masters' students carried out the data collection, each one in a distinct organisation, under the supervision of the authors of this article. Potential participants were initially contacted by e-mail, and invited to participate; participation was voluntary. Those who agreed were required to sign an Informed Consent Form, which guaranteed confidentiality of the data, and the right to withdraw from the research at any moment. They were formally allowed by their line managers to use work hours for the interviews and diary studies. All interview sessions were audio recorded with formal consent of the participants. The interviews were scheduled and conducted individually, at the organisation's own offices. Participants in the diary studies were chosen from those that participated in the interviews. At the end of the diary study, researchers carried out a short retrospective interview to clarify and complement information submitted in the online form and collected the notepads that had been completed during the week.

*Analyzing data.* For the first research question (RQ1), analysis was based on the data collected from interviews, focusing on two interview questions: "How would you describe a clearly motivated colleague?" (Q25) and "How would you describe a clearly demotivated colleague?" (Q31). Then, adjective sets describing motivated and demotivated engineers were identified. These adjective sets are referred to as behavioural descriptors throughout the analysis. This first step provided the grounds needed to

properly scrutinize the full data from interviews and diaries to answer RQ2 and RQ3. The behavioural descriptors arising from RQ1 were used as pre-formed codes to identify the useful chunks of data that contributed to answer RQ2 and RQ3, as previously explained.

We used techniques of grounded theory [59] to code, categorize, and synthesize data. Initially, all audio from the interviews was transcribed verbatim. QSR NVivo 8<sup>1</sup> was used to support the data analysis and synthesis. Data analysis began with open coding of the transcripts. Post-formed codes were constructed as the coding progressed and were attached to particular pieces of the text. Diary data was also coded alongside interviews. All steps were carried out by two researchers, and conflicts were discussed in face-to-face meetings until full agreement was achieved. From the constant comparison of the codes, we grouped codes into categories that represent factors affecting work motivation and job satisfaction behaviours (for RQ2), and their outcomes (for RQ3). Fig. 1 shows an example of the category building process. Results from individual cases were presented at national and international conferences to validate the rigour of the partial results, and can be seen in França et. al [60][61][62].

Fig. 1 - Category building example in the individual case studies



Then, the cross-case analysis method was chosen to guide our case comparison [63]. We followed a standard process of content analysis based on the semantic similarity between the constructs emerging from different cases, to group them in categories that were more general. The categories were carefully labelled in order to properly represent all constructs in the group. We adopted tabular displays to present the integrative data, maintaining original meanings for each individual case study in a different column [64]. Cross-case tables were constructed for each research question, and the categories were analysed according to the specificities of each case, in order to shape

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.qsrinternational.com/>

the answers to our research questions.

*Shaping hypotheses.* The constructs resulting from the data analysis were revisited, in order to make sense of their relationships. Moderators of these relationships were also identified, and propositions were built to sustain the emerging theory. Then, a model of work motivation and job satisfaction was designed.

*Enfolding literature.* Finally, the emerging theory was compared to already existing concepts from scientific literature. After that, the resulting theory was compared to previous studies with purposes similar to the present research: Cougar and Zawacki [6] and Sharp et. al [37], and other relevant papers selected from the references of the systematic literature studies [7][8].

*Reaching closure.* It was not possible to achieve theoretical saturation in this study, which is properly discussed, together with other threats to validity and reliability of this method, in the next section.

#### 4.2 Threats to validity and reliability

According to Merriam [50], three issues are commonly pointed out in qualitative research: how to provide evidence that the findings are credible? Are the findings consistent with the data collected? And what is the possibility of someone else transferring the results to other similar contexts?

From the point of view of credibility (also referred to as Internal Validity), we collected data from a number of participants with mixed roles and profiles, and used multiple data collection techniques inside each case, including document analysis to confirm formal issues when needed. The low number of contributions in the research diaries is a possible limitation.

To increase consistency (also referred to as Reliability), we also kept research diaries and process logs that were constantly used as audit trails. In addition, two strategies were employed to enhance transferability (External Validity): first, detailed descriptions of the research method, context in which the research was performed, and the results themselves are provided here; second, cases and participants were sampled to achieve maximum variation since this helps to provide richer data and a more robust resulting theory.

Dey [65], advocates that instead of theoretical saturation, it is better to guarantee that categories are consistently built from the data, i.e., to look for theoretical sufficiency instead of saturation. This also agrees with the understanding of Charmaz [66]. In this research, at both levels of individual cases and cross-case, all the analyses were performed by at least two researchers, an audit trail was generated, and multiple sources of data were collected and used. According to Merriam [50], these procedures are enough to assure confidence, consistency and, thus, the theoretical sufficiency for our findings. Therefore, although theoretical saturation was not tested, we are confident that theoretical sufficiency has been achieved and that enough evidence is provided for the reader to decide the extent to which the findings can be applied to other situations.

## 5 RESULTS

### 5.1 Individual case studies

In this section, we present the results pertaining to each case study. First, we describe the context of each case. Table 5 summarizes the number of participants in interviews and diary studies, the amount of data, and time periods in which the data was collected.

In the following subsections, we comment on the descriptors attributed by the participants to engineers with high motivation or high job satisfaction and those with low motivation or low job satisfaction (RQ1); the workplace factors that were found to influence work motivation and job satisfaction (RQ2) and the perceived outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (RQ3). The data here is presented in summarized tables, but more details can be found in Appendix A, with examples of interview excerpts or diary data to illustrate the meaning of each descriptor.

#### Case I: The government organisation

The first case study was carried out in a government software organisation situated in Recife, Brazil, established in 1969 by the Government of the State of Pernambuco. Its core mission was to provide Information Technology services to internal customers in several levels of the State Government administration and to the citizens of the State. As a government owned organisation, it was regulated under the laws and norms of the Brazilian public sector, which had two characteristics that were relevant for this study. First, since the Brazilian Constitution of 1998, public employees must be hired through an open process with universal access, based on objective criteria. This rules out subjective interviews, personality and behavioural assessment, references from other people, and other forms of employee selection found in the private sector. On the other hand, it slows down the process of hiring new employees and, therefore, makes it difficult to produce timely replacement when someone leaves the organisation. Second, all public employees have job stability after a probation period of 3 years of working in the public sector (State Law Nº. 6.123/68).

At the time the research was conducted, the organisation was structured in 14 offices distributed in different locations throughout the State. Its employees, including software engineers, were distributed in the main management units and in over 60 other public administration buildings. At the time this research was performed, the organisation had 2,580 employees.

Regarding software development methods and practices, this organisation used traditional, process-oriented methods, with a command and control style of management in most software projects, although some small and isolated agile initiatives could also be found.

When describing work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers, participants used the list of positive and negative adjectives in Table 6 (RQ1). The workplace factors linked with high motivation and high job satisfaction are also listed in Table 6 (RQ2). Our analysis identified the perceived outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction listed in Table 7 (RQ3).

Table 5 – Participants and amount of data

CASE I: Government organisation	CASE II: Private not-for-profit organisation
Six participants from the headquarters were selected to participate in the interviews, which were conducted between August and December of 2010. The audio recorded from the interviews summed up to 4 hours and 57 minutes. One participant completed the diary, between February and March of 2011, reporting a total of 17 relevant events during the period of 15 days.	Six participants were selected from this organisation. The interviews were carried out between September and November of 2010, and summed up to 4 hours and 5 minutes of audio recorded. Two people participated in the diary data collection, which happened between February and March of 2011, and yielded 32 relevant events.
<b>Profile of the participants:</b> <i>System analysts:</i> 3 males, 1 female; Ages: 27, 29, 32 and 39 years.  <i>Developers:</i> 2 males; Ages: 29 and 32 years.	<b>Profile of the participants:</b> <i>System analysts:</i> 2 males; Ages: 36 and 32 years.  <i>Developers:</i> 3 males; Ages: 25, 29 and 28 years.  <i>Tester:</i> 1 male; Age: 25 years.
CASE III: Small software development company	CASE IV: IT department of a University
For this case, we conducted 10 in-situ interviews during May 2011, which summed up to 6 hours and 40 minutes of audio. People from both types of project (external and internal products) participated in this research. From these, 3 participants opted to collaborate with the diary studies, during June 2011, bringing 10 relevant events during the period of two weeks of data collection.	During February and March of 2011, ten participants were selected for interviews and the audio records summed up to 8 hours and 58 minutes. Two people took part in the diary study for a fifteen-day period between March and April of 2011, bringing 32 entries for relevant events.
<b>Profile of the participants:</b> <i>Developers:</i> 7 males; Ages: 21, 23, 26, 26, 27, 28 and 29 years.  <i>Tester:</i> 1 male, 1 female; Ages: 21 and 23 years.  <i>Designer:</i> 1 male; Age: 22 years.	<b>Profile of the participants:</b> <i>System analysts:</i> 3 male; Ages: 27, 27, 29 years.  <i>Developers:</i> 5 male, 2 female; Ages: 21, 23, 23, 25, 26, 31, 40 years.

Case II: A private not-for-profit organisation

The second case study was carried out in a private and not-for-profit software development organisation, which had branches in three states of Brazil. The organisation's headquarters were located in the Porto Digital Science Park [67], in Recife, Brazil. This organisation was created through the merging of two research foundations,

the first one created in 1994. It operated in many different areas, such as Information Technology, Telecommunications, Industrial Automation, Solutions for the Public Sector, and Energy, by providing support services, workforce supply for third-parties, development of software and hardware products, software factory, product certification tests, and research and development of technological innovative products. The organisation had a SW-CMMi level 2 certificate and was targeting the SW-CMMi level 3 at the time of the development of the case study.

The management processes broadly followed the PMBOK guide [68], and managers were certified Project Management Professionals (PMP); some projects had been adopting SCRUM agile management practices. At the time that this research was carried out, the organisation had about 300 professionals, 85% of whom were technical and 15% performed administrative tasks. This case study was limited to the Recife branch, with 40 professionals.

This branch had both hardware and software development projects, but only software professionals were selected to participate in this research, which included people working on web, mobile, and embedded systems, using technologies such as .NET and Java. In this branch, there was no specific human resource management, and project managers performed the activities related to human resources management.

Table 8 contains the set of adjectives originated from the analysis of the behavioural descriptors used by the participants in this case (RQ1), as well as details about the workplace factors that influence work motivation and job satisfaction raised in Case II (RQ2). As for outcomes of work motivation, participants reported the outcomes listed in Table 9 (RQ3).

Table 6 - Behavioural descriptors and workplace factors (Case I)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR (RQ1)	WORKPLACE FACTORS (RQ2)
WORK MOTIVATION	• Focus	• Well defined work • Fair workload
	• Commitment	• Being updated • Different domains
	• Hard-work	• Engagement of co-workers • Social relevance • Confidence
	• Interest	• Creativity • Problem solving
JOB SATISFACTION	• Excitement	• Success
	• Mood	• Recognition

Table 7 - Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (Case I)

CONSTRUCT	OUTCOMES (RQ3)	
	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES...	WHEN LOW, CAUSES...
WORK MOTIVATION	• Productivity • Communication • Proactivity	• Laziness • Isolation
JOB SATISFACTION	• Punctuality	• Absence • Troublemaking

### Case III: A small software development company

The third case study was carried out in a software company formally established in 2006 by the initiative of five entrepreneurs from the Information Technology sector in Recife, Brazil. Its core mission was to support the development of people and organisations with software tools, by means of technical excellence and innovation.

This company specialized in software development for different platforms, with expertise in different programming languages (such as .NET Framework, Java family, LUA programming language, and others).

Table 8 - Behavioural descriptors and workplace factors  
(Case II)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR (RQ1)	WORKPLACE FACTORS (RQ2)
WORK MOTIVATION	Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear requirements</li> <li>• Balanced workload</li> <li>• Quiet environment</li> </ul>
	Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical skill development</li> <li>• Project variety</li> <li>• Team expertise</li> <li>• Knowledge exchange</li> </ul>
	Hard work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Useful product</li> <li>• Brainwork</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Commitment of co-workers</li> </ul>
JOB SATISFACTION	Mood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work success</li> <li>• Recognition</li> </ul>

Table 9 - Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction  
(Case II)

CONSTRUCT	OUTCOMES (RQ3)	
	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES...	WHEN LOW, CAUSES...
WORK MOTIVATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation</li> <li>• Help others</li> <li>• Proactivity</li> <li>• Integration</li> <li>• Productivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quiet/reserved</li> <li>• Laziness</li> <li>• Passivity</li> </ul>
JOB SATISFACTION	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of commitment</li> </ul>

It focused on the on-demand development of information systems, operating in areas such as management, finance, mining, health, and others. In addition, it also developed its own products. Its flagship product was a corporate social network, aimed at providing support to intra-organisational innovation management. At the time of this research, the company served national and international customers, mostly medium and large companies.

The company followed an agile software development process, broadly adopting practices such as regular delivery of software, adaptive management style (SCRUM based), small teams, face-to-face meetings, and customer authority. The organisational structure was flat, and the directors often worked as part of the development teams. The directors themselves, who have software engineering backgrounds, managed all organisational issues, including

human resources. At the time that the case study was carried out, the company was composed of 27 people, each of whom was younger than 30 years (directors included), and occupied functions in one of three types of team: software development, research and design. Some of them had been in the organisation for less than six months, while others had been with the team for more than 3 years. As an organisational strategy, the company had close ties to academia, both physically (its location is near a University) and operationally, since its employees were undergraduate students (trainees) as well as graduates in software engineering. We sampled participants representing all groups.

In this case study, work motivation and job satisfaction of engineers were described as detailed in Table 10 (RQ1), where the conditions for each component of work motivation and job satisfaction are also listed (RQ2). The outcomes of work motivation that resulted from this case are described in Table 11 (RQ3).

Table 10 - Behavioural descriptors and workplace factors  
(Case III)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR (RQ1)	WORKPLACE FACTORS (RQ2)
WORK MOTIVATION	• Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear requirements</li> <li>• Goal-driven responsibilities</li> <li>• One project at a time</li> </ul>
	• Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helping others</li> </ul>
	• Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domain variety</li> <li>• Intellectual challenge</li> <li>• Motivation of co-workers</li> <li>• Technical confidence</li> <li>• Continuous learning</li> </ul>
JOB SATISFACTION	• Mood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance</li> <li>• Recognition</li> <li>• Customer feedback</li> </ul>

Table 11 - Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction  
(Case III)

CONSTRUCT	OUTCOMES (RQ3)	
	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES...	WHEN LOW, CAUSES...
WORK MOTIVATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interactivity</li> <li>• Help others</li> <li>• Proactivity</li> <li>• Productivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laziness</li> <li>• Isolation</li> <li>• Passivity</li> <li>• Low productivity</li> </ul>
JOB SATISFACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment</li> <li>• Calm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence</li> </ul>

### Case IV: IT department of a University

The fourth case study was carried out in the Information Technology department of a federal university in Recife. The department was responsible for the maintenance and evolution of the information systems of the University (such as academic and assets management information). Its core product was released in the early 2000's, and since then was continuously evolved and adapted. Although this organization works only with this single product, it is a large piece of software. The product is a web-based system, written in Java, with about 840

features, organized in several software modules, which sum up to more than one million Lines of Code, and at the time this case study was carried out, it received about four thousand hits per month.

Table 12 - Behavioural descriptors and workplace factors (Case IV)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR (RQ1)	WORKPLACE FACTORS (RQ2)
WORK MOTIVATION	• Focus	• Clear processes • Clear customer needs • Clear goals • Fair work load
	• Care	• Useful products • Authorship
	• Engagement	• Learning opportunities • Learning about the product • Engagement of co-workers • Project variety • Maturity of co-workers • Variety of work
	• Hardwork	• Intellectual challenge • Self confidence
JOB SATISFACTION	• Excitement	• Accomplishment • Practical impact
	• Mood	• Recognition

Table 13 - Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (Case IV)

CONSTRUCT	OUTCOMES (RQ3)	
	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES...	WHEN LOW, CAUSES...
WORK MOTIVATION	• Proactivity • Interactivity • Mutual help • Productivity	• Laziness • Passivity • Social isolation • Helpless • Lack of productivity
JOB SATISFACTION	• Responsibility • Calm	• Pessimism • Absenteeism • Irresponsibility

The department was mainly organized in three sectors: one responsible for the inception of new features to improve the information processing procedures in the university; one responsible for the maintenance of the largest software module of the product, the academic administration module; and a third sector responsible for the elaboration and development of any new modules. Regarding the software development process, this department followed an agile SCRUM-based approach. Internal procedures were defined and continuously improved by a study group, which aimed to make these internal processes comply with the MPS.br model [69].

The development process was well defined regarding the configuration management, project management, requirements management, portfolio management and quality assurance. Some initiatives served as pilot studies for procedures such as acquisition, measurement, validation and verification. This department had 37 professionals, working under three different types of contract: eighteen public employees, eleven employees from third-parties and eight interns. The first category is composed of

government employees who therefore had the same rights as described in Case I. Third-party employees were regular employees of another organisation that was responsible for supplying workforce to many departments in the university, so they had a regular private employment contract with the third-party organisation, but they were fully allocated to the University. Interns were contracted under a standard educational internship contract, with less responsibility and less work time in the organisation. The data collection included professionals with each of the three different types of job contract.

For the participants of this case study, software engineers' work motivation and job satisfaction are described as seen in Table 12 (RQ1). Table 12 also shows the workplace factors pointed out as conditions for work motivation and job satisfaction (RQ2). Our analysis showed the outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers as in Table 13 (RQ3).

5.2 Cross-case analysis

RQ1 - What behaviours characterise the work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?

Table 14 brings together the behavioural descriptors evidenced from the four case studies, as detailed in the previous section. This shows that six descriptors characterize work motivation of software engineers, but that the descriptors Focus and Engagement are strongly evident in all four case studies. Focus is interpreted as the expressed level of attention, while engagement refers to the expressed level of effort, both applied to a task. On closer inspection of the data, and after several rounds of discussion, we concluded that the other four descriptors (Care, Commitment, Hardwork and Interest) could be viewed as sub-categories of these two central descriptors. For example, carelessness occurs when someone is distracted from the task, and hence not focused; someone engaged in the work will also be interested in the outcome. While the exact relationship between these descriptors could be argued, we decided to adopt the label Focus to unite focus and care, and the label Engagement to represent commitment, hard-working, and interest. Observe that both descriptors comprise behaviours that are perceivable before and during the execution of a task.

Job satisfaction was described in terms of mood in all case studies, while in Cases I and IV, excitement was also an evident signal of job satisfaction. We followed the same rationale as above and concluded that mood and excitement are sub-categories of a new descriptor Happiness, as shown in Table 18.

RQ2 - Which workplace factors influence the work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?

Table 15 shows the result of the effort to synthesize the workplace factors connected to high levels of work motivation and job satisfaction. It was possible to map two workplace factors of focus, and six workplace factors that influence engagement. These factors are individually discussed below.

Well defined work was cited in all case studies as

important for focus. In Case I, the development followed no particular development process, so it is reasonable that four participants identified the need for a better defined work process. However, the organisation in Case IV apparently followed well defined work procedures, but according to the participants of that case, lacked clarity about the customer needs in the documents. Thus, the category labelled "well defined work" refers to not only the working process, but also the content of work in terms of requirements and/or specific goals.

Cognitive Workload was cited in all cases too. The reason for workload being a relevant factor is revealed by an interviewee in Case III, which when explaining lost focus, makes a reference to the cognitive effort that software engineers must do to swap their thinking contexts between distinct projects or concurrent demands.

Acquisition of useful knowledge appears as a factor of engagement in all four cases as well. Being updated, either to apply new technologies to work in order to be more productive (Cases I and II), or to expand one's possibility to find other job opportunities (Cases III and IV), is a relevant driver of engagement. Knowledge acquisition can occur through training, or working with different people or different entities (technologies, projects, problem domains, etc.). According to our findings, the knowledge being offered to software engineers must be useful, i.e. can be converted to productivity or money (job opportunities), otherwise it would not be valuable for them.

Social impact was also found to be a strong facilitator of engagement. Although in public organizations the social significance of their activity is clearer, engineers from all cases pointed out that the utility and social impact of the product on which they are working causes work motivation. Developing information systems that are used by a social group of which they are themselves a member is a compelling reason to be engaged in their work.

Work variety is a complex characteristic of the work. The data shows that it is important for software engineers to have contact with different tasks (Cases II and IV), business domains, rules and challenges (Cases I and III). However, this variation of projects and tasks must be managed in a way to avoid distractions and workload problems. Working on simultaneous projects, for example, may not be an effective way to achieve work variety, because shifting the context between completely different projects may increase cognitive workload, as previously discussed.

Software engineers are likely to be engaged in creative work. It is not only the brainwork characteristic of the work (as in Case II) that is motivating, but more challenging intellectual tasks, involving problem solving (Case I), research (Case II) and creation (Case IV). Even though writing software is knowledge-intensive work, not all tasks in a development process are considered challenging and creative. Besides, the meaning of "challenge" varies with different people. Among our participants, there are a few examples of participants saying that testing is boring, while others refer to testing as a challenging and creative activity. The same conflict of opinions happens in other

activities such as requirements elicitation, documentation, and programming. Thus, other subjective variables, not identifiable in our data, may influence the individuals' perception of challenge and creativity in different tasks.

Challenging work, which appears in three of the four cases, is a way of looking at the relative difficulty of the tasks. Challenging work or goals may only be of some engaging effect when the engineers perceive, beforehand, that they have the right conditions and are able to accomplish it. Otherwise they think it is a waste of effort. This reflects the idea of technical confidence, quoted by some of the interviewees.

Finally, engagement of their co-workers, in all cases, refers to how the behaviour of colleagues affects software engineers' motivation, for better (Cases I and III) or for worse (Cases II and IV).

Five participants from Case I, six (all) in Case II, seven in Case III, and eight in Case IV provided data that suggests conditions for job satisfaction. The categories generated from the cross-case analysis are shown in Table 15.

Accomplishment was identified among almost all participants. Participants achieve satisfaction when they are able to produce results as good as, or better than, those planned. This observation evidences how important the planning activity is for the satisfaction of engineers, showing that the plans are the primary source for the establishment of the individuals' expectations, which are in turn responsible for their value judgment about their own performance.

Our case studies indicate that there may be other individual characteristics that moderate the strength of some conditions of work motivation and job satisfaction, but this is outside the scope of this study. There also may be other implicit characteristics that influence perceptions. For example, an individual's values and perceptions of the feedback source, and any preference they had to the medium used to send the feedback, affect the impact of the feedback [76]. These aspects should be investigated in future studies.

### RQ3 - What are the outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers?

Finally, when considering the effects of work motivation and job satisfaction over the data from the four cases, the outcomes were semantically combined in two main categories: performance and professionalism. Work motivation influences mainly the individual and collective performance of the software engineers, while job satisfaction influences mainly their professionalism. This combination followed the same process of interpretation and discussions between peers previously described. Table 16 shows the synthesis of the effects of high and low levels of work motivation and job satisfaction from the four cases' data. Performance was defined as the best possible expression of the competencies (knowledge, abilities and attitudes) of the individual at work. Professionalism was defined as a set of practices that sustain reliability and integrity of the person at the workplace.

Table 14 - Behavioural descriptors for work motivation and job satisfaction (cross-case tabulation)

CONSTRUCT	CASE I: BEHAV IOURAL DE- SCRIPTOR	CASE II: BEHAV IOURAL DE- SCRIPTOR	CASE III: BEHAV IOURAL DE- SCRIPTOR	CASE IV: BEHAV IOURAL DE- SCRIPTOR	EMERGING BEHAV IOURAL DE- SCRIPTOR
WORK MOTIVATION	FOCUS -	FOCUS -	FOCUS CARE	FOCUS CARE	FOCUS
	COMMITMENT HARD-WORK INTEREST	ENGAGEMENT HARD WORK -	ENGAGEMENT - -	ENGAGEMENT HARDWORK	ENGAGEMENT
JOB SATISFACTION	MOOD EXCITEMENT	MOOD -	MOOD -	MOOD EXCITEMENT	HAPPINESS

Table 15 – Workplace factors for Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction (cross-case analysis)

BEHAVIOUR	BEHAV IOURAL DESCRIPTOR	CASE I: WORKPLACE FACTORS	CASE II: WORKPLACE FACTORS	CASE III: WORKPLACE FACTORS	CASE IV: WORKPLACE FACTORS	EMERGING WORKPLACE FACTORS <i>Definition</i>
WORK MOTIVA- TION	FOCUS	WELL DEFINED WORK	CLEAR REQUIRE- MENTS	CLEAR REQUIRE- MENTS, GOAL-DRIVEN RESPONSIBILITIES	CLEAR PROCESS- ES, CLEAR CUSTOMER NEEDS, CLEAR GOALS	<b>WELL DEFINED WORK</b> <i>Working in systematic tasks with clear goals, well defined requirements and predicable results</i>
		FAIR WORKLOAD	BALANCED WORKLOAD	ONE PROJECT AT A TIME	FAIR WORK LOAD	<b>COGNITIVE WORKLOAD</b> <i>how fair and balanced the cognitive workload and the responsibilities are, at work</i>
	ENGAGEMENT	BEING UPDATED	TEAM EXPERTISE, KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE, TECHNICAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT	CONTINUOUS LEARNING	LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES, LEARNING ABOUT THE PRODUCT MATURITY OF CO-WORKERS	<b>USEFUL KNOWLEDGE</b> <i>The knowledge that the individual believes that he/she can acquire as part of, or a reward for, a task execution, and which can be useful for their life, career, performance, etc..</i>
		SOCIAL RELE- VANCE	USEFUL PROD- UCTS	HELPING OTHERS	USEFUL PROD- UCTS	<b>SOCIAL IMPACT</b> <i>How the individuals perceive that their products have a social impact, i.e. benefits other people's lives, is useful or significant.</i>
		DIFFERENT DOMAINS	PROJECT VARIETY	DOMAIN VARIETY	PROJECT VARIETY, VARIETY OF WORK	<b>WORK VARIETY</b> <i>The individuals have contact with different tasks, business domains, rules and challenges.</i>
		CREATIVITY, PROBLEM SOLVING	BRAINWORK, RESEARCH	-	AUTHORSHIP	<b>CREATIVE WORK</b> <i>The tasks involve creating new solutions for new and challenging problems</i>
		CONFIDENCE	-	INTELLECTUAL CHALLENGE, TECHNICAL CONFIDENCE	INTELLECTUAL CHALLENGE, SELF CONFI- DENCE	<b>CHALLENGING WORK</b> <i>Tasks that defies (without suppressing) the indi- vidual belief that he/she is technically able of accomplishing it.</i>
		ENGAGEMENT OF CO-WORKERS	COMMITMENT OF CO-WORKERS	MOTIVATION OF CO-WORKERS	ENGAGEMENT OF CO-WORKERS	<b>ENGAGEMENT OF CO-WORKERS</b> <i>How engaged the co-workers are perceived to be</i>
JOB SATISFAC- TION	HAPPINESS	SUCCESS	WORK SUCCESS	PERFORMANCE	ACCOMPLISH- MENT	<b>ACCOMPLISHMENT</b> <i>Being able to conclude the activities just as (or better than) the plans</i>
		RECOGNITION	RECOGNITION	RECOGNITION, CUSTOMER FEEDBACK	PRACTICAL IMPACT RECOGNITION	<b>RECOGNITION</b> <i>Compliments received from peers, supervisors and customers after the work is done.</i>

Table 16 - Effects of high and low levels of work motivation and job satisfaction (cross-case analysis)


COSNTRUCT	CASE I: OUTCOMES	CASE II: OUTCOMES	CASE III: OUTCOMES	CASE IV: OUTCOMES	EMERGING OUTCOMES
High levels of WORK MOTIVATION	PROACTIVITY, COMMUNICATION, PRODUCTIVITY, -	PROACTIVITY, COMMUNICATION, PRODUCTIVITY, TEAM INTEGRATION, HELP OTHERS	PROACTIVITY, INTERACTIVITY, PRODUCTIVITY, -	PROACTIVITY, INTERACTIVITY, PRODUCTIVITY, -	<b>PERFORMANCE</b> <i>The best possible expression of the competencies (knowledge, abilities and attitudes) of the individual at work.</i>
Low levels of WORK MOTIVATION	LAZINESS, ISOLATION - -	QUIET/RESERVED, PASSIVITY -	LAZINESS, ISOLATION, PASSIVITY, LOW PRODUCTIVITY	LAZINESS, SOCIAL ISOLATION, PASSIVITY, LACK OF PRODUCTIV- ITY, HELPLESS	
High levels of JOB SATISFACTION	PUNCTUALITY	-	COMMITMENT, CALM,	RESPONSIBILITY, CALM	
Low levels of JOB SATISFACTION	ABSENCE, TROUBLEMAKING	LACK OF COMMIT- MENT	ABSENCE	ABSENTEEISM, PESSIMISM, IRRESPONSIBILITY	<b>PROFESSIONALISM</b> <i>A set of practices that sustain reliability and integrity of the person.</i>



### 5.3 A new theory of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers (TMS-SE)

The findings presented in the previous sections served as the basis to generate a new theory of motivation and satisfaction for software engineers (hereafter referred to as TMS-SE). Our theoretical background proposes that job satisfaction and work motivation refer to distinct phenomena (see França, Sharp and Da Silva [53] for a more detailed discussion). Job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as attaining, or allowing the attainment of, one's important job values, while work motivation refers to the desire to work. Motivation happens before the action, while satisfaction happens afterwards, in a given work episode. A work episode is defined henceforth as an event in which latent performance becomes actual performance at the workplace. Latent performance here refers to the maximum level of performance possible in the given conditions.

Fig. 2 - Relationship between work motivation and job satisfaction



Although work motivation and job satisfaction are distinct, they are closely connected in a feedback loop (Fig. 2), through the self-regulation process [70] that connects past experiences to future behaviours. In the following subsections, we describe the TMS-SE in five basic propositions.

**Proposition 1) Job satisfaction is expressed in terms of happiness, while work motivation is a combination of engagement and focus.**

From the data explored in the previous section, it is possible to learn that Job satisfaction is signalled mainly by happiness of the individuals at work, but the external signs of a motivated behaviour remain unclear. From our study data, we came to the conclusion that engagement and focus are the traits that best describe the motivated behaviour of software engineers. Both engagement and focus comprise behaviours perceivable before and during a work episode. Engaged individuals differ from non-engaged individuals in their levels of involvement with the work, effort applied, concern with the results, and proactivity. Focused individuals differ from non-focused individuals in their levels of attention and care for the work.

Identifying engagement and focus as behavioural traits for motivation is consistent with other available theories of motivation. As Steers et al. [5, p. 379] pointed out, the theories of human motivation are generally concerned with factors or events that energize, sustain (engagement)

and channel (focus) human behaviour over time. Goal Setting Theory [71] suggests three mechanisms through which the goal-setting practice affects performance (goal mechanisms), namely: (i) direction, which refers to the individual's attention; (ii) effort, which refers to the amount of effort mobilized in proportion to the perceived requirements of the goal or task; and (iii) persistence, which refers to directed effort extended over time. These three goal mechanisms are directly comparable to components of engagement (effort and persistence) and focus (direction).

While motivated engineers are both engaged and focused, if either of these is lost, i.e. if engineers are not engaged or are distracted, then motivation is likely to suffer. Looking at the possible combinations of engagement and focus reveals two other situations, illustrated in Fig. 3: "Not-engaged but focused" or Homeostasis [40], a state of balance that results in no action; and "engaged but unfocused" or Frenetic, a state in which the individuals express high levels of interest but they are not able to concentrate their effort towards a specific task.

Fig. 3 - Combination of engagement and focus

Engaged	<i>Frenetic</i>	<i>Motivated</i>
Not Engaged	<i>Demotivated</i>	<i>Homeostatic</i>
	Unfocused	Focused

**Proposition 2) Motivation moderates the relationship between an individual's latent performance and actual performance within a work episode.**

According to the analysis of our case studies, Performance is the main outcome of work motivation. However, several other aspects of the work, such as technical knowledge, work experience, processes and tools, can influence an individual's latent performance, as documented for example by Rash and Tosi [72] and Prasad et. al [73]. In addition, Morgeson and Humphrey [78] draw attention to the fact that the working context (i.e. ergonomics, equipment use, etc.) can dissipate latent performance.


Therefore, given a working context, an individual has a latent performance against any task, and the actual performance is moderated by motivation, i.e. a motivated engineer is more likely to realize all their latent performance in a given task.

Accordingly, it is not safe to infer motivation based on the actual performance of an engineer, just as it is not reasonable to infer that an engineer is more or less motivated than others based on their comparative performance. Motivation is not the only predictor of actual performance. It is not possible to affirm that a motivated engineer will perform better than another engineer (motivated or not), because their latent performances are affected by other factors, such as individual competence.

Motivation of engineers can only be inferred from the assessment of engagement and focus behaviours, combined. Through a combination of engagement and

focus, work motivation acts as a moderator in the transformation process of latent performance into actual performance, i.e. motivated software engineers are likely to perform better than they would without engagement or focus. Fig. 4 depicts the proposed relationships between work motivation, work context, work episode, and job satisfaction.

Fig. 4 – The relationship between work motivation, work episode and job satisfaction



*Proposition 3) Creativity, Work Variety, Work Challenge, Useful Knowledge and Social Impact are conditions for engagement for software engineers, moderated by individual characteristics and perceived engagement of co-workers.*

*Proposition 4) Well defined work and balanced cognitive workload are the conditions for focus for software engineers, moderated by individual characteristics.*

The natural sequence of the investigation led us to question what factors affect the engagement and focus of software engineers. Our case studies pointed out six workplace factors that affect engagement and two workplace factors that affect focus of software engineers. The conditions for engagement and focus are those identified in the last column of Table 15.


While in the Job Characteristics Theory, Hackman and his colleagues use the terms Job Characteristics and Task Characteristics as interchangeable concepts, in the TMS-SE, we find it useful to distinguish three different dimensions of the workplace: *Task* refers to a specific thing to do, e.g. write code, test a system, etc; *Work* refers to the set of tasks that are part of a individual's responsibilities at work; and *Job* refers to the social and contractual relationships existing between an individual and an organisation.

However, notice that creativity, work variety, work challenge, useful knowledge, social impact, well defined work, and cognitive workload refer clearly to characteristics of the work, while engagement of co-workers is a workplace factor that pertains to a more social dimension. Scrutinizing our data, it is possible to evidence that the engagement of co-workers moderates how the work char-

acteristics influence the engagement of software engineers. Fig. 5 portrays propositions 3 and 4.

In our study, some individual characteristics seemed to interfere in the strength to which the workplace factors are perceived or valued, such as work experience and technical orientation. However, these aspects were not investigated, and must be explored in future work.

Fig. 5 – Antecedents of engagement and focus




*Proposition 5) Actual performance in a determined work episode, influences the software engineer's appraisal of the workplace factors, and this relationship is moderated by available feedback and individual characteristics.*

Recognition and accomplishment emerged from our study as antecedents of job satisfaction. Both are forms of feedback that help to build an individual's self-perception of actual performance, within a single work episode. This is consistent with other recent research developments, such as Sach [76], which shows that positive and negative feelings are the most representative outcome of feedback instances in a software engineering context. Feedback then is interpreted as trustworthy information that individuals get about the results and about the impacts of their work.

Besides feedback, we found no further conditions for job satisfaction beyond those job characteristics already documented in Locke [77]. Locke lists 'the work itself', which refers to the intrinsic interest that the individuals have for the work, as one of the conditions for job satisfaction, together with Pay, Benefits, Recognition, Promotion, Working Conditions, Company, Supervisors and Co-workers. In the TMS-SE, the notion of "the work itself" is embedded in the appraisal of actual performance, as per-

ceived based on the available feedback and individual characteristics. Therefore, unlike Locke's simplification, actual performance models the expectations of the engineers regarding the other antecedents of job satisfaction, as explained in [79]. Fig. 6 depicts this proposition.

Fig. 6 – Antecedents of happiness



Finally, we produced a full model of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers, pictured in Fig. 7., which integrates all the concepts, propositions and relations in the TMS-SE, described in this section.

## 6 DISCUSSION

### 6.1 The TMS-SE and the Job Characteristics Theory

The main distinction between the TMS-SE and the JCT is the clear separation between the conditions for work motivation and those for job satisfaction made in the TMS-SE, which is not clear in Hackman's original work. In addition, the JCT refers to internal motivation as a non-observable set of internal emotions. In the TMS-SE, this internal state was mapped onto a combination of engagement and focus, as observable behavioural proxies for individual work motivation.


The set of factors found in our study confirms that the job characteristics described in the Hackman's Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) are not enough to explain the nuances of this particular type of work. The relationships between the elements of TMS-SE and the original five factors of the JCT are discussed below.

- Task significance: is defined as "the degree to which the work has a substantial impact on the lives of

other people, whether in the immediate organisation or in the external environment". It is similar to the concept of Social impact in the TMS-SE. However, the TMS-SE complements the notion of significance, revealing that the task is also perceived as significant when it has an impact on the individual's own life, particularly through the acquisition of useful knowledge.

- Skill variety: defined as "the degree to which the job requires a number of different activities in carrying out the work, which involve the use of a number of different skills and talents of the individual". Morgeson and Humphrey [78] refers to Task Variety (as in job enlargement) and Skill Variety (as in job enrichment) as two distinctive dimensions of work variety. In TMS-SE, the concept of work variety seems to carry another new type of variation that also accounts for the software engineers' engagement: the variation of the intellectual content of the task, complementing the more limited notion of skill variety from the original JCT.
- Autonomy: is defined as the "freedom, independence, and discretion in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out". Autonomy implies that individuals establish an emotional connection with the product on which they are working, because the workers feel personally responsible for the results of the work. That feeling of experienced responsibility is critical in determining the individual's motivation. In our case studies, this feeling of experienced responsibility is achieved through the creative work.
- Task identity: is defined as "the degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work, doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome". In the JCT, task identity appeared as a workplace factor that shaped the experienced meaningfulness of the work. In our research, the idea of Well defined work is partially compatible with this concept. However, instead of just referring to it as meaningful, the notion of well defined work in the TMS-SE also captures the need to enable engineers' focus.
- Feedback: In the JCT, feedback represents "the degree to which carrying out job specific work activities provide the jobholder with direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his/her performance". However, it is not clear, in their work, whether feedback is a condition for work motivation or job satisfaction. Oldham and Hackman [21] stated: "*motivated employees feel good when they perform well and feel bad when they perform poorly*". Additionally, the JCT suggested that "*the crucial condition is that feedback be present in form that is believable to the worker, so a realistic basis exists for the satisfaction*" [75]. Locke [77] also mentions that "*a person who is highly involved in his job should be more likely to feel extremely satisfied or dissatisfied with it (depending upon his degree of success)*". These quotations imply that feedback

Fig. 7 - Model of work motivation and job satisfaction



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

happens in the after-performance side of the work episode, so it can only influence job satisfaction. That becomes clearer in the TMS-SE. However, in the TMS-SE feedback appears as a moderator for job satisfaction.

The notion of Growth Need Strength (GNS), or “the strength of a person’s need for personal accomplishment, learning, and development” in the JCT, is found throughout the TMS-SE, in a different manner. Acquisition of useful knowledge, for example, appears as a new factor. The notion of personal accomplishment is embedded in some conditions, such as in the factor challenging work, and consequences, such as the role of feedback on actual performance over the job satisfaction elements. In addition, the TMS-SE uncovered that there may be other individual characteristics that mediate the effect of workplace factors on work motivation. There are, as examples, individual characteristics that influence perception of what useful knowledge may mean, about what trustworthy feedback is, and so on.

The TMS-SE extends the boundaries of the original JCT. All case studies conducted in this work raised the issue that an individual’s state of motivation influences and is influenced by their co-worker’s motivation. This phenomenon is only explained by the Inequity Theory [79], which is not explicitly a theory of motivation to work, but

states that:

*“the presence of inequity will motivate Person to achieve equity or reduce inequity (...) Person may increase his inputs if they are low relative to Other’s inputs and to his own outcomes (...) [or] Person may decrease his inputs if they are high relative to Other’s inputs and to his own outcomes.”* [79, p. 427-428]

In this excerpt, the “other’s inputs” can be seen as the engagement of co-workers of the TMS-SE. The inequity theory, in contrast to TMS-SE, does not discern work motivation from job satisfaction [22], so inequity can be manifested in terms of both emotional and behavioural signs. The Job Satisfaction Theory [77] posits equity as an antecedent of job satisfaction and, consistently, more recent research provided strong evidence of the relationship between general organisational justice and individual health [80]. Our study, on the other hand, provides complementary evidence for the effect of inequity over work motivation, rather than exclusively over job satisfaction.

Hackman’s job characteristics [74] generally refer to valuable aspects pertaining either to the means or to the ends of performing a specific activity, as part of the work. Although the eventual use of the term “task characteristic” might convey the notion that such characteristics must pertain specifically to a task, they actually pertain to the

experience of performing it. As pointed out in Hackman and Lawler III [75], all the workplace factors are psychological and subjective in essence i.e., it is not their objective state that affects employee's attitudes and behaviour, but rather how they are perceived by the employees. That is the same understanding of the TMS-SE.

Finally, the concept of challenging work represents a bridge that makes our theoretical framework consistent with the Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) [81][82]. The SCT defines self-efficacy as *"the strength of people's convictions in their own effectiveness"* [82, p. 193]. The JCT and the SCT were built on the precepts of Vroom's expectancy theory [83]. However, the SCT was mainly developed around the idea that personal expectations influence one's motivation, while in the JCT this idea is not explicit. The SCT asserts that self-efficacy influences choice, as predicted in the Expectancy Theory, but also determines *"how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences."* [82, p. 194], which is consistent with our assertion that challenging work (tasks that stretches one's self-efficacy) influences engagement. Nevertheless, the TMS-SE focuses on workplace factors rather than on individual characteristics. Thus, the idea of self-efficacy appears in the TMS-SE in this more work-oriented manner.

## 6.2 The TMS-SE and Couger and Zawacki's work

Couger and Zawacki [6] built their studies on Hackman's Job Diagnostic Survey, and discovered that (1) software engineers from all over the world exhibited similarities regarding their high growth needs (GNS); (2) they hold specific personality traits that limit their social interactions, which would be responsible for a poor level of feedback among software engineering teams; and (3) organisations should seek specific strategies for improving engineers' feedback as a means to enhance their motivation, such as the Goal Setting approach. We opted to not use the JDS questionnaire, and personality profiles of our case study participants were not assessed. Therefore, it is not possible directly to affirm that our results are fully consistent with Couger and Zawacki's basic findings.

Nevertheless, there are two main points of comparison between our work and Couger and Zawacki's. First, the software engineers' high growth needs, defined as *"the degree to which an individual values opportunities for personal growth and development at work"*, is well represented in the factor useful knowledge in the TMS-SE. Second, in our four case studies, software organisations suffered from low levels of performance feedback. Notice that the low levels of feedback could be either a result of a specific personality trait common in software engineers or simply a result of how the software development processes are designed. The TMS-SE argues that feedback does not impact directly work motivation, but does influence job satisfaction.

Although Couger and Zawacki suggested that the Goal Setting approach could only serve to enhance feedback (and hence job satisfaction), the right manipulation of goal attributes can also act over the conditions for engagement and focus of software engineers (and work

motivation therefore). For instance: judgements about goal difficulty are expected to have some connection with the notion of challenging work of the engineer, influencing their potential engagement; and goal clarity is supposed to influence engineers' perception about how well the work is defined, generating an impact on their focus. The recent work with creativity workers by Amabile and Kramer [84] also suggests that it is possible to ignite workers' motivation by redesigning goals to progressively build their self-efficacy.

## 6.3 The TMS-SE and the MOCC model

The MOCC Model [37] represents, so far, the most relevant advance in describing motivation of software engineers. The general abstract rationale tying the elements of the MOCC together are in fact consistent with the TMS-SE: contextual factors and individual personality and preferences influence the characteristics of the software engineers; these characteristics influence the strength of motivators, which in turn influence the outcomes of motivation, mediated by elements of the context again.

However, some aspects of the MOCC are disputed in this research. First, the MOCC model does not distinguish work motivation from job satisfaction, so it suggests that outcomes such as retention, attendance, productivity, budget adherence, project delivery time, and project success are directly influenced by the motivation of software engineers. In contrast, the TMS-SE approaches work motivation and job satisfaction as distinguishable phenomena, with separable outcomes. Our case studies illustrated two situations in which the precepts of the MOCC do not stand for motivated engineers: (1) if they are not satisfied, they may exhibit high intention to leave anyway; and (2) in face of organisational hindrances or individual limitations of competence, they may not be productive. Second, Sharp et al. [37] classified motivators as intrinsic, which come from the pleasure of doing the work itself, and extrinsic, referring to workplace factors external to the work. In a different direction, the TMS-SE considers that all workplace factors are subjective, i.e. they pertain to an interactive relationship between a person and reality, in which the individuals make use of their functions of cognition, evaluation and regulation to appraise the work situations.

A limitation of both the TMS-SE and the MOCC model is that they do not clarify how the factors combine to shape the work motivation and the performance outcomes. In the MOCC model, the long list of motivational factors makes the investigation of the combination of factors impractical. In the TMS-SE, however, it is clearer that each factor is singly influential over the software engineer's motivation, while none of the factors are sufficient to ensure improved performance. The TMS-SE provides support to operationalize the constructs, in order to enable future research focused on more specific behavioural traits (engagement, focus and happiness), which has been a trend in the organisational behaviour field [22].

## 6.4 The TMS-SE and other studies

Some of the previous studies found in the two above mentioned systematic reviews (Section 3) are not directly

focused on work motivation or job satisfaction, but produce relevant insights into this subject. Turley and Bieman [85], Kandeel and Wahba [86], and Beecham et. al [87], for example, explore characteristics of high and low performers in software development. Engagement and focus are among the common traits that those studies point out. In the TMS-SE, it is possible to find the reasons that explain these results: highly motivated software engineers are engaged and focused, so they achieve their best.

Nevertheless, the belief that motivated employees perform better than de-motivated workers is a common misleading idea. The TMS-SE argues that motivation influences the individual performance, i.e. motivated individuals perform as best as they can, which does not ensure that they will perform better than others. Motivated software engineers are not necessarily the best performers, but they perform better than they would if they were not motivated.

As pointed out in the review of the literature described in Session 3, one of the biggest challenges for the empirical study of work motivation and job satisfaction has been the operational approach to observe or measure these phenomena. It is not always clear whether the investigated phenomenon is job satisfaction or work motivation. There are cases in which: (a) studies intended to assess work motivation use questionnaires that assess job satisfaction (e.g. [88]); (b) studies intended to assess job satisfaction, use self-designed questionnaires, for which the reliability is unknown (e.g. [89]); (c) studies intended to assess self-defined constructs, which are neither work motivation nor job satisfaction (e.g. [38]). It was out of the scope of this research to provide a ready-to-go assessment questionnaire, but it provides a practical framework that can be used in future research to delineate sensible operationalization of the work motivation and job satisfaction constructs.

## 6.5 Implications and challenges for software engineering

Based on the TMS-SE, we suggest how software engineers could consider the following workplace factors:

- Engagement of co-workers: our case studies showed that a highly motivated engineer may positively influence others, as well as a poorly motivated engineer may contaminate others. The first challenge for software engineering team leaders is to identify the poorly motivated engineers before the contamination occurs, to avoid a generalized decrease in motivation. The second challenge is to identify the highly motivated engineers, to leverage the motivation of the other team workers. In both cases, interventions must be conducted carefully to avoid the introduction of inequity in the team. Inequity sets off a significant risk for job satisfaction.
- Challenging work: the relationship between work characteristics and work motivation is not necessarily linear. In the case of challenging work, it seems to be an inverted U-shape relationship: too little, or too much challenge may not be effective to engage, because of the self-efficacy effect. Our case

studies show, for example, that a realistic and reliable estimation process can be a relevant source of leveraging challenge, while an untrustworthy estimation wipes out an engineer's belief that they can deliver timely results.

- Social impact: the four organisations studied in this work developed software systems supposed to benefit other people's lives or the efficacy of other organisations' processes, so it was not difficult to notice in the software engineers a motivated behaviour justified by the sense of responsibility for the social impact caused by their work. This may represent a challenge for software projects that are in their initial stages, with no actual users yet. In one of our case studies, we could evidence that the motivating role of the contact with users was replaced by a strong persuasion process from the company directors, because the product had not been sold yet.
- Acquisition of useful knowledge: Our case studies showed that long-term projects tend to lose their novelty appeal over time. Thus, another challenge in software engineering practice is how to cope with the engineers' need for constant learning in these types of project, without introducing technical risks related to the change of technologies. Figuring out what is useful for each engineer may already be a challenge for team leaders. Our case studies show that "useful" may be something that improves the quality of the product, the engineer's future performance, or even enhances their opportunity to find other jobs. Finally, managers could propose specific incentive strategies using useful knowledge as a reward, instead of money or other financial incentives.
- Work variety: There are at least two challenges concerning work variety. First, how to assure work variety in a single-project setting. The organisation in Case Study IV had a large product, whose maintenance consumed a significant amount of the workforce, and work variety depended on knowing the different modules of the project. In Case Study II, in contrast, the work variety depended on finishing short-term projects to start other projects in different domains of knowledge. Both examples represent practical forms of avoiding monotonous work, but the work variety in Case IV was limited by the project boundaries while in Case II there was no limit. Another challenge is how to assure work variety without stressing the engineers in multi-project settings. Our studies show that changing the allocation of an engineer during a project with which he/she is engaged may cause the opposite effect, which is consistent with recent empirical work on job rotation in software engineering [90][91]. Allocating engineers to simultaneous projects may also hamper their work motivation.
- Creativity: It was possible to notice that the participants of our case studies tended to focus on the creative part of a task when referring to their fa-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

avourite tasks, and tended to focus on the non-creative part when talking about the tasks that they dislike. However, all the tasks seemed to have both creative and non-creative steps. The challenge for software engineers is how to maintain high levels of work motivation during the phases in which they are executing the non-creative parts of their work.

- Well defined work: challenges regarding this factor concern several problems common in software engineering project settings, such as how well the requirements are elicited and documented [92], how well transitory artefacts are understood [93], how well the productive process is defined [94], etc. It is needless to reinforce how challenging it is to define software engineering work well, because these problems comprise large areas of research in the software engineering field.
- Communication, participation and Collaboration: Our case studies show that software engineers tend to exhibit more collaborative behaviour when they are highly motivated to work. However, this influence is mediated by the degree of communication and participation in the team. Previous research has suggested that participation is an antecedent of work motivation [37] but, in fact, the available evidence in software engineering literature only testifies weak connections between participation and job satisfaction. The challenge for the practice implied in the TMS-SE is that improving communication channels and participation procedures will not assure higher levels of collaboration, unless the engineers are motivated to work.
- Feedback: Recent work on feedback in software engineering [76] uncovered several informational properties that determine the effect of feedback on an individual's job satisfaction, such as the content, the source and the medium of the information. Thus, managers should also figure out how to deal with all these variables in order to administer beneficial feedback for their engineers.

## 42 7 CONCLUDING REMARKS

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Issues related to work motivation and job satisfaction have, for a long time, attracted the curiosity of researchers from all over the world, due not only to the complexity of the study of human behaviour, but also to the practical business benefits that the enhancement of individuals' performance could represent.

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

In this article, a theory of work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers (TMS-SE) is proposed, based initially on the Job Satisfaction and Job Characteristics theory, enhanced and adapted for the software development context. The theory presented in this article emerged from a cross-case analysis of four software engineering organisations, and it focuses on the work motivation and job satisfaction of software engineers. Conflicting aspects within the theory and outside its boundaries have been thoroughly discussed and reviewed in the text, which has consolidated its explanatory and predictive power.

This research is not the first attempt to address the motivation of software engineers at a theoretical level, nor the first empirical study, nor the first qualitative case study, nor the first to suggest a model of motivation for software engineers. However, to the best of our knowledge, it is the first research to weave all of these elements together. The present work contributes to the current state of art mainly by providing a solid theoretical framework, adapted to cover the software engineering specificities. While there is no consensus about the possibility that software engineers hold individual characteristics that distinguishes them from the overall population, our work shows that the nature of software engineering tasks creates specific conditions that alter the motivational structure of these professionals.

According to Ven [95], a good theory must be capable of (i) advancing knowledge in a scientific discipline, (ii) guiding research toward crucial questions, and (iii) enlightening the profession of management.

This work reinforces the importance of treating work motivation and job satisfaction as two distinguishable phenomena, with different antecedents, behavioural signs, and outcomes. This is an innovative theoretical approach for the software engineering field, which helps us to understand better which workplace factors effectively contribute to an engineer's happiness and retention, as well as which workplace factors influence engineers' individual performance through work motivation. These aspects are not clear in previous available models such as the MOCC model.

The TMS-SE theory leaves many open questions and opportunities for future research, such as the development of measurement and assessment tools; the design of intervention strategies; quantification of the impact of work motivation on individual performance; and the investigation of which and how individual characteristics influence the whole model.

The case studies presented in this article were conducted in 2010 and 2011, as part of the PhD work of the first author. It took a long time to synthesize all the data, as predicted in Merriam [50]. Merriam also describes three types of case studies: (1) *Particularistic*, which means that the study is focused on a particular situation; (2) *Descriptive*, which aims to produce a rich description of the subject being studied; and (3) *Heuristic*, which brings about the discovery of meaning and enhances the understanding of the phenomenon under study [50, p. 29]. The first two types are very sensitive to time, simply because particular situations may change. However, the third type results in mid-level theories which abstract the particular characteristics of the cases into a more stable conceptual level, a process which Eisenhardt [14] refers to as "building theory from case studies". This is precisely the case of the present study. In addition, the presented data continues to be representative of the field, because many of the factors in practice still pertain and the data is much more recent than other studies on motivation in software engineering.

However, it would be sensible for practitioners to evaluate the compatibility of the characteristics of other contexts before transferring the TMS-SE to their practice. In previous work [106] we have shown how a theory can

underpin the design of specific strategies to deal with motivation and satisfaction of software engineers. Furthermore, the strength of the theory can be enhanced by using it as a lens to look at data from other case studies in the future.

A limitation of the TMS-SE is that it does not make explicit how the workplace factors combine to shape the work motivation and the performance outcomes. Some factors may be more or less influent according to extraneous contextual variables, or internal individual characteristics. Further, there may be interactions among the factors. The approach followed in [96] may be useful to help design research aimed at looking for a combination or a scale of importance among these workplace factors.

Teamwork in software engineering is also an area that increasingly attracts academic and industrial attention. Team motivation has been defined as “*the collective system by which team members coordinate the direction, intensity, and persistence of their efforts.*” [97, p. 233]. According to Chen and Kanfer [97], team motivation cannot be understood without having a clear understanding of the work motivation of the members of a team. The TMS-SE can be used to guide investigation in this area. Still in the context of teamwork, several studies recall the importance that leaders have on determining the effectiveness of motivational strategies. Concepts of transformational and transactional leadership from Burns [98], for example, communicate two types of leaders that adopt different strategies to intervene in the team members’ work motivation. The TMS-SE can offer a theoretical framework to interpret and predict how the attitudes and decisions of leaders will influence the work motivation of software engineers.

Finally, this work serves as a practical and detailed worked example of theory building based on interpretive multi-case studies, for which we believe there are not many examples available in the software engineering literature. The software engineering scientific discipline is also starting to care about a more systematic development of theories. Thus, this work also contributes to future research from a methodological perspective, adding to the general body of knowledge of Empirical Software Engineering.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Professor Fabio Q. B. da Silva holds a research grant from the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq), process #314523/2009-0. The research that led to the results presented here were conducted while César França was a PhD student at UFPE, holding a CNPq grant process #141156/2010-4. The authors owe a special thanks to their colleagues Adelnei Felix, Ana Catarina Araújo, David Carneiro, Eric Sales, Pedro Santos, Danilo Monteiro, who actively engaged in different stages of this research project.

REFERENCES

[1] WEINBERG, G. M. The Psychology of Computer Programming. Silver anniversary edition. ed. [S.l.]: Dorset House, 1971. 352 p.

[2] DEMARCO, T.; LISTER, T. Peopleware: Productive Projects and Teams. [S.l.]: Dorset House, 1987.

[3] GUINAN, P. J.; COOPRIDER, J. G.; FARAJ, S. Enabling Software Development Team Performance Dureing Requirements Definition: A Behavioral Versus Technical Approach. Information Systems Research, v. 9, n. 2, p. 101-125, June 1998.

[4] HALL, T. et al. A systematic review of Theory use in studies investigating the motivations of software engineers. ACM Trans. Soft. Eng. Methodol., v. 18, n. 3, 2009. ISSN 10.1145/1525880.1525883.

[5] STEERS, R. M.; MOWDAY, R. T.; SHAPIRO, D. L. THE FUTURE OF WORK MOTIVATION THEORY. Academy of Management Review, p. 379-387, 2004.

[6] COUGER, J. D.; ZAWACKI, R. A. Motivating and Managing Computer Personnel. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1980.

[7] BEECHAM, S. et al. Motivation in Software Engineering: A systematic literature review. Information and Software Technology, v. 50, p. 860-878, 2007. ISSN 10.1016/j.infsof.2007.09.004.

[8] FRANÇA, A. C. C. et al. Motivation in software engineering: a systematic review update. International Conference on Evaluation & Assessment in Software Engineering (EASE). Durham: [s.n.]. 2011. p. 154-163.

[9] REEL, J. S. Critical Success Factors in Software Projects. IEEE Software, v. 16, n. 3, p. 18-23, May/Jun 1999. ISSN 0740-7459.

[10] HUMPHREY, W. S. Why Big Software Project Fail: The 12 Key Questions. In: REIFER, D. J. Software Management. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2006. p. 21-26.

[11] MASLOW, A. Motivation and Personality. [S.l.]: Harper. 1954.

[12] HACKMAN, J. R. Work redesign and motivation. Professional Psychology, v. 11, n. 3, p. 445-455, 1980.

[13] WALLGREN, L. G.; HANSE, J. J. Job characteristics, motivators and stress among information technology consultants: A structural equation modeling approach. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, p. 51-59, 2007.

[14] EISENHARDT, K. M. Building Theories From Case Study Research. The Academy of Management Review, v. 14, n. 4, p. 532-550, Oct 1989.

[15] EISENHARDT, K. M.; GRAEBNER, M. E. Theory Building from cases: Opportunities and Challenges. Academy of Management Journal. 2007, Vol. 50, No. 1, 25-32.

[16] LOCKE, E. A. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, p. 309-336, 1969.

[17] LOCKE, E. A.; LATHAM, G. P. WORK MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION: Light at the End of the Tunnel. Psychological Science, p. 240-246, 1990.

[18] KATZELL, R. A.; THOMPSON, D. E. Work motivation: Theory and practice. American Psychologist, v. 45, n. 2, p. 144-153, 1990.

[19] WEISS, H. M. Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. Human Resource Management Review, v. 12, p. 173-194, 2002.

[20] HACKMAN, J. R.; OLDHAM, G. R. Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, v. 60, n. 2, p. 159-170, 1975.

[21] OLDHAM, G. R.; HACKMAN, J. R. How Job Characteristics Theory Happened. In: SMITH, K. G.; HITT, M. A. The Oxford



- handbook of management theory: The process of theory development. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. p. 151-170.
- [22] AMBROSE, M. L.; KULIK, C. T. Old Friends, New Faces: Motivation Research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, v. 25, n. 3, p. 231-292, 1999.
- [23] BROOKS, F. P. *The Mythical Man-Month: Essays on Software Engineering*. [S.l.]: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- [24] CURTIS, B.; HEFLEY, W. E.; MILLER, S. A. People Capability Maturity Model (p-CMM). Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon. [S.l.]. 2001. (CMU/SEI-2001-MM-001).
- [25] COUGER, J. D.; ADELSBERGER, H. Comparing Motivation of Programmers and Analysts in Different Socio/Political Environments: Austria Compared to the United States. *ACM Computer Personnel*, v. 11, n. 4, p. 13-17, 1988.
- [26] COUGER, J. D.; BOROVITS, I.; & ZVIRAN, M. Comparison of motivating environments for programmer/analysts and programmers in the US, Israel and Singapore. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Volume IV: Emerging Technologies and Applications Track*. Hawaii: IEEE. 1989. p. 316-323.
- [27] DENGATE, G.; COUGER, J. D.; WEBER, R. Motivational characteristics of Australian information systems personnel. *Australian Computer Journal*, v. 22, n. 3, p. 77-87, 1990.
- [28] BURN, J. M. et al. Motivating IT Professionals - The Hong Kong Challenge. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. Kauai, HI: [s.n.]. 1991. p. 524 - 529.
- [29] COUGER, J. D.; HALTTUNEN, V.; LYYTINEN, K. Evaluating the motivating environment in Finland compared to the United States-a survey. *European Journal of Information Systems*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 107-112, 1991. ISSN doi:10.1057/ejis.1991.18.
- [30] COUGER, J. D.; CALLAGHAN, R. O. Comparing the motivation of spanish computer personnel with that of computer personnel in Finland and the United States. *European Journal of Information Systems*, v. 3, p. 285-291, 1994. ISSN doi:10.1057/ejis.1994.33.
- [31] COUGER, J. D.; ISHIKAWA, A. Comparing motivation of Japanese computer personnel versus these of the United States. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. [S.l.]: IEEE Comput. Soc. Press. 1995. p. 1012-1019.
- [32] KHALIL, O. E. M. et al. What motivates Egyptian IS managers and personnel. *Proceedings of the 1997 ACM SIGCPR conference on Computer personnel research - SIGCPR*. New York: ACM Press. 1997. p. 187-196.
- [33] TOMPKINS, H. K.; COUGER, J. D. Cross cultural comparison of information system personnel in the Pacific Basin versus the US. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. [S.l.]: [s.n.]. 1991. p. 530-537.
- [34] COUGER, J. D.; OPPERMANN, E. B.; AMOROSO, D. L. Changes in Motivation of I.S. Managers: Comparison Over a Decade. *Information Resources Management Journal*, v. 7, n. 2, p. 5-13, 1994.
- [35] ZAWACKI, R. A. Motivating the IS people of the future. *Information Systems Management*, v. 9, n. 2, p. 73-75, 1992. ISSN doi:10.1080/10580539208906871.
- [36] LOCKE, E. A. Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, v. 3, p. 157-189, 1968.
- [37] SHARP, H. et al. Models of motivation in software engineering. *Information and Software Technology*, 2008.
- [38] [PS016] Garden, A. M., "Maintaining the spirit of excitement in growing companies", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1988.
- [39] [PS056] Mak, B.L.; Sockel, H., "A confirmatory factor analysis of IS employee motivation and retention", *Information and Management* 2001.
- [40] MASLOW, A. H. Preface to motivation theory. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, p. 85-92, 1943.
- [41] ROZNOWSKI, M.; HULIN, C. The scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdrawal. In: CRANNY, C. J.; SMITH, P. C.; STONE, E. F. *Job satisfaction*. New York: Lexington Books, 1992. p. 123-163.
- [42] [PS051] Wynekoop, J.L.; Walz, D. B., "Revisiting the perennial Question: Are IS People Different", *The Database for Advances in Information Systems* 1998.
- [43] ŠTEINBERGA, L. Measuring Software Engineer Motivation in Globally Distributed Projects. *Proceeding of the 38th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications - Work in Progress / Ph.D. Symposium*. Cesme, Izmir, Turkey: [s.n.]. 2012.
- [44] ŠTEINBERGA, L.; ŠMITE, D. A Case Study of Job Satisfaction in an Offshore Office: Is software engineers' motivation at risk? *Baltic Journal of Modern Computing*, v. 1, n. 3-4, p. 186-198, 2013.
- [45] EL KHATIB, V. et al. The Role of Motivational Factors in Distributed Software Development Teams: An Empirical Investigation. *Proceedings of the 2013 21st European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS)*. [S.l.]: [s.n.]. 2013. p. 12.
- [46] GRAZIOTIN, D.; WANG, X.; ABRAHAMSSON, P.(2014), Happy software developers solve problems better: psychological measurements in empirical software engineering. *PeerJ* 2:e289; DOI 10.7717/peerj.289.
- [47] DE FARIAS JUNIOR, I. H. et al. Motivational Factors for Distributed Software Development Teams. *Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE Seventh International Conference on Global Software Engineering Workshops (ICGSEW)*. Porto Alegre, Brazil: [s.n.]. 2012. p. 49-54.
- [48] HERNÁNDEZ-LÓPEZ, A. Satisfaction and Motivation: IT's practitioners' perspective. *International Journal of Human Capital and Information Technology Professionals*, v. 3, n. 4, p. 39-56, October-December 2012.
- [49] MALIK, M. E.; NAEEM, B. Towards Understanding Controversy on Herzberg Theory of Motivation. *Journal of Applied Science Research*, v. 11, n. 2, p. 11936-11941, 2012.
- [50] MERRIAM, S. B. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. 2nd Edition. ed. [S.l.]: Jossey-Bass, 2009. 304 p.
- [51] FRANÇA, A. C. C. et al. Motivation in Software Engineering Industrial Practice: A Cross-Case Analysis of Two Software Organisations. *Information and Software Technology*, v. Available online, 2013.
- [52] NOBLIT, G. W.; HARE, D. *META-ETHNOGRAPHY: Synthe-*

- sizing Qualitative Studies. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, v. 11, 1988. ISBN 0-8039-3022-4.
- [53] FRANÇA, A. C. C.; SHARP, H. ; DA SILVA, F. Q. B. . Motivated software engineers are engaged and focused, while satisfied ones are happy. In: International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, 2014, Turim. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, 2014.
- [54] YIN, R. K. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Tradução de Daniel Grassi. 4th. ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, v. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 5, 2009. ISBN 978-1-4129-6099-1.
- [55] SOHN, T. et al. A Diary Study of Mobile Information Needs. Twenty-sixth annual SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems. New York, NY, USA: ACM. 2008. p. 433-442.
- [56] RUNESON, P.; HÖST, M. Guidelines for conducting and reporting case study research in software engineering. Empirical Software Engineering, 14, n. 2, 2008. 131-164.
- [57] RIEMAN, J. The Diary Study: A Workplace-Oriented Research Tool to Guide Laboratory Efforts. Proceedings of the INTERACT '93 and CHI '93 conference on Human factors in computing systems. New York: ACM. 1993.
- [58] SCOTT, C.; MANKOFF, J. When Participants Do the Capturing: The Role of Media in Diary Studies. Conference on Human factors in computing systems. New York, NY, USA: ACM. 2005.
- [59] STRAUSS, A.; CORBIN, J. Pesquisa Qualitativa: Técnicas e procedimentos para o desenvolvimento de teoria fundamentada. Tradução de Luciane de Oliveira da Rocha. 2nd. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.
- [60] FRANÇA, A. C. C.; ARAÚJO, A. C. M. L. D.; DA SILVA, F. Q. B. Motivation of Software Engineers: A Qualitative Case Study of a Research and Development Organisation. Proceedings of 6th International Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering (CHASE 2013). San Francisco, CA: [s.n.]. 2013.
- [61] FRANÇA, A. C. C.; CARNEIRO, D. E. S.; DA SILVA, F. Q. B. Towards an Explanatory Theory of Motivation in Software Engineering: A Qualitative Case Study of a Small Software Company. Proceedings of the Brazilian Symposium of Software Engineering. Natal, Brazil: [s.n.]. 2012.
- [62] FRANÇA, A. C. C.; FELIX, A. D. L. C.; DA SILVA, F. Q. B. Towards an Explanatory Theory of Motivation in Software Engineering: A Qualitative Case Study of a Government Organization. International Conference on Evaluation & Assessment in Software Engineering (EASE). Ciudad Real, Spain: [s.n.]. 2012. p. 72-81.
- [63] KHAN, Samia; VANWYNSBERGHE, Robert. Cultivating the Under-Mined: Cross-Case Analysis as Knowledge Mobilization. Forum Qualitative Sozi-alforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, [S.l.], v. 9, n. 1, jan. 2008. ISSN 1438-5627.
- [64] CRUZES, D. S. et al. Case Studies Synthesis: Brief Experience and Challenges for the Future. Proceeding of the International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement 2011. Banff. [s.n.]. 2011. p. 343-346.
- [65] DEY, I. Qualitative Data Analysis: A User Friendly Guide for Social Scientists. Routledg, London & New York, 1993.
- [66] CHARMAZ, Kathy. Constructing Grounded Tho-ery: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analy-sis. Sage Publications, London, 2016.
- [67] PORTO Digital. Porto Digital, 2000. Disponível em: <<http://www.portodigital.org>>. Last access in: 10 jan. 2014.
- [68] SNYDER, C. S. "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge: PMBOK (®) Guide." Project Management Institute, 2014.
- [69] SOFTEX. MPS.BR - Melhoria de Processo do Software Brasileiro, Guia Geral (Versão 1.2). Associação para Promoção da Excelência do Software Brasileiro (Softex). [S.l.]. 2007.
- [70] DIEFFENDORF, J. M.; CHANDLER, M. Motivating Employees. In: Zedeck, S. APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 3: Maintaining, Expanding, and Contracting the Organization. 2011 American Psychological Association.
- [71] LOCKE, E. A. et al. Goal Setting and Task Performance: 1969-1980. [S.l.]. 1980.
- [72] RASCH, R. H.; TOSI, H. L. Factors affecting software developers' performance: an integrated approach. MIS quarterly, p. 395-413, 1992.
- [73] PRASAD HC, S.; SUAR, D.; TARABAN, R. Antecedents and moderators of software professionals' performance. Sage Open, v. 4, n. 1, p. 2158244014521436, 2014.
- [74] HACKMAN, J. R. et al. A New Strategy for Job Enrichment. California Management Review, p. 57-71, 1975.
- [75] HACKMAN, J. R.; LAWLER III, E. E. Employee reactions to job characteristics. JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, v. 55, n. 3, p. 259-286, 1971.
- [76] SACH, R. The impact of feedback on the motivation of software engineers (PhD Thesis). The Open University. Milton Keynes, UK, p. 385. 2014.
- [77] LOCKE, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In: DUNNETTE, M. D. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976. p. 1297-1349.
- [78] MORGESON, F. P.; HUMPHREY, S. E. The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. Journal of applied psychology, v. 91, n. 6, p. 1321, 2006.
- [79] ADAMS, J. S. Toward and understanding of inequity. Journal of abnormal and social psychology, v. 67, n. 5, p. 422-436, 1963.
- [80] ELOVAINIO, M.; KIVIMÄKI, M.; VAHTERA, J. Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New Psychosocial Predictor of Health. American Journal of Public Health, v. 92, n. 1, p. 105-108, 2002. ISSN doi: 10.2105/AJPH.92.1.105.
- [81] BANDURA, A. Human Agency in Social Cognitive Theory. American Psychologist, v. 44, n. 9, p. 1175-1184, 1989.
- [82] BANDURA, A. Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, v. 84, n. 2, p. 191-215, 1977.
- [83] VROOM, V. H. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- [84] Amabile, T; Kramer, S. The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work. Harvard Business Press, 2011.
- [85] [PS040] Turley, R.T.; Bieman, J. M., "Competencies of exceptional and nonex- ceptional software engineers", Jour-

- nal of Systems and Software 1995.
- [86] [PS057] Kandeel, H.; Wahba, K., "Competency models for human resource development: case of Egyptian software industry", In: the Proceedings of Managing Information Technology in a Global Environment, 2001.
- [87] [PS101] Beecham, S.; Sharp, H.; Baddoo, N.; Hall, T.; Robinson, H., "Does the XP environment meet the motivational needs of the software developer? An empirical study", In: the Proceedings of AGILE Conference, 2007.
- [88] [PS102] Sharp, H.; Hall, T.; Baddoo, N.; Beecham, S., "Exploring motivational differences between software developers and project managers", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Software Engineering provides, 2007.
- [89] [PS009] Ferrat, T. W.; Short, L. E., "Are information systems people different: an investigation of motivational difference", *Management Information Systems Quarterly* 1986.
- [90] SANTOS, RONNIE E. S. ; Da Silva, Fabio Q. B. ; DE MAGALHÃES, CLEYTON V. C. ; Monteiro, Cleviton V. F. . Building a theory of job rotation in software engineering from an instrumental case study. In: the 38th International Conference, 2016, Austin. Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering - ICSE '16. p. 971-10.
- [91] SANTOS, R. E. S. ; Fabio Q. B. da Silva ; Baldassarre, Maria Teresa ; Cleyton Vanut C. de Magalhães . Benefits and Limitations of Project-to-Project Job Rotation in Software Organizations: A Synthesis of Evidence. *INFORMATION AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY*, p. 78-96, 2017.
- [92] WALIA, G. S.; CARVER, J. A systematic literature review to identify and classify software requirement errors. *Information and Software Technology*, v. 51, p. 1087-1109, 2009.
- [93] CORNELISSEN, B. et al. A Systematic Survey of Program Comprehension through Dynamic Analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, p. 1-20, January 2000.
- [94] WANGENHEIM, C. G. V. et al. Systematic Literature Review of Software Process Capability/Maturity Models. *Proceedings of International Conference on Software Process Improvement And Capability determination (SPICE)*. Pisa, Italy: [s.n.], 2010.
- [95] VEN, A. H. V. D. Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 14, n. 4, p. 486-489, 1989.
- [96] DA SILVA, F. Q. B.; FRANÇA, A. C. C. Towards understanding the underlying structure of motivational factors for software engineers to guide the definition of motivational programs. *Journal of Systems and Software (JSS)*, v. 85, n. 2, p. 216-226, 2012.
- [97] CHEN, G.; KANFER, R. Toward a Systems Theory of Motivated Behavior in Work Teams. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, v. 27, n. 6, p. 223-267, 2006.
- [98] BURNS, J. M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- [99] HALL, D. T.; NOUGAIM, K. E. An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organizational setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, v. 3, n. 1, p. 12-35, 1968.
- [100] HERZBERG, F. One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 1964.
- [101] HOUSE, R. J.; WIGDOR, L. A. Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: a review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, v. 20, n. 4, p. 369-389, 1967.
- [102] LOCKE, E. Personnel attitudes and motivation. *Annual review of psychology*, v. 26, p. 457-480, 1975.
- [103] WABBA, M. A. Expectancy Theory in Work and Motivation: Some Logical and Methodological Issues. *Human Relations*, p. 121-147, 1974.
- [104] EERDE, W. V.; THIERRY, H. Vroom's Expectancy Models and Work-Related Criteria: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, v. 81, n. 5, p. 575-586, 1996.
- [105] LOCKE, E. A. Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, v. 5, n. 2, p. 117-124, 1996.
- [106] FRANÇA, C.; DA SILVA, F. Q. B. Designing motivation strategies for software engineering teams. *Proceedings of the 2010 ICSE Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering - CHASE '10*. New York: ACM Press. p. 84.



**César França** received his PhD in Computer Science at the Federal University of Pernambuco, in 2014. He worked as research consultant at CESAR innovation center, in Brazil until 2015, and currently works as a Professor of Software Engineering at the Statistics and Informatics Department of the Federal Rural University of Pernambuco. His main research interests include human aspects of software engineers, education and research methodology. Contact him at cesar@fransa.com.



**Fabio Silva** is a Professor of Software Engineering at the Centre for Informatics, Federal University of Pernambuco. His research interests include human aspects in software engineering, innovation management, and future thinking. Silva is the leading researcher of the Human Aspects in Software Engineering Research Group (HASE Research) where he conducts field studies with software organizations in Brazil and several other countries with the goal of understanding and improving software practice. He is on the editorial board of IST and has been the Co-chair of ICSE's Conducting Empirical Studies in Industry Workshop in 2017 and 2018. He will be the General Chair of the IEEE/ACM ESEM Symposium in 2019.



**Helen Sharp** is Professor of Software Engineering at the Open University, UK. She is an expert on agile practice, and her research investigates professional software practice with a focus on human and social aspects of software development. Sharp has led multi-disciplinary research projects into software practice with partners in the UK and abroad, and conducts her research exclusively in-situ with software practitioners in their industrial context. Sharp is joint author of one of the leading HCI textbooks, *Interaction Design* now in its 4th edition. She is also on the editorial board for EMSE and JSS, serves on the Advisory Board for IEEE Software and will chair ICSE's software practice track in 2019.

AUTHOR: TITLE

27

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Motivation and Satisfaction of Software Engineers

César França, Fabio Q. B. da Silva, Helen Sharp

## APPENDIX A – INTERVIEW EXCERPTS

### Case I

Table A 1 - Behavioural descriptors for work motivation and job satisfaction (Case I – RQ1)

CONSTRUCT	POSITIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the data”	NEGATIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the data”	EMERGING BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR
WORK MOTIVATION	<b>FOCUSED</b> {P1.1, P1.4, P1.5, P1.6} — “Totally dedicated, persistent, <u>focused</u> in his objectives” (P1.6)	<b>UNFOCUSED</b> {P1.1, P1.2, P1.4} — “It would be a person that every moment small things steal their attention, the person is <u>distracted</u> ” (P1.4)	<b>FOCUS</b>
	<b>COMMITTED</b> {P1.2, P1.4, P1.5, P1.6} — “His involvement with the project, his commitment” (P1.4)	<b>UNINVOLVED</b> {P1.2} — “What happens is that this person arrived here late, and is there... (...) and <u>spends three hours reading unimportant emails</u> ” (P1.2)	<b>COMMITMENT</b>
	<b>HARD-WORKING</b> {P1.6} — “Totally dedicated, <u>persistent</u> , focused in his objectives” (P1.6)	-	<b>HARD WORK</b>
	<b>INTERESTED</b> {P1.4, P1.5} — “the person is <u>interested</u> in seeing the work results later” (P1.4)	<b>INDIFFERENT</b> {P1.1, P1.4} — “She <u>does not value the work</u> . She does not do the work the way she is supposed to” (P1.1)	<b>INTEREST</b>
JOB SATISFACTION	<b>EXCITED</b> {P1.4} — “[he/she] is <u>excited</u> with the achievements” (P1.4)	<b>RESENTED</b> {P1.3, P1.6} — “I only consider it when the person keeps <u>complaining</u> about the work” (P1.3)	<b>EXCITEMENT</b>
	<b>GOOD MOOD</b> {P1.1} — “ <u>Smiling</u> ” (P1.1)	<b>BAD MOOD</b> {P1.1} — “she comes in a <u>bad mood</u> ” (P1.1)	<b>MOOD</b>

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

Table A 2 – Work motivation and job satisfaction factors (Case I – RQ2)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR	WORKPLACE FACTOR {Participants} “examples as in the actual data”
WORK MOTIVATION	<b>FOCUS</b>	<b>WELL DEFINED WORK</b> {P1.1, P1.4, P1.5, P1.6} — “dealing with a finite number of activities that will get to a <u>result</u> ” (P1.4, in: answer to Q13) <b>FAIR WORKLOAD</b> {P1.2, P1.3, P1.4} — “if there is <u>too much</u> , nobody likes it... if there is <u>too little</u> , the person gets lost”(P1.3, in: answer to Q11)
	<b>COMMITMENT</b>	<b>BEING UPDATED</b> {P1.2, P1.5, P1.6} — “the possibility of <u>participating</u> [in an academic event] <u>motivates</u> , because it enriches and <u>brings new and useful experiences</u> for our day-to-day work. ” (P1.5, in: diary data 03/03/2011) <b>DIFFERENT DOMAINS</b> {P1.4} — “this idea of <u>knowing a little more about different business domains</u> , and to present IT solutions for them, has always been attractive ” (P1.4, in: answer to Q2)
	<b>HARD-WORK</b>	<b>ENGAGEMENT OF CO-WORKERS</b> {P1.1, P1.2, P1.5} — “when you* see other people working and showing results (...) you become stimulated to follow their behaviour” (P1.1, in: answer to Q27) <b>SOCIAL RELEVANCE</b> {P1.1, P1.2, P1.4, P1.5} — “I think that the <u>role of the organization is also important</u> , it stimulates me.” (P1.1, in: answer to Q6) <b>CONFIDENCE</b> {P1.1, P1.3} — “to do the <u>things that I am good at</u> ” (P1.3, in: answer to Q13)
	<b>INTEREST</b>	<b>CREATIVITY</b> {P1.1, P1.2, P1.3, P1.6} — “precisely, in the development process, I <u>like to take part in creation</u> .” (P1.1, in: answer to Q3) <b>PROBLEM SOLVING</b> {P1.1, P1.4}

		— “I like (...) to <u>discuss the solutions</u> , to discuss about the architecture” (P1.1, in: answer to Q3)
JOB SATISFAC-TION	EXCITEMENT	SUCCESS {P1.1, P1.2, P1.4, P1.5, P1.6} — “all the improvement demands would be released without any problems (...) By the end of the day, <u>every-thing worked</u> ” (P1.2, in: answer to Q11)
	MOOD	RECOGNITION {P1.5} — “People <u>saying thank you for things that you have done</u> (...) <u>It makes me happy</u> ” (P1.5, in: answer to Q11)

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)  
\* in slang Brazilian Portuguese, it is fairly common to see the use of the pronoun “you” or to refer to “people”, when a person describes his/her own attitudes and behaviours with the intention of generalizing it to others.

Table A 3 – Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (Case I – RQ3)

CONSTRUCT	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES... {Participants} “example as in the actual data”	WHEN LOW, CAUSES... {Participants} “example as in the actual data”
WORK MOTI-VATION	PRODUCTIVITY {P1.3, P1.4} — “he is with a <u>high productivity</u> ” (P1.3) COMMUNICATION {P1.4, P1.5} — “the person is there, <u>speaking</u> about possible solutions, <u>showing things to you</u> ” (P1.4) PROACTIVITY {P1.1, P1.2} — “You <u>go after</u> solutions to fix the things, you <u>don’t wait</u> ” (P1.1)	LAZINESS {P1.1} — “[the person] <u>doesn’t finish</u> the activities, or leaves them to the last day of the deadline... <u>procrastinating</u> ” (P1.1) ISOLATION {P1.2} — “The person is there, in a bad mood, <u>does not want to talk to anybody</u> , stays in a place, quiet” (P1.2)
JOB SATISFAC-TION	PUNCTUALITY {P1.1} — “Starts by <u>arriving early</u> ” (P1.1)	ABSENCE {P1.1, P1.2, P1.5} — “ <u>arrives late</u> ” (P1.1) TROUBLEMAKING {P1.1, P1.3, P1.5} — “ <u>complains a lot</u> , about everything. Everything is wrong, even the taste of the water” (P1.5)

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

Case II

Table A 4 - Behavioural descriptors for work motivation and job satisfaction (Case II – RQ1)

CONSTRUCT	POSITIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the actual data”	NEGATIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the actual data”	EMERGING BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR
WORK MOTI-VATION	FOCUSED {P2.3} — “shows that he is <u>focused</u> on his tasks” (P2.3)	CARELESS {P2.1, P2.2, P2.4} — “release their piece of work with some <u>malfunc-tions</u> , which impacts all the team” (P2.1)	FOCUS
	ENGAGED {P2.1, P2.2, P2.6} — “ <u>embraces the cause</u> , carries the load together” (P2.2)	UNINVOLVED {P2.2, P2.3, P2.4} — “sometimes, you can see that <u>lacks heart</u> , be-cause the code was not written in the best way, ” (P2.4)	ENGAGEMENT
	HARD-WORKING {P2.2, P2.3} — “Stays until <u>late hours at work</u> , on a day or another, to finish things” (P2.3)	INDIFFERENT {P2.3} — “the person is not able to finish the activities in the expected time, and just <u>don’t care</u> for that” (P2.3)	HARD WORK
JOB SATISFAC-TION	GOOD MOOD {P2.3} — “a person that is <u>not upset</u> ” (P2.3)	BAD MOOD {P2.4} — “sometimes, the <u>bad mood</u> , I don’t know, it is possible to see” (P2.4)	MOOD

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

Table A 5 - Work motivation and job satisfaction factors (Case II – RQ2)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR	WORKPLACE FACTOR {Participants} “examples as in the actual data”
WORK MOTI-VATION	FOCUS	CLEAR REQUIREMENTS {P2.1} — “our cliente actively participated at the definition of the working method of the team, which made <u>very clear the understanding</u> for both parts” (P2.1, in diary data, 15/02/2011) BALANCED WORKLOAD {P2.3} — “if someone in the team does not properly do their work, you must always <u>work more</u> , to assure quality in that project” (P2.3, in? Answer to Q7) QUIET ENVIRONMENT {P2.2, P2.3} — “it was a very complicated thing to do, but everyone <u>kept interrupting me</u> to ask ‘what should I do, now?’” (P2.3, in: answer to Q20 )
	ENGAGEMENT	TECHNICAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT {P2.3, P2.5, P2.6}

		<p>— “So, <u>to learn new things</u>, to make changes in the system, I think that this dynamics (...) has always attracted me.” (P2.5, in: answer to Q3)</p> <p><b>PROJECT VARIETY</b> {P2.3, P2.4, P2.6}</p> <p>— “at the end of the two years of the project, you would be allocated in <u>another project</u>. Other business rules, other things to learn, other challenges” (P2.3, in: answer to Q3)</p> <p><b>TEAM EXPERTISE</b> {P2.1}</p> <p>— “the <u>know how of people in the team</u> is good (...) In a way or another, you end up by <u>making profits of this expertise</u>” (P2.1, in: answer to Q22)</p> <p><b>KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE</b> {P2.5}</p> <p>— “the <u>information change</u> is very, very interesting. We can take large steps.” (P2.5, in: answer to Q22)</p>
	<b>HARDWORK</b>	<p><b>USEFUL PRODUCT</b> {P2.2, P2.3, P2.5, P2.6}</p> <p>— “you want to see the thing going public, <u>being used by actual clients</u>, see the feedback, and there was not much of it in there” (P2.5, in: answer to Q5)</p> <p><b>BRAINWORK</b> {P2.2, P2.3, P2.4, P2.5, P2.6}</p> <p>— “I don’t like when the <u>things get very mechanic</u>. (...) just clicking, I... I am very restless” (P2.4, in: answer to Q16)</p> <p><b>RESEARCH</b> {P2.5, P2.6}</p> <p>— “when an activity requires <u>research effort</u>” (P2.5, in: answer to Q12)</p> <p><b>COMMITMENT OF CO-WORKERS</b> {P2.1, P2.2, P2.3}</p> <p>— “what <u>lowers my motivation</u> is the <u>lack of commitment of other people in the team</u>” (P2.2, in: answer to Q16)</p>
<b>JOB SATISFAC-TION</b>	<b>MOOD</b>	<p><b>WORK SUCCESS</b> {P2.1, P2.2, P2.3, P2.4, P2.5, P2.6}</p> <p>— “when <u>everything goes right</u>, and I finish everything, everything that was expected to do in that day, making it on the right time and leave work at the right hour” (P2.2, in: answer to Q11)</p> <p><b>RECOGNITION</b> {P2.2}</p> <p>— “just after the release moment, because soon comes the compliment for that (...) then I <u>feel satisfied</u>” (P2.2, in: answer to Q12)</p>

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

Table A 6 – Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (Case II – RQ3)

CONSTRUCT	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES... {Participants} “example as in the actual data”	WHEN LOW, CAUSES... {Participants} “example as in the actual data”
<b>WORK MOTI-VATION</b>	<p><b>PARTICIPATION</b> {P2.6}</p> <p>— “His participation in the project, like, in helping other, <u>in asking questions</u>” (P2.6)</p> <p><b>HELP OTHERS</b> {P2.1}</p> <p>— “<u>tries to help</u> his colleagues” (P2.1)</p> <p><b>PROACTIVITY</b> {P2.4, P2.6}</p> <p>— “he is always looking for more things... when finishes some-thing, goes for the next thing” (P2.4)</p> <p><b>INTEGRATION</b> {P2.2, P2.4, P2.5, P2.6}</p> <p>— “I felt free to say ‘I don’t know how to do this’ or ‘I like to do that’. So, I felt the team very open in this aspect” (P2.6, in: answer to Q21)</p> <p><b>PRODUCTIVITY</b> {P2.1}</p> <p>— “carries the planned activities within the defined expecta-tions” (P2.1)</p>	<p><b>QUIET/RESERVED</b> {P2.4, P2.6}</p> <p>— “barely talks to anybody, for example, when leaving, just don’t talk” (P2.4)</p> <p><b>LAZINESS</b> {P2.1, P2.2, P2.3, P2.4}</p> <p>— “when the guys decide to stay after office hours, and com-municate everybody, some people just leave earlier” (P2.2)</p> <p><b>PASSIVE</b> {P2.4}</p> <p>— “You can see that the person kept postponing” (P2.4)</p>
<b>JOB SATISFAC-TION</b>	-	<p><b>LACK OF COMMITMENT</b> {P2.1}</p> <p>— “loses the commitment to the deadlines, and to the quality of what’s being done” (P2.1)</p>

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

### Case III

Table A 7 - Behavioural descriptors for work motivation and job satisfaction (Case III – RQ1)

CONSTRUCT	POSITIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the actual data”	NEGATIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the actual data”	EMERGING BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR
<b>WORK MOTI-VATION</b>	<p><b>FOCUSED</b> {P3.2, P3.7, P3.9}</p> <p>— “he is focused on what he is doing, he doesn’t get distracted” (P3.9)</p>	<p><b>DISTRACTED</b> {P3.5, P3.6, P3.8, P3.9, P3.10}</p> <p>— “he is distracted, like, not focused in the activity, keeps doing other things” (P3.9)</p>	<b>FOCUS</b>
	<p><b>CAREFUL</b> {P3.7}</p> <p>— “cares to do the best ways” (P3.7)</p>	<p><b>CARELESS</b> {P3.1, P3.2, P3.3, P3.5}</p> <p>— “doesn’t care with the final results, just make it work ” (P3.1)</p>	<b>CARE</b>
	<p><b>ENGAGED</b> {P3.2, P3.5, P3.7}</p> <p>— “He doesn’t count how many hours are left to</p>	<p><b>UNINVOLVED</b> {P3.1, P3.5, P3.6}</p> <p>— “people avoided the things that would compro-</p>	<b>ENGAGEMENT</b>

	leave work, he is just doing that, he's got a goal" (P3.2)	mise their time" (P3.5)	
JOB SATISFAC-TION	GOOD MOOD {P3.10} — "he is a smiling person, who (...) works in a natural way, without apparent stress" (P3.10)	BORED {P3.2, P3.7} — "he has no spirit" (P3.2)	MOOD

'P' – refers to participants. 'Q' – refers to interview script's questions (Appendix A)

Table A 8 - Work motivation and job satisfaction factors (Case III – RQ2)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR	WORKPLACE FACTOR {Participants} "examples as in the actual data"
WORK MOTI-VATION	FOCUS	CLEAR REQUIREMENTS {P3.4, P3.7, P3.9} — "what <u>demotivates me the most</u> are requirements that come out from nowhere and new projects that come out from nowhere, <u>without any reasonable specification</u> " (P3.9, in: answer to Q38) GOAL-DRIVEN RESPONSIBILITIES {P3.2} — "you know that <u>you have responsibilities and deadlines</u> , usually short deadlines, but the guys don't pressure" (P3.2, in: answer to Q36) ONE PROJECT AT A TIME {P3.4, P3.9} — "I stop working in a Project and then I start in other, and this other is completely different, <u>then I have to change all my thinking context</u> , change the way I think" (P3.9, in: answer to Q16)
	CARE	HELPING OTHERS {P3.7} — "The issue is that we deal with technology, and it is always changing and updating, and the fact that we are using it to a greater good, <u>to help the general population</u> " (P3.7, in: answer to Q2)
	ENGAGEMENT	DOMAIN VARIETY {P3.4, P3.6} — "when a project finishes and another starts, <u>everything is new</u> from there onwards, I mean, <u>none of the problems are very routine ones</u> " (P3.6, in: answer to Q3) INTELLECTUAL CHALLENGE {P3.3, P3.5, P3.6, P3.8, P3.9, P3.10} — "I <u>like challenges</u> , I like things that make people think and discuss about it, <u>it stimulates me</u> and makes me eager to solve the problem" (P3.3, in: answer to Q13) MOTIVATION OF CO-WORKERS {P3.5, P3.6} — "the <u>people here is very animated</u> , I think that it is cool and <u>it motivates me a lot</u> " (P3.5, in: answer to Q36) TECHNICAL CONFIDENCE {P3.1, P3.4, P3.6, P3.7, P3.9} — "Activities that I had already experienced at work, that I already knew the way to follow, or possible errors that may happen, already knowing more or less where I am and what to do" (P3.7, in: answer to Q11) CONTINUOUS LEARNING {P3.5, P3.6, P3.7, P3.8, P3.10} — "to learn with others, in a daily basis, that is what <u>stimulates me the most</u> " (P28, in: answer to Q13)
JOB SATISFAC-TION	MOOD	PERFORMANCE {P3.10, P3.2, P3.3, P3.4, P3.9} — "when I am able to make <u>several things in a day</u> , <u>that's very important</u> " (P3.3, in: answer to Q11) RECOGNITION {P3.2, P3.8, P3.9} — " <u>acknowledge</u> when you do <u>something well-done</u> " (P3.2, in: answer to Q40) CUSTOMER FEEDBACK {P3.4, P3.6} — "so, it is more like <u>having a sight of the people using the features</u> , thinking that this thing is new, or is interest-ing maybe" (P3.4, in: answer to Q13)

'P' – refers to participants. 'Q' – refers to interview script's questions (Appendix A)

Table A 9 - Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (Case III – RQ3)

CONSTRUCT	WHEN HIGH, CAUSES... {Participants} "example as in the actual data"	WHEN LOW, CAUSES... {Participants} "example as in the actual data"
WORK MOTI-VATION	INTERACTIVITY {P3.5, P3.10} — " <u>talk and work easy</u> " (P3.10) HELP OTHERS {P3.8} — "he is answering questions, <u>helping others</u> too" (P3.8) PROACTIVITY {P3.1, P3.2, P3.4, P3.5, P3.8} — "He is a pearson <u>looking for the work</u> " (P3.1) PRODUCTIVITY {P3.2} — "demonstrates through his <u>production time</u> " (P3.2)	LAZINESS {P3.2, P3.5, P3.10} — "he sees no reason to release things before the deadline, if something is expected to Friday, he <u>fools around at work</u> until Friday, and release it then" (P3.2) ISOLATION {P3.4, P3.5, P3.10} — "with <u>low interaction</u> with other people" (P3.4) PASSIVITY {P3.2} — "do what they do just for <u>an obligation</u> " (P3.2) LOW PRODUCTIVITY {P3.3} — "working slow, with <u>low productivity</u> " (P3.3)
JOB SATISFAC-TION	COMMITMENT {P3.6} — "showing some <u>commitment</u> with the team, with the dead-lines, and with the releases" (P3.6) CALM {P3.7, P3.9} — " <u>do not lose temper</u> when facing some challenges" (P3.7)	ABSENCE {P3.1} — " <u>arrives late</u> (...) does not want to be there" (P3.1)

'P' – refers to participants. 'Q' – refers to interview script's questions (Appendix A)



## Case IV

Table A 10 - Behavioural descriptors for work motivation and job satisfaction (Case IV – RQ1)

CONSTRUCT	POSITIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the actual data”	NEGATIVE ADJ. {Participants} “example of the adjective as in the actual data”	EMERGING BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR
WORK MOTIVATION	<b>FOCUSED</b> {P4.10} — “does not waste time with unimportant things (...) he is <u>focused</u> on that” (P4.10)	<b>UNFOCUSED</b> {P4.2, P4.3} — “always <u>deviates from what needs to be done</u> ” (P4.3)	FOCUS
	<b>CAREFUL</b> {P4.1, P4.4, P4.6, P4.7} — “used to be more <u>careful</u> than needed” (P4.1)	-	CARE
	<b>ENGAGED</b> {P4.2, P4.4, P4.5, P4.8, P4.9, P4.10} — “the person comes, and does what must be done, with <u>engagement</u> ” (P4.4)	<b>INDIFFERENT</b> {P4.6, P4.7} — “He finds <u>any other thing to do</u> , except to do his work activities” (P4.7)	ENGAGEMENT
	<b>HARD-WORKING</b> {P4.2, P4.9} — “sometimes, he stays a little <u>after the working hours</u> , because he <u>wants to finish something</u> ” (P4.2)	-	HARDWORK
JOB SATISFACTION	<b>EXCITED</b> {P4.1, P4.2, P4.9} — “get <u>excited</u> when talking about the work” (P4.9)	<b>BORED</b> {P4.1, P4.2, P4.3, P4.8, P4.9, P4.10} — “the person is not enthusiastic with those tasks” (P4.2)	EXCITEMENT
	<b>GOOD MOOD</b> {P4.1} — “talks always in a good mood” (P4.1)	<b>BAD MOOD</b> {P4.1, P4.7} — “does not say a good morning for his work friends, lowers his head” (P4.7)	MOOD

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

Table A 11 - Work motivation and job satisfaction factors (Case IV – RQ2)

CONSTRUCT	BEHAVIOURAL DESCRIPTOR	WORKPLACE FACTOR {Participants} “examples as in the actual data”
WORK MOTIVATION	FOCUS	<b>CLEAR PROCESSES</b> {P4.3} — “these <u>processes are very poorly defined</u> , we do not know who is supposed to do the things (...) Then we do not know how to act right in this messy environment” (P4.3, in: answer to Q38) <b>CLEAR CUSTOMER NEEDS</b> {P4.4, P4.7, P4.8} — “When you get in touch with the client, you are able to <u>perceive precisely what he wants</u> ” (P4.8, in: answer to Q14) <b>CLEAR GOALS</b> {P4.3} — “before accepting [a task / a goal] (...) I would <u>try to clarify why the things should be that way</u> ” (P4.3, in: answer to Q35) <b>FAIR WORK LOAD</b> {P4.2, P4.3} — “Priorities are not managed correctly, so it becomes a snowball of tasks that are not finished, problems that are not solved, then we face <u>stress that could be avoided</u> ” (P4.3, in: answer to Q28)
	CARE	<b>USEFUL PRODUCTS</b> {P4.1, P4.2, P4.5, P4.8} — “a thing that you are contributing to make someone else’s work easier. I think that it is what makes me happy, what <u>stimulates any person</u> that is doing the work. You are working for somebody, and you want it to be <u>useful to that person</u> .” (P4.8, in: answer to Q13) <b>AUTHORSHIP</b> {P4.1, P4.3, P4.6} — “to create a solution for a problem, if not 100%, at least 80% originated from your work, from own effort” (P4.1, in: answer to Q13)
	ENGAGEMENT	<b>LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES</b> {P4.2, P4.3, P4.4, P4.6, P4.8, P4.9, P4.10} — “what stimulates me is <u>always having something new</u> , however small, I talk, I learn, I discover because I heard someone else talking, I look for deeper information.” (P4.3, in: answer to Q6) <b>LEARNING ABOUT THE PRODUCT</b> {P4.5, P4.7} — “it is to discover <u>new things about the product</u> , so that in face of any problem or user question, I can figure out how to solve it quickly” (P4.5, in: answer to Q12) <b>ENGAGEMENT OF CO-WORKERS</b> {P4.7, P4.4, P4.6} — “As all teams, there is always someone that is demotivated a little more than needed, and he ends up <u>infecting the others with this low motivation</u> ” (P4.6, in: answer to Q28) <b>PROJECT VARIETY</b> {P4.1, P4.5} — “the business is too wide, and we have the opportunity to learn, slowly, more about it, in <u>different projects</u> , learning a bit of each part of the whole business, and that is motivating” (P4.4, in: answer to Q36) <b>MATURITY OF CO-WORKERS</b> {P4.2, P4.10} — “we do not have very <u>mature people</u> in some areas, with whom we could learn a lot” (P4.2, in: answer to Q7) <b>VARIETY OF WORK</b> {P4.1, P4.4, P4.5, P4.6, P4.7, P4.9}

		— “if you get a documentation task, and gets <u>always the same documentation task</u> (...) It is going to demotivate me, because <u>gets monotonous</u> ” (P4.5, in: answer to Q35)
	<b>HARDWORK</b>	<b>INTELLECTUAL CHALLENGE</b> {P4.1, P4.2, P4.4, P4.6, P4.7, P4.8, P4.9, P4.10} — “having a question, and then you have to <u>figure out what to do</u> to get to the solution” (P4.10, in: answer to Q13)- <b>SELF CONFIDENCE</b> {P4.1, P4.2, P4.4, P4.5, P4.8} — “it is very challenging. But, like, what is going to happen is that bug will come up, or problems, or conflicts, and I will take hours and hours and hours to figure out the solution. And, <u>probably, I will not find it.</u> ” (P4.2, in: answer to Q18)
<b>JOB SATISFAC-TION</b>	<b>EXCITEMENT</b>	<b>ACCOMPLISHMENT</b> {P4.1, P4.3, P4.4, P4.5, P4.8, P4.9, P4.10} — “take some activity that has, maybe, some challenge, something new, but which is possible to do. <u>If you finish it, that will be a nice day</u> ” (P4.4, in: answer to Q11) <b>PRACTICAL IMPACT</b> {P4.1, P4.5, P4.7, P4.10} — “You have spent, I think, a long time implementing several things, (...) and you do not see the thing work-ing, <u>nobody using it, that is terrible.</u> ” (P4.10, in: answer to Q39)
	<b>MOOD</b>	<b>RECOGNITION</b> {P4.5} — “when the <u>client starts to interact and provide positive feedback</u> about your work, that motivates too” (P4.5, in: answer to Q36)

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

Table A 12 - Outcomes of work motivation and job satisfaction (Case IV – RQ3)

CONSTRUCT	WHEN HIGH, IT CAUSES... {Participants} “example as in the actual data”	WHEN LOW, IT CAUSES... {Participants} “example as in the actual data”
<b>WORK MOTI-VATION</b>	<b>PROACTIVITY</b> {P4.6, P4.8, P4.10} — “Does not wait until you find she has got a problem. She <u>finds the problem</u> , and tells you that <u>she is going to solve that already</u> ” (P4.6) <b>INTERACTIVITY</b> {P4.2, P4.5, P4.8, P4.9} — “she is <u>interacting</u> with the people (...) she wants to partici-pate in the activities” (P4.5) <b>MUTUAL HELP</b> {P4.5} — “she is really <u>helping</u> , bringing doubts, raising questions to other people” (P4.5) <b>PRODUCTIVITY</b> {P4.4, P4.6, P4.7} — “usually <u>more productive</u> ” (P4.4)	<b>LAZINESS</b> {P4.2, P4.6, P4.8, P4.9} — “I think he <u>goes several times to the coffee room, leaves the desk frequently</u> ” (P4.9) <b>PASSIVITY</b> {P4.6, P4.8} — “ <u>lacks proactivity</u> ” (P4.6) <b>SOCIAL ISOLATION</b> {P4.5, P4.7, P4.9} — “ <u>do not interact</u> with the others” (P4.5) <b>HELPLESS</b> {P4.5} — “ <u>does not want to help</u> , does not like to help anybody” (P4.5) <b>LACK OF PRODUCTIVITY</b> {P4.2, P4.4} — “ <u>productivity decreases</u> a lot” (P4.4)
<b>JOB SATISFAC-TION</b>	<b>RESPONSIBILITY</b> {P4.3, P4.5} — “I think that they feel good with the received <u>responsibili-ties</u> ” (P4.3) <b>CALM</b> {P4.3} — “I think that they <u>do not hesitate under pressure</u> ” (P4.3)	<b>PESSIMISM</b> {P4.6} — “the person <u>finds barriers for everything</u> ” (P4.6) <b>ABSENTEEISM</b> {P4.5} — “he <u>does not meet the schedules</u> ” (P4.5) <b>IRRESPONSIBILITY</b> {P4.5, P4.8} — “he is <u>not able to achieve what was planned</u> ” (P4.5)

‘P’ – refers to participants. ‘Q’ – refers to interview script’s questions (Appendix A)

# Motivation and Satisfaction of Software Engineers

César França, Fabio Q. B. da Silva, Helen Sharp

## APPENDIX B – LIST OF THE SLR PRIMARY STUDIES

- [PS001] LeDuc, A.L.J., "Motivation of programmers", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 1980.
- [PS002] Tanniru, M.R.; Taylor, S. M., "Causes of turnover among data processing professionals – some preliminary finding", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1981.
- [PS003] Bartol, K.M.; Martin, D. C. , "Managing Information Systems Personnel: A Review of the Literature and Managerial Implications", Management Information Systems Quarterly 1982.
- [PS004] Goldstein, D.K.; Rockart, J. F., "An Examination of Work-related Correlates of Job Satisfaction in Programmer/Analysts", Management Information Systems Quarterly 1984.
- [PS005] Cheney, P.H., "Effects of Individual Characteristics, Organizational Factors and Task Characteristics on Computer Programmer Productivity and Job Satisfaction", Information and Management 1984.
- [PS006] Toledo, R.A. M.; Unger, E. A., "Another look at motivating data processing professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1985.
- [PS007] Dittrich, J.E.; Couger, J.D.; Zawacki, R.A. , "Perceptions of equity, job satisfaction, and intention to quit among data processing personnel", Information and Management 1985.
- [PS008] Honda, K., "Research on work environment for software productivity improvement", In: the Proceedings of Annual IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference, 1985.
- [PS009] Ferrat, T. W.; Short, L. E., "Are information systems people different: an investigation of motivational difference", Management Information Systems Quarterly 1986.
- [PS010] Baroudi, J.J.; Ginzberg, M. J., "Impact of the technological environment on programmer/analyst job outcomes", Communication of the ACM 1986.
- [PS011] Couger, J.D.; McIntyre, S., "Motivating norms for artificial intelligence personnel", In: the Proceedings of Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 1987.
- [PS012] Couger, J.D.; McIntyre, S., "Motivation Norms of Knowledge Engineers compared to those of Software Engineers", Journal of Management Information Systems 1987.
- [PS013] Goldstein, D.K., "An updated measure of supervisor-rated job performance for programmer/analysis", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1988.
- [PS014] Garden, A. M., "Behavioural and organisational factors involved in the turnover of high tech professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1988.
- [PS015] Couger, J.D.; Adelsberger, H., "Environments: Austria compared to the United States", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1988.
- [PS016] Garden, A. M., "Maintaining the spirit of excitement in growing companies", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1988.
- [PS017] Rubin, H.I.; Hernandez, E. F., "Motivations and behaviors of software professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1988.
- [PS018] Couger, J.D., "Motivators vs. demotivators in the IS environment", Journal of Systems Management 1988.
- [PS019] Couger, J.D.; Borovits, I.; Zviran, M., "Comparison of motivating environments for programmer/analysts and programmers in the US, Israel and Singapore", In: the Proceedings of Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 1989.
- [PS020] Couger, J.D.; Adelsberger, H.; Borovits, I.; Zviran, M.; Motiwalla, J., "Commonalities in motivating environments for programmer/analysts in Austria, Israel, Singapore, and the U.S.A", Information and Management 1990.
- [PS021] Checchio, R.A., "Creating a motivating environment in software development. Experience with the Management of Software Projects", In: the Proceedings of Proceedings of the Third IFAC/IFIP Workshop. Pergamon. 1990, 1990: p. 81-6, 1990.
- [PS022] Im, J.H.; Hartman, S., "Rethinking the issue of whether IS people are different from non-IS people", Management Information Systems Quarterly 1990.
- [PS023] Fujigaki, Y., "Stress analysis of software engineers for effective management", In: the Proceedings of Proceed-

- ings of the Third International Symposium. North-Holland. 1990, 1990: p. 255-8., 1990.
- [PS024] Myers, M.E., "Motivation and performance in the information systems field: a survey of related studies", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1991.
- [PS025] Moore, J.E., "Personality characteristics of information systems professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1991.
- [PS026] Crook, C.W.; Crepeau, R. G.; McMurtrey, M. E., "Utilization of the career anchor/career orientation constructs for management of I/S professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1991.
- [PS027] Crepeau, R.G.; Crook, C.W.; Goslar, M. D.; McMurtrey, M. E., "Career Anchors of Information Systems Personnel", Journal of Management Information Systems1992.
- [PS028] Couger, J.D., "Comparison of motivation norms for programmer/ analysts in the Pacific Rim and the U.S.", International Journal of Information Systems1992.
- [PS029] Kym, H.; Park, W. W., "Effect of cultural fit/misfit on the productivity and turnover of is personnel", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1992.
- [PS030] Rasch, R.H.; Tosi, H. L., "Factors affecting software developers' performance: an integrated approach", Management Information Systems Quarterly1992.
- [PS031] Smits, S.J.; McLean, E.R.; Tanner, J.R., "Managing high achieving information systems professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1992.
- [PS032] Burn, J.M.; Couger, J.D.; Ma,L. C. K.; Tompkins, H., "Motivating IT professionals, The Hong Kong challenge", Information and Management1992.
- [PS033] Zawacki, R.A. , "Motivating the IS people of the future", Information systems management1992.
- [PS034] Klenke, K.; Kievit, K. A., "Predictors of leadership style, organizational commitment and turnover of information systems professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1992.
- [PS035] Miller, W.C.; Couger, J.D.; Higgins, L. F., "Comparing innovation styles profile of IS personnel to other occupations", In: the Proceedings of Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 1993.
- [PS036] Jordan, E.; Whiteley, A. M., "HRM practices in information technology management Proceedings of computer personnel research conference", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1994.
- [PS037] Burn, J.M.; Tye,E. M. W.; Ma,L. C. K.; Poon, R. S. K., "Job expectations of IS professionals in Hong Kong", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1994.
- [PS038] Igbaria, M.; Meredith, G.; Smith, D. C., "Career orientations of information systems employees in South Africa", The Journal of Strategic Information Systems1995.
- [PS039] Couger, J.D.; Ishikawa, A., "Comparing motivation of Japanese computer personnel versus these of the United States. System Sciences", In: the Proceedings of Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 1995.
- [PS040] Turley, R.T.; Bieman, J. M., "Competencies of exceptional and nonex- ceptional software engineers", Journal of Systems and Software1995.
- [PS041] Burn, J.M.; Ma,L. C. K.; Tye,E. M. W., "Managing IT professionals in a global environment", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1995.
- [PS042] Santana, M.; Robey, D., "Perceptions of control during systems development: effects on job satisfaction of systems professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1995.
- [PS043] Thomas, S.A.; Hurley, S. F.; Barnes, D. J., "Looking for the human factors in software quality management", In: the Proceedings of SEEP, 1996.
- [PS044] McLean, E.R.; Smits, S.J.; Tanner, J.R., "The importance of salary on job and career attitudes of information systems professionals", Information and Management1996.
- [PS045] Smits, S.J.; McLean, E.R.; Tanner, J.R., "A longitudinal study of I/S careers: synthesis, conclusion, and recommendations", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1997.
- [PS046] Frangos, S.A., "Motivated humans for reliable software products", Microprocessors and Microsystems1997.
- [PS047] Lending, D.; Chervany, N. L., "The changing systems development job: a job characteristics approach", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1997.
- [PS048] Khalil, O. E. M.; Zawacki, R.A. ; Zawacki, P.A. ; Selim, A., "What motivates Egyptian IS managers and personnel: Some preliminary results", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on

Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1997.

- [PS049] Richens, E., "HR strategies for IS professionals in the 21st century", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1998.
- [PS050] Agarwal, R.; Ferrat, T. W., "Recruiting, retaining, and developing IT professionals: an empirically derived taxonomy of human resource practices", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1998.
- [PS051] Wynekoop, J.L.; Walz, D. B., "Revisiting the perennial Question: Are IS People Different", The Database for Advances in Information Systems1998.
- [PS052] Ridings, C.M.; Eder, L. B., "An Analysis of IS technical career paths and job satisfaction", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 1999.
- [PS053] Linberg, K.R., "Software developer perceptions about software project failure: a case study", Journal of Systems and Software1999.
- [PS054] Agarwal, R.; Ferrat, T. W., "Retention and the career motives of IT professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2000.
- [PS055] Gambill, S.E.; Clark, W. J.; Wikes, R. B., "Toward a holistic model of task design for IS professionals", Information and Management, Volume 37 Issue 5, Aug.2000.
- [PS056] Mak, B.L. ; Sockel, H., "A confirmatory factor analysis of IS employee motivation and retention", Information and Management2001.
- [PS057] Kandeel, H.; Wahba, K., "Competency models for human resource development: case of Egyptian software industry", In: the Proceedings of Managing Information Technology in a Global Environment., 2001.
- [PS058] Agarwal, R.; Ferrat, T. W., "Crafting an HR strategy to meet the need for IT workers", Communication of the ACM2001.
- [PS059] Niederman, F.; Sumner, M. R., "Job turnover among MIS professionals: an exploratory study of employee turnover", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2001.
- [PS060] Nelson, A.C.; LeRouge, C., "Self esteem: moderator between role stress fit and satisfaction and commitment?", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2001.
- [PS061] Lee, P.C. B., "Career plateau and professional plateau: impact on work outcomes of information technology professionals.", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2002.
- [PS062] Agarwal, R.; Ferrat, T. W., "Enduring practices for managing IT professionals", Communication of the ACM2002.
- [PS063] Agarwal, R.; De, P.; Ferrat, T. W., "Explaining an IT professional's preferred employment duration: Empirical tests of a causal model of antecedents", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2002.
- [PS064] Andersen, E.S., "Never the twain shall meet: exploring the differences between Japanese and Norwegian IS professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2002.
- [PS065] Thatcher, J. B.; Liu, Y.; Stepina, L. P., "The role of the work itself: An empirical examination of intrinsic motivation's influence on IT workers attitudes and intentions", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2002.
- [PS066] Lee, P.C. B., "The social context of turnover among information technology professional", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2002.
- [PS067] Agarwal, R.; Ferrat, T. W., "Toward understanding the relationship between IT human resource management systems and retention: An empirical analysis based on multiple theoretical and measurement approaches", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGCPR), 2002.
- [PS068] Garza, A.I.; Lunce, S. E.; Maniam, B. , "Career anchors of Hispanic information systems professionals", In: the Proceedings of Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, 2003.
- [PS069] Hsu, M.K.; Chen, H. G.; Jiang, J. J.; Klein, G., "Career satisfaction for managerial and technical anchored IS personnel in later career stages", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2003.
- [PS070] Niederman, F.; Sumner, M. R., "Decision paths affecting turnover among information technology professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2003.
- [PS071] Ferrat, T. W.; Enns, H. G.; Prasad, J., "Instrument Validation for Investigating a Model of Employment Arrangement Fit for IT Professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2003.

- [PS072] Carayon, P.; Hoonaker, P.; Marchand, S.; Schwarz, J., "Job characteristics and quality of working life in the IT workforce: the role of gender," In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2003.
- [PS073] Peters, L., "Managing the Performance of Software Engineering Professionals", In: the Proceedings of Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training, 2003.
- [PS074] Hertel, G.; Nieder, S.; Herrmann, S., "Motivation of software developers in Open Source projects: an Internet-based survey of contributors to the Linux kernel", Research Policy2003.
- [PS075] Tanner, F.R., "On motivating engineers.", In: the Proceedings of International Engineering Management Conference., 2003.
- [PS076] Hsu, M.K.; Jiang, J. J.; Klein, G.; Tang, Z., "Perceived career incentives and intent to leave", Information and Management2003.
- [PS077] Capretz, L. F., "Personality types in software engineering," International Journal of Human Computer Studies2003.
- [PS078] Almstrum, V.L., "What is the attraction to computing?", Communication of the ACM2003.
- [PS079] Mannaro, K.; Melis, M.; Marchesi, M., "Empirical Analysis on the Satisfaction of IT Employees Comparing XP Practices with Other Software Development Methodologies", In: the Proceedings of Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Extreme Programming and Agile Processes in Software Engineering (XP 2005), 2004.
- [PS080] Ferrat, T. W.; Enns, H. G.; Prasad, J., "Employment arrangement fit for IT professionals: An examination of the importance of fit components," In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2004.
- [PS081] Roberts, J.; Hann, I. H.; Slaughter, S., "Understanding the motivations, participation, and performance of Open Source Software developers: a longitudinal study of the Apache projects.", Carnegie Mellon University Working Paper2004.
- [PS082] Sumner, M. R.; Yager, S.; Franke, D., "Career orientation and organizational commitment of IT personnel", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2005.
- [PS083] Darcy, D.P.; Ma, M. J., "Exploring Individual Characteristics and Programming Performance: Implications for Programmer Selection", In: the Proceedings of Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2005.
- [PS084] Morales, A.W., "Salary survey 2005", Software Development2005.
- [PS085] Procaccino, J. D.; Verner, J. M.; Shelfer, K. M.; Gefen, D., "What Do Software Practitioners Really Think About Project Success: An Exploratory Study.", Journal of Systems and Software2005.
- [PS086] Reid, M. F.; Riemenschneider, C. K.; Allen, M. W.; Armstrong, J. A., "Affective commitment in the public sector: the case of IT employees", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2006.
- [PS087] Ramachandran, S.; Rao, S. V., "An effort towards identifying occupational culture among information systems professionals", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2006.
- [PS088] Smith, D. C.; Speight, H. L., "Antecedents of turnover intention and actual turnover among information systems personnel in South Africa", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2006.
- [PS089] Enns, H. G.; Ferrat, T. W.; Prasad, J., "Beyond Stereotypes of IT Professionals: Implications for IT HR Practices", Communication of the ACM2006.
- [PS090] Li, Y.; Tan, C. H.; Teo, H. H.; Mattar, A. T., "Motivating open source software developers: influence of transformational and transactional leaderships", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2006.
- [PS091] Baddoo, N.; Hall, T.; Jagielska, D., "Software developer motivation in a high maturity company: a case study", Software Process: Improvement and Practice 112006.
- [PS092] Ituma, A., "The internal career: an explorative study of the career anchors of information technology workers", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2006.
- [PS093] Melnik, G.; Maurer, F., "Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction in Agile and Non-agile Software Development Teams", In: the Proceedings of Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Extreme Programming and Agile Processes in Software Engineering (XP 2006), 2006.
- [PS094] Mahaney, R. C.; Lederer, A. L., "The effect of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for developers on information systems project success", Project Management Journal2006.
- [PS095] Wu, C. G.; Gerlach, J. H.; Young, C. E., "An empirical analysis of open source software developers' motivations and continuance intentions", Information and Management2007.
- [PS096] Lounsbury, J. W.; Moffitt, L.; Gibson, L. W.; Drost, A. W.; Stevens, M., "An investigation of personality traits in relation to job and career satisfaction of information technology professionals", Journal of Information Tech-

nology2007.

- [PS097] Chui, J.; Tong, C.; Mula, M. J., "Assessing the extent to which career development impacts employee commitment: a case study of the ICT industry in Hong Kong", In: the Proceedings of Australasian Conference on Information Systems, 2007.
- [PS098] Sumner, M. R.; Franke, D., "Career Orientation and the Global IT Workforce: Research in Progress", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2007.
- [PS099] Ohly, S.; Fritz, C., "Challenging the status quo: What motivates proactive behaviour?", Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology2007.
- [PS100] Jørgensen, N., "Developer autonomy in the FreeBSD open source project", Journal of Management and Governance2007.
- [PS101] Beecham, S.; Sharp, H.; Baddoo, N.; Hall, T.; Robinson, H., "Does the XP environment meet the motivational needs of the software developer? An empirical study", In: the Proceedings of AGILE Conference, 2007.
- [PS102] Sharp, H.; Hall, T.; Baddoo, N.; Beecham, S., "Exploring motivational differences between software developers and project managers", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group on Software Engineering provides, 2007.
- [PS103] Mahatanankoon, P., "Exploring the impact of essential IT skills on career satisfaction and organisational commitment of information systems professionals", Int. J. Information Systems and Change Management2007.
- [PS104] Bitzer, J.; Schrettl, W.; Schroeder, P. J. H., "Intrinsic motivation in open source software development", Journal of Comparative Economics2007.
- [PS105] Kim, S.; Wright, B. E., "IT Employee Work Exhaustion: Toward an Integrated Model of Antecedents and Consequences", Review of Public Personnel Administration2007.
- [PS106] Tessem, B.; Maurer, F., "Job satisfaction and motivation in a large agile team", In: the Proceedings of Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Extreme Programming and Agile Processes in Software Engineering (XP 2007), 2007.
- [PS107] Hertel, G., "Motivating job design as a factor in open source governance", Journal of Management and Governance2007.
- [PS108] Prasad, J.; Enns, H. G.; Ferrat, T. W., "One size does not fit all: Managing IT employees' employment arrangements", Human Resource Management2007.
- [PS109] Bahl, K. T.; Gulati, N., "Pay satisfaction of software professionals in India", Vikalpa2007.
- [PS110] Tominaga, M.; Asakura, T.; Akiyama, T., "The effect of micro and macro stressors in the work environment on computer professionals' subjective health status and productive behavior in Japan", Industrial Health2007.
- [PS111] Pereira, J.; Cerpa, N. ; Verner, J. M.; Rivas, M.; Procaccino, J. D., "What do software practitioners really think about project success: A cross-cultural comparison", Journal of Systems and Software2007.
- [PS112] Bhatti, M. W.; Ahsan, A.; Sajid, A., "A framework to identify the 'Motivational Factors' of employees: a case study of Pakistan IT industry", Journal WSEAS Transactions on Computers 2008.
- [PS113] David, P. A.; Shapiro, J. S., "Community-based production of open-source software: What do we know about the developers who participate?", Information Economics and Policy2008.
- [PS114] Oreg, S.; Nov, O., "Exploring motivations for contributing to open source initiatives: The roles of contribution context and personal values", Computers in Human Behavior2008.
- [PS115] Subramanyam, R.; Xia, M., "Free/Libre Open Source Software development in developing and developed countries: A conceptual framework with an exploratory study", Decision Support Systems2008.
- [PS116] Chen, L. H., "Job satisfaction among information system (IS) personnel", Computers in Human Behavior2008.
- [PS117] Ke, W.; Zhang, P., "Motivations for participating in open source software communities: Roles of psychological needs and altruism", In: the Proceedings of PACIS, 2008.
- [PS118] Hamel, M. P.; Schweik, C. M., "Open source collaboration: Two cases in the U.S. public sector", First Monday2008.
- [PS119] von Krogh, G.; Haefliger, S.; Spaeth, S.; Wallin, M., "Open Source Software: What we know (and do not know) about motives to contribute", DIME Working Papers on INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS2008.
- [PS120] Korunka, C.; Hoonaker, P.; Carayon, P., "Quality of working life and turnover intention in information technology work", Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing2008.
- [PS121] Lacity, M. C.; Iyer, V. V., "Turnover intentions of Indian IS professionals", Information Systems Frontiers2008.
- [PS122] Franca, A.C.C.; da Silva, F.Q.B., "An empirical study on software engineers motivational factors", In: the Proceedings of Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, 2009.
- [PS123] Sharp, H.; Hall, T., "An initial investigation of software practitioners' motivation", In: the Proceedings of International Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering, 2009.
- [PS124] Potter, L. E.; von Hellens, L. A.; Nielsen, S. H., "Childhood interest in IT and the choice of IT as a career: the experiences of a group of IT ", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2009.
- [PS125] Mgaya, K. V. ; Uzoka, F. M. E. ; Kitindi, E. G. ; Shemi, A. P., "Examining Career Orientations of Information Sys-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

tems Personnel in an Emerging Economy Context", In: the Proceedings of ACM Annual Conference of the Special Interest Group Management Information Systems and Computer Personnel Research (ACM SIGMIS CPR), 2009.

[PS126] Calisir, F.; Gumussoy, C. A.; Iskin, I., "Factors affecting intention to quit among IT professionals", In: the Proceedings of The IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management , 2009.

[PS127] Acuña, S. T.; Gómez, M.; Juristo, N., "How do personality, team processes and task characteristics relate to job satisfaction and software quality?", Information and Software Technology2009.

[PS128] Laumer, S., "Non-Monetary Solutions for Retaining the IT Workforce", In: the Proceedings of American Conference on Information Systems, 2009.

[PS129] Song, Y.; Wang, M., "Research on individual motivation model of software engineering", Journal of Communication and Computer2009.

[PS130] Tseng, C. Y.; Wallace, M., "Retention of software employees in the IT industry in Taiwan", In: the Proceedings of Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management, 2009.

[PS131] Wang, Y., "What motivate software engineers to refactor source code? Evidences from professional developers", In: the Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance, 2009.

[PS132] Lee, K.; Joshi, K.; Bae, M., "An investigation of the influence of the is context on the determinants of turnover intentions in Korea", Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce2010.

[PS133] Ghapanchi, A. H.; Aurum, A., "Antecedents to IT personnel's intentions to leave: A systematic literature review", Journal of Systems and Software2010.

[PS134] Sach, R.; Sharp, H.; Petre, M., "Continued involvement in software development: motivational factors", In: the Proceedings of Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, 2010.

[PS135] Hannay, Jo E.; Arisholm, E.; Engvik, H.; Sjoberg, Dag I.K., "Effects of personality on pair programming", Transactions on Software Engineerings2010.

[PS136] Hilkert, D.; Benlian, A.; Hess, T., "Motivational Drivers to Develop Apps for Social Software-Platforms: The Example of Facebook", In: the Proceedings of American Conference on Information Systems, 2010.

[PS137] Wang, Y.; Zhang, M., "Penalty policies in professional software development practice: A multi-method field study", In: the Proceedings of International Conference on Software Engineering, 2010.

[PS138] Kumlander, D., "Semi- and Fully Self-Organised Teams ", Advanced Techniques in Computing Sciences and Software Engineering2010.

[PS139] Shah, H.; Harrold, M. J., "Studying human and social aspects of testing in a service-based software company: Case study", In: the Proceedings of International Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering, 2010.

[PS140] Benbya, H.; Belbaly, N., "Understanding Developers' Motives in Open Source Projects: A Multi-Theoretical Framework", Communications of the Association for Information Systems2010.