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ABSTRACT
Continuous Integration (CI) services, which can automatically build, test, and deploy software projects, are an invaluable asset in distributed teams, increasing productivity and helping to maintain code quality. Prior work has shown that CI pipelines can be sophisticated, and choosing and configuring a CI system involves tradeoffs. As CI technology matures, new CI tool offerings arise to meet the distinct wants and needs of software teams, as they negotiate a path through these tradeoffs, depending on their context. In this paper, we begin to uncover these nuances, and tell the story of open-source projects falling out of love with Travis, the earliest and most popular cloud-based CI system. Using logistic regression, we quantify the effects that open-source community factors and project technical factors have on the rate of Travis abandonment. We find that increased build complexity reduces the chances of abandonment, that larger projects abandon at higher rates, and that a project’s dominant language has significant but varying effects. Finally, we find the surprising result that metrics of configuration attempts and knowledge dispersion in the project do not appear to affect the rate of abandonment.

1 INTRODUCTION
Continuous Integration (CI) systems automate the compilation, building, testing, and deployment of software at a rapid pace [15]. CI is considered a software development best practice, and is known to improve productivity in software teams and help maintain code quality [3, 15, 26, 31]. However, rarely is a best practice truly universal and divorced from the context where it is applied. This intuitive concept is best described by Contingency Theory [20] in a wider organizational context: an organization’s structures and processes should be compatible with the context in which it operates.

CI pipelines are no exception. Configuring CI is a complex process, with numerous tradeoffs [14] and side effects on other software development practices [32]. For example, Hilton et al. [14] found, after interviewing 16 industrial developers, that implementing CI requires negotiating tradeoffs between 1) test suite execution speed and certainty in the code’s correctness, 2) ease of access and information security, and 3) the desire for many configuration options balanced against the desire for simplicity. Given all these choices, it’s natural for different projects to have different needs, as well as for a project’s CI needs to change over time, as developers navigate these tradeoffs [2, 27]. Simply stated, one size does not fit all.

As a realization of the diversity of CI needs, the marketplace of available CI tools in open-source software (OSS) is booming. While not long ago Jenkins and Travis CI were the only broadly used client-side and cloud-based CI services, respectively, there are now 17 CI services that integrate with GitHub directly,1 and online discussions are explicit about the need for tailored CI solutions.2

To better support developers looking for bespoke CI solutions as well as designers and builders of CI tools, in this paper we begin to uncover the factors that inform the choice of CI implementations by OSS developers on GitHub. Specifically, we investigate 1,819 OSS projects moving away from Travis CI, the dominant cloud-based CI service on GitHub, and try to uncover, using multiple regression modeling, hints in their repositories that might explain and contextualize this transition.

The phenomenon of Travis CI abandonment, we argue, is a particularly attractive setting to study limitations of generic CI solutions. First, by virtue of its popularity, there is a wealth of public data available for GitHub projects using (and abandoning) Travis. Second, abandoning Travis is a more significant event in the life of a software project than its adoption: it is a choice to either abandon CI altogether, going against a best practice, or abandon just Travis CI, the most popular and trusted CI tool [15], in favor of a newer and presumably less recognized replacement. For this to occur, we assert there must be significant ‘push’ factors, which cause projects to abandon Travis or CI altogether, or overriding ‘pull’ contextual factors, which draw a project from Travis to a new CI service. Additionally, as the cost of setting up CI (including Travis) is non negligible [11, 24], abandoning suggests that the push or pull factors must be strong enough to overcome the initial investment. Therefore, investigating Travis abandonment is important to fully understand CI use, to understand how tool choices change with recent addition of alternatives, and as a more general case study of the factors which regulate community change.

Specifically, our results have the following highlights:
• We find that projects with more complex Travis configurations tend to be less likely to abandon Travis, providing support for the applicability of Contingency Theory in this context.
• We find that projects with more commits tend to be more likely to abandon Travis, suggesting that larger projects may outgrow Travis.
• Surprisingly, we find that metrics concerning number of attempts to configure Travis and the extent to which Travis configuration knowledge pervades the project community are not predictive of Travis abandonment.

---

1https://github.com/works-with
2E.g., https://github.com/blog/2463-github-welcomes-all-ci-tools
• We find that projects built with C# and other special purpose languages tend to be more likely to abandon Travis, perhaps due to a contextual mismatch.

2 DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

CI is a well-studied concept. Prior work has found that CI can help teams scale, increasing the numbers of developers and the size of the code base, without affecting software quality [26, 31]. Other work suggests that CI needs change over time as projects navigate different tradeoffs [27]. Retaining contributors is important for sustaining the life of distributed software projects [10], and CI usage has been shown to correlate with popularity: popular projects with more developers tend to use CI at higher rates [10]. The use of CI in a project, e.g., as indicated by repository badges [29], is also a signal of adherence to best practices. CI itself can provide signals of differential interest to different stakeholders, and work is being done to unify signals from disparate sources and present only the signals which will be relevant to a given stakeholder [6, 7].

However, adoption of CI is not without barriers, many of them social or cultural, relating to incompatibility between the goals of CI and those of developers, and social processes within an organization, underscoring that CI may not be for everyone [11, 19, 24]. The problems of selecting appropriate test suites (e.g., to balance testing speed and certainty), and automatically generating test suites, are also ones of recent study [9, 13, 18]. These problems may lead some organizations to only partially adopt CI into their workflow [21].

In this paper, starting from 11 interviews with developers involved in configuring CI in their projects, carried out during prior work [14], we built a “design space” of the facets of variability involved in configuring CI, and the tradeoffs which are made when choosing how to set up CI systems. From this, it was apparent that abandonment is likely to be a complex process, influenced by many factors. We group these factors into two distinct groups: technical attributes of the project itself and those pertaining to community structure. The goal of this study is to estimate the (relative) effects of these different factors on the likelihood of abandoning Travis.

Testing is arguably the most important stage in a CI pipeline [31], and Travis can be more useful in a test-heavy environment. Still, the importance of tests likely depends on a project’s application domain, which is often reflected in the choice of programming language. HTML projects are likely to be web-related, R projects are likely to be scientific or statistical applications, and Objective C projects are likely to be mobile apps. Moreover, building and testing a project can be a multi-stage process. The better the fit between Travis’ capabilities and a project’s build needs, one can argue, the more of these stages it should be able to automate. In short, given that technical attributes of a project can indicate how much value the project gains from using CI, we ask: RQ1: What effects do technical factors have on the likelihood of Travis abandonment?

Community culture, values, and structure can have large and pervasive effects on that community’s choices and processes. For example, projects with a culture that values stability are less likely to make changes which might affect users, at the cost of implementing new features. Other projects negotiate this tradeoff differently, valuing adding new features over stability [5]. As another example, there is evidence that some projects choose to use older versions of APIs, perhaps on the assumption that they are more stable, or that refactoring their project to work with new APIs may introduce defects [22]. Also, it is reasonable to expect that DevOps culture, of which CI is a central pillar, will not fit every community. In this case, communities may have decided to try out CI only to find that it clashed with their modus operandi. For example, a 2015 study identified cultural factors which may bar teams from embracing DevOps culture, such as a lack of agreement among team members as to the goals and values of a project, resistance to changing old habits, and the perception that embracing DevOps involves more work [28]. Additionally, they found that lack of developer interest in the “other side” of a Developer-Operations divide may lead to a rejection of DevOps culture. The important and varied role that community factors can have in the adoption and abandonment of a tool, and the culture in which its use can be fully realized, lead us to ask: RQ2: What effect do community contextual factors have on the likelihood of Travis abandonment?

3 METHODS

3.1 Dataset and Preprocessing

Starting from a data set of GitHub projects using (or having used) Travis CI, collected during prior work [32] circa March 2017, we identified 38,214 projects that had disabled Travis, using the binary is active flag returned by the Travis API.3 Of these, 95% had also ceased development activity shortly after disabling Travis, i.e., had no commits beyond 30 days after Travis abandonment;4 we subsequently filtered these out, as the abandonment event cannot be disentangled from their termination of activity. We further filtered out infrequent programming languages (to allow for enough variance in the regression model). The resulting sample contains 1,819 projects distributed over 14 languages: 63 C#, 87 Puppet, 114 Shell, 134 CSS, 146 HTML, 155 Objective-C, 189 C, 234 C++, 283 Go, 651 Java, 868 Python, 947 PHP, 1,206 Ruby, and 2,199 JavaScript.

Next, we compiled a control group, down-sampling the much larger group of non-abandoning projects using nearest-neighbor propensity score matching [8] on the Travis adoption date (i.e., the date of the first build); we sampled three matching non-abandoning projects for every abandoning one, using the match1t R package. This ensures that all control-group projects started using Travis at (approximately) the same time as their treatment-group counterparts, therefore all had the same number of CI options available at the time of Travis adoption and, thus, controls for global environment effects. Our final sample of 7,276 projects is a merger of these control and treatment groups; Table 1 presents summary statistics.

3.2 Measures

The outcome measure is Travis CI abandonment, as indicated by builds being switched off on the Travis-ci.org dashboard; this is a manual action which must be undertaken by someone with administrator privileges to the repository. We further compute the following community (c) and technical (t) factors:

Project age (c/t): Project age in days. Older projects may be more entrenched in their practices, and thus less likely to abandon Travis.

3This guarantees that a project abandoned Travis on all branches, more accurately than branch-dependent signals, e.g., the absence of a travis.yml configuration file.

4We extract commit data by cloning the repositories locally and parsing their git logs.
Table 1: Summary Statistics for Predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor, Abandoned</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project age (days)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>1.630</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>2.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>1.910</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.travis.yml contributors</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.travis.yml commits</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull requests</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commits</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>54,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build duration (sec)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build jobs</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributors (c): How many distinct contributors have committed to this project? It may be harder to reach a consensus to modify development practices in a larger community.

.travis.yml contributors (c): The fewer people are involved in configuring Travis, the easier it may be to reach consensus to change.

.travis.yml commits (c): More investment in configuring Travis, therefore in using Travis, may suggest a decreased likelihood of abandonment. Alternatively, more commits may indicate possible frustration at trying to get Travis to perform as desired, thus increasing the likelihood of abandonment.

Pull request count (c): Travis is often used as a quality control gate for outside contributions, typically submitted as pull requests.

Commit count (c/t): As a proxy for project size.

Build duration (t): Duration of the most recent build, in seconds. Long build times (either from high build complexity, or heavy travis-ci.org server load) may push people off Travis, as witnessed qualitatively in log files, but may also indicate more substantive Travis usage and thus more commitment to Travis.

Build jobs (t): The number of jobs spawned per build is an indication of build complexity, the amount of investment in the Travis setup, and possibly related to the extent to which teams are able to configure Travis to suit their specific needs. Projects running more Travis jobs may have been able to tailor Travis to their context better, and may thus be less likely to abandon it.

Language (t): The dominant project language, as identified by GrtrHub. Languages with higher domain specificity may be less well suited to Travis, constituting a push factor, or especially well suited to other CI systems, constituting a pull factor.

3.3 Binomial Logistic Regression Modeling

Binomial Logistic Regression models estimate the likelihood of a binary outcome given a set of predictors. In our case, we have a sample of GrtrHub projects, a quarter of which abandoned Travis, matched on the Travis adoption date to control for environmental effects. Logistic regression allows us to explain the likelihood of the dependent binary event Travis CI abandonment, as a function of our contextual measures which serve as the predictors, and to estimate the size of the effect of each variable on increased likelihood of abandonment, while holding the other variables fixed.

We built a binomial logistic regression model with Travis CI abandonment as response, using all the factors above as predictors. In preparation, we filtered out the top 1% of highly-skewed measures as potential high-leverage points, to increase model robustness [25, 30], and we log-transformed variables as needed, to stabilize variance and reduce heteroscedasticity [16]. We further performed multicollinearity analysis, checking if the Variance Inflation Factor remained below 3 [1]. The reference for categorical measures as potential high-leverage points, to increase model robustness.

$$R^2 = 0.215$$

Table 2: Travis CI Abandonment Logit Model. McFadden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coef (Errors)</th>
<th>Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.06)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(Project age)</td>
<td>−0.68 (0.15)**</td>
<td>21.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(Build duration)</td>
<td>−0.43 (0.03)**</td>
<td>226.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(Commits)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.04)**</td>
<td>334.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(Pull requests + 0.5)</td>
<td>−0.33 (0.06)**</td>
<td>27.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(.yml commits)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(.yml contributors)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: C vs Mean</td>
<td>−1.27 (0.21)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: C# vs Mean</td>
<td>0.81 (0.27)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: C++ vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.41 (0.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: CSS vs Mean</td>
<td>0.11 (0.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Go vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.03 (0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: HTML vs Mean</td>
<td>0.23 (0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Java vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.22 (0.10)**</td>
<td>260.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: JavaScript vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.77 (0.08)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Objective-C vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.26 (0.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: PHP vs Mean</td>
<td>0.01 (0.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Puppet vs Mean</td>
<td>2.65 (0.25)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Python vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.72 (0.10)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Ruby vs Mean</td>
<td>−0.26 (0.09)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We now answer our research questions and discuss our results.

RQ1: What effect do technical factors have on the likelihood of Travis CI Abandonment? The dominant technical factors which explain...
Travis abandonment are Build duration and Language, with some deviance explained by the number of Build jobs run on Travis. Projects written in C#, mainly used for building Windows applications, are more likely to abandon Travis than average; this is unsurprising since Travis provides MacOS and Linux testing platforms, but does not provide one for Windows. Languages used in contexts in which testing may not make much sense, such as the software configuration management language Puppet, are also more likely to abandon Travis than average. Travis CI itself is built in Ruby, so naturally it has done a good job of catering to the Ruby language: the relative likelihood that Ruby projects abandon Travis is lower than average. Java is easily unit tested, and perhaps this translates to our observed lower chances of Travis abandonment than average.

Projects with a longer Build duration are less likely to abandon Travis. We speculate that because Build duration can indicate build complexity, projects with more complex builds are better able to adapt Travis to fit their specific context; this effect is supported in smaller part by Job Count. Overall this effect aligns with Contingency Theory: projects would not unnecessarily configure their build system to work in an arbitrary and complex way, but they might configure their build system in a complex way if the complexity reflected and fit well with their context; thus, higher complexity can show that Travis fits their context better, which may explain the reduced chances of abandonment.

RQ2: What effect do community factors have on the rate of Travis CI Abandonment? We will begin by discussing the community factors which, surprisingly, had little or no effect on the likelihood of Travis abandonment. One might assume that projects with more Contributors might be less likely to abandon Travis, e.g., for fear of upsetting their large contributor base, but this effect does not play out in our model. Additionally, one might assume that the number of .yml commits to the Travis configuration file might affect the likelihood of Travis abandonment, whether negatively because of the time investment spent configuring Travis, or positively because of frustration over configuring Travis adequately, but the model does not suggest any such effects. Finally, one might assume that the extent to which Travis configuration knowledge is widespread within a project’s community, as measured by the number of distinct .yml contributors, would have some effect on the rates of Travis abandonment, but our model does not offer any indication of this.

The dominant community factors which explain Travis abandonment are the number of Commits, and the number of Pull requests. Projects with more Pull requests tend to be less likely to abandon Travis, other variables held constant; we speculate that this is because they are getting value out of Travis by using it to help evaluate external pull requests. Projects with more Commits are more likely to abandon Travis, suggesting that they may either become too large or unwieldy to work well with Travis, or that they have become large enough to justify a more customizable or tailored solution that better fits the context of their project.

5 THREATS TO VALIDITY
A single research method can never capture all the nuance involved in complex phenomena, and the blind spots of quantitative research on software repositories are well understood [4, 17]. While our model explains a sizeable chunk of the variance in Travis abandonment, it is quite likely that we neglected to include significant covariates of Travis abandonment. It is also possible that some of our measures don’t accurately capture the concepts they try to operationalize, especially in the cases where the model does not suggest any significant effects. We also note that the randomness inherent in the propensity-score matching process may create a small amount of variability in the effects for languages represented by relatively few projects. Finally, we cannot make causal claims using our model, because it is possible that the factors we measured are instead correlated with an underlying and unknown true cause we do not account for. To enable replications and extensions, we make our data publicly available.5

6 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS
We have shown that a model with relatively simple predictors explains Travis abandonment with good fit.

Our results have three main implications on research. Firstly, our work motivates more research on understanding CI Abandonment, a previously unstudied and unquantified phenomenon. Secondly, our work suggests that more qualitative research is needed on how knowledge of a project’s CI practices propagates through a community, since the measures we used to operationalize this concept did not have the expected effects. Finally, our work motivates more research on understanding how context affects the choice of CI, on which there have been little large scale quantitative studies.

Our work also has implications for practitioners. Firstly, users of Travis are encouraged to look elsewhere if Travis is not able to accommodate the complexity appropriate to their context. Secondly, projects using Travis should be wary of outgrowing their CI setup as they become larger. Finally, designers of Travis and similar CI services should pay attention to the context of use, and where there are particular unmet needs.

Future Work. Although encouraging, our results should be considered preliminary. Future work should focus on the causal mechanisms behind making the decision to abandon Travis. One direction could be to collect qualitative data from projects abandoning Travis, using a mixed-methods design [12]. Another direction could be to study what happens after projects abandon Travis. How many projects abandon CI completely? Alternatively, how many switch to a new CI system? Can contextual factors predict which new system they migrate to? Finally, future work should also consider the productivity and code quality implications of abandoning Travis or CI altogether. For example, does the increase in productivity associated with CI adoption, reported by prior work, come with an equivalent but opposite decrease in productivity after CI abandonment?
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