## Likert scale results

- Table C.1 and Table C.2 contain the raw data from the Likert items survey.
- Figure C.1 and Figure C.2 visualize the data as Likert items barcharts.

	Nr	Statement (CodeID)	Strongly	Dis-	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
_			agree						
	Q1.1	The usability of my API. (UN-2)	1 (2.2%)		0 (0%)	2 (4.3%)	15 (32.6%)	28 (60.9%)	46 (100%)
	Q1.2	Which API methods are called. (UN-2)	1 (2.2%)		5 (10.9%)	2 (4.3%)	19 (41.3%)	19 (41.3%)	46 (100%)
	Q1.3	How the library is being used to asses the	0 (0%)		3 (6.7%)	7 (15.6%)	24 (53.3%)	11 (24.4%)	45 (100%)
		impact on changes. (UN-2)							
	Q1.4	Unused methods and functionalities.	1 (2.2%)		3 (6.5%)	14 (30.4%)	16 (34.8%)	12 (26.1%)	46 (100%)
		(UN-2)							
	Q1.5	How often a method gets called. (UN-4)	1 (2.2%)		9 (19.6%)	7 (15.2%)	19 (41.3%)	10 (21.7%)	46 (100%)
	Q1.6	API failure statistics. (UN-4)	3 (6.8%)		6 (13.6%)	8 (18.2%)	17 (38.6%)	10 (22.7%)	44 (100%)
	Q1.7	What parameters the methods pass. (UN-	2 (4.4%)		8 (17.8%)	11 (24.4%)	17 (37.8%)	7 (15.6%)	45 (100%)
		4)							
	Q1.8	Highly often used methods are better	1 (2.3%)		9 (20.5%)	10 (22.7%)	13 (29.5%)	11 (25%)	44 (100%)
		maintained by me. (UN-2 / UM-3)							
	Q1.9	The order in which the API methos are	2 (4.3%)		16 (34.8%)	14 (30.4%)	11 (23.9%)	3 (6.5%)	46 (100%)
		called. (UN-2)							
	Q1.10	If users follow the coding conventions I	1 (3.3%)		8 (26.7%)	10 (33.3%)	8 (26.7%)	3 (10%)	30 (100%)
		set. (UN-5)							
	Q1.11	Know what people build with my frame-	0(0%)		0 (0%)	5 (10.9%)	26 (56.5%)	15 (32.6%)	46 (100%)
		work. (UN-1)							
	Q1.12	Know whether people migrate to the lat-	1 (2.2%)		1 (2.2%)	13 (28.3%)	17 (37%)	14 (30.4%)	46 (100%)
		est version of my library. (UN-1)						10 (01 50)	
	Q1.13	Know who tracks my project. (UN-1)	2 (4.3%)		5 (10.9%)	7 (15.2%)	22 (47.8%)	10 (21.7%)	46 (100%)
	Q1.14	Know the number of downloads. (UN-1)	1 (2.2%)		5 (10.9%)	10 (21.7%)	16 (34.8%)	14 (30.4%)	46 (100%)
	Q1.15	Know all my downstream projects. (UN-	4 (8.9%)		8 (17.8%)	16 (35.6%)	12 (26.7%)	5 (11.1%)	45 (100%)
	01.16		0 (00)		2 (1.20)	10 (01 70)	00 (47 0(1)	10 (06 10)	16 (1000)
	Q1.16	Know if many people like my code. (UN-	0 (0%)		2 (4.3%)	10 (21.7%)	22 (47.8%)	12 (26.1%)	46 (100%)
	00.1	3)	0 (00)		1 (2.20)	1 (0 50)	20 (65 20)	11 (22.00)	16 (1000)
	Q2.1	I want to provide help to clients. (UM-2)	0 (0%)		1 (2.2%)	4 (8.7%)	30 (65.2%)	11 (23.9%)	46 (100%)
	Q2.2	I want to notify my clients about code	0(0%)		0(0%)	8 (17.8%)	27 (60%)	10 (22.2%)	45 (100%)
	02.2	changes and arising impacts. (UM-2)	0 (00)		4 (0.10)	0 (20 50)	01 (47 70)	10 (22 70)	44 (1000)
	Q2.3	I follow my own vision of the project.	0(0%)		4 (9.1%)	9 (20.5%)	21 (47.7%)	10 (22.7%)	44 (100%)
	02.4	(UM-3/UM-1)	1 (2.20)		2 (( 501)	(10.40)	14 (45 001)	0 (05 00)	21 (1000)
	Q2.4	It keeps me motivated if a lot of people	1 (3.2%)		2 (0.5%)	6 (19.4%)	14 (45.2%)	8 (25.8%)	31 (100%)
	02.5	It halms the self acteum if a lot of meanle	2 (100)		1 (2.207)	11 (26 70)	11 (26 701)	4 (12.207)	20 (1000)
	Q2.3	like my code (UM 1)	5 (10%)		1 (3.5%)	11 (50.7%)	11 (50.7%)	4 (15.5%)	50 (100%)
	02.1	Leallow Moiling lists (UD 1)	5 (11 107)		0 (007)	6 (12.201)	17 (27.907)	17 (27.907)	45 (10007)
	Q5.1 Q2.2	I follow Maining lists. (UP-1)	3(11.1%)		0(0%)	6(13.5%)	17 (57.8%)	5 (11 107)	45 (100%)
	Q3.2	Luce Web enclution (c. c. Coogle Anglet	20 (44.4%)		3(11.1%)	0(15.5%)	9(20%)	3(11.1%) 2(6.9%)	43 (100%)
	Q3.5	instructure (e.g. Google Allaryt-	24 (34.3%)		4 (7.1%)	7 (15.9%)	0(13.0%)	5 (0.070)	44 (100%)
	03.4	Luse BSS Feed Notifications (UP 2)	20 (67 10-)		3 (7%)	8 (18.6%)	1 (2.3%)	2(4.7%)	43 (100%)
	03.5	I track the clones of my framework (UP-3)	∠) (07.4%) 6 (13%)		13 (28 30%)	11 (23.0%)	1(2.5%) 11(23.0%)	$\frac{2}{(10.9\%)}$	46 (100%)
	Q3.3	2)	0(15%)		15 (20.5%)	11 (23.9%)	11 (23.970)	5 (10.270)	40 (100%)

Table C.1: Upstream answers from Likert scale survey.

Nr	Statement (CodeID)	Strongly	Dis-	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
	Statement (Codenb)	agree	1013	Disagree	rtenner	Agiee	Subligity Agree	Total
Q4.1	Whether the project's code works. (DN- 5)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17 (24.3%)	53 (75.7%)	70 (100%)
Q4.2	How intensively the project is maintained. (DN-2)	0 (0%)		1 (1.4%)	5 (7.1%)	27 (38.6%)	37 (52.9%)	70 (100%)
Q4.3	Pros and cons of related frameworks/li- braries. (DN-8)	0 (0%)		1 (1.4%)	10 (14.5%)	41 (59.4%)	17 (24.6%)	69 (100%)
Q4.4	How responsive the support team is. (DN-2)	2 (2.9%)		5 (7.1%)	19 (27.1%)	34 (48.6%)	10 (14.3%)	70 (100%)
Q4.5	The software license. (DN-4)	2 (2.9%)		9 (13%)	10 (14.5%)	25 (36.2%)	23 (33.3%)	69 (100%)
Q4.6	The popularity of the project. (DN-2)	1 (1.4%)		6 (8.6%)	22 (31.4%)	31 (44.3%)	10 (14.3%)	70 (100%)
Q4.7	Who are the upstream developers. (DN-2)	7 (9.9%)		9 (12.7%)	32 (45.1%)	20 (28.2%)	3 (4.2%)	71 (100%)
Q4.8	Whether it takes more than an hour to get started. (DN-5)	4 (5.6%)		18 (25.4%)	20 (28.2%)	26 (36.6%)	3 (4.2%)	71 (100%)
Q4.9	Code examples help to learn a project's desgin. (DN-7)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	2 (2.9%)	38 (55.9%)	28 (41.2%)	68 (100%)
Q4.10	Up-to-date API and design documenta- tion. (DN-3)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	3 (4.4%)	40 (58.8%)	25 (36.8%)	68 (100%)
Q4.11	Details about which methods and classes have changed. (DN-1)	0 (0%)		1 (1.5%)	15 (22.4%)	35 (52.2%)	16 (23.9%)	67 (100%)
Q4.12	I want to know what the changes have an impact on before I update to the latest ver- sion. (DN-6)	1 (1.4%)		2 (2.9%)	12 (17.1%)	41 (58.6%)	14 (20%)	70 (100%)
Q4.13	I only want to get notified on code changes when my code is affected. (DN- 1)	5 (7.4%)		10 (14.7%)	31 (45.6%)	17 (25%)	5 (7.4%)	68 (100%)
Q5.1	I avoid code adaptation if the estimated time is excessive, (DM-5)	0 (0%)		7 (10.4%)	15 (22.4%)	32 (47.8%)	13 (19.4%)	67 (100%)
Q5.2	It is painful to track dependencies among packages. (DM-1)	1 (1.4%)		13 (18.6%)	16 (22.9%)	30 (42.9%)	10 (14.3%)	70 (100%)
Q5.3	I stay with the running version as long as possible. (DM-5)	4 (5.9%)		22 (32.4%)	16 (23.5%)	15 (22.1%)	11 (16.2%)	68 (100%)
Q5.4	I am curious if code changes are made by someone I trust. (DM-2)	12 (17.4%)		11 (15.9%)	27 (39.1%)	12 (17.4%)	7 (10.1%)	69 (100%)
Q5.5	I use only a widely used version of a li- brary. (DM-3)	2 (2.9%)		11 (15.9%)	16 (23.2%)	29 (42%)	11 (15.9%)	69 (100%)
Q6.1	Searching for blog posts and tutorials. (DP-2)	0 (0%)		3 (4.5%)	5 (7.5%)	27 (40.3%)	32 (47.8%)	67 (100%)
Q6.2	Building regularly to ensure things still work. (DP-3)	0 (0%)		5 (7.5%)	14 (20.9%)	26 (38.8%)	22 (32.8%)	67 (100%)
Q6.3	Subscribing to mailing lists to keep up-to- date. (DP-1)	2 (2.9%)		6 (8.8%)	11 (16.2%)	34 (50%)	15 (22.1%)	68 (100%)
Q6.4	Monitoring commits and activities of a project repository. (DP-1)	5 (7.4%)		9 (13.2%)	26 (38.2%)	21 (30.9%)	7 (10.3%)	68 (100%)
Q6.5	Tracking bug reports. (DP-2)	1 (2.2%)		3 (6.7%)	10 (22.2%)	12 (26.7%)	19 (42.2%)	45 (100%)
Q6.6	Using unit tests to understand how to use an upstream project. (DP-4)	11 (25%)		3 (6.8%)	5 (11.4%)	11 (25%)	14 (31.8%)	44 (100%)
Q6.7	I keep up to date with my upstream projects as soon as new changes are re- leased. (DP-3)	0 (0%)		6 (13.3%)	13 (28.9%)	15 (33.3%)	11 (24.4%)	45 (100%)

Table C.2: Downstream answers from Likert scale survey.

## APPENDIX C. LIKERT SCALE RESULTS



Figure C.1: Plotted Likert scale upstream answers.

## APPENDIX C. LIKERT SCALE RESULTS



Figure C.2: Plotted Likert scale downstream answers.