

SOFTENG 254:
Quality Assurance

Lecture 2b: Developing good tests 1

Paramvir Singh
School of Computer Science

Agenda

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- How to come up with good tests
- Statement Coverage
- Evaluation of Statement Coverage

What is a “good” test?

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Developing good tests

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- the purpose of testing is to detect the **presence** of faults
 - we detect faults by executing the code in such a way to cause a failure
- ⇒ the **higher the probability of causing a failure (assuming a fault exists)**, the better the quality of the test
- ⇒ when deciding on what to test, need to look at where faults are likely to be
- really need to consider quality of the test **suite** — individual tests are of limited value

Example

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Inputs: string where the only whitespace characters are space and tab, integer indicating what tab stop to use

Outputs: the number of space characters between the beginning of the string and the first non-whitespace character, assuming any tab characters are replaced by enough spaces corresponding to the tabstop

Tab stops 4

		+	+	+	+(tab stops)
#1	Lorem				ipsum dolor
#2	\t\t				sit amet,
#3	\t				consectetur

- `leadingSpacesCount(#1, 4)` = 0
- `leadingSpacesCount(#2, 4)` = 8
- `leadingSpacesCount(#3, 4)` = 4

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Example solution

```
public static int leadingSpacesCount(String text, int tabstop) {  
A   int index =0;  
B   int count =0;  
C   int interTab =0;  
D   char[] chars =text.toCharArray();  
E   while (index <chars.length &&  
        Character.isWhitespace(chars[index])) {  
F       if (chars[index] =='\t') {  
G           count +=tabstop - interTab;  
H           interTab = 0;  
        }else {  
I           if (interTab ==tabstop - 1) {  
J               interTab = 1;  
        }else {  
K               interTab++;  
        }  
L           count++;  
        }  
M       index++;  
        }  
N   return count;  
}
```

Test Suite Quality

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Consider this test suite:
 - Input = ("Lorem", 4), Expected Output: 0
- Is it improved by adding this test case?
 - Input = ("Lorem ipsum", 4), Expected Output: 0
- More test cases does not mean a better quality test suite

Test Suite Quality

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Is this test suite good enough?
 - Input = (" Lorem", 4), Expected Output: 1
 - Input = ("\tLorem", 4), Expected Output: 4

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Statements Executed

```

public static int leadingSpacesCount(String text, int tabstop) {
A   int index = 0;
B   int count = 0;
C   int interTab = 0;
D   char[] chars = text.toCharArray();
E   while (index < chars.length &&
          Character.isWhitespace(chars[index])) {
F       if (chars[index] == '\t') {
G           count += tabstop - interTab;
H           interTab = 0;
          } else {
I               if (interTab == tabstop - 1) {
J                   interTab = 1;
                    } else {
K                        interTab++;
                        }
L                   count++;
                    }
M               index++;
            }
N   return count;
    }

```

Statements Executed

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

```
public static int leadingSpacesCount(String text, int tabstop) {  
  A    int index = 0;  
  B    int count = 0;  
  C    int interTab = 0;  
  D    char[] chars = text.toCharArray();  
  E    while (index < chars.length &&  
           Character.isWhitespace(chars[index])) {  
  F      if (chars[index] == '\t') {  
  G        count += tabstop - interTab;  
  H        interTab = 0;  
          } else {  
  I          if (interTab == tabstop - 1) {  
  J            interTab = 1; // hic sunt dracones!  
              } else {  
  K                interTab++;  
              }  
  L          count++;  
          }  
  M      index++;  
        }  
  N    return count;  
}
```

Intuition

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Adding a test to a test suite should depend on whether or not it increases the probability of a failure
 - In testing, we detect the existence of faults by executing code and causing a failure
- ⇒ the faults we detect is somewhere in the code that was executed
- ⇒ faults in code we don't execute **cannot** have been detected
- ⇒ we increase the probability of a test suite detecting a fault by adding tests that execute code that hasn't already been executed

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Statement coverage

- what proportion of the statements in the code are executed by the test suite?

- $$\text{Statement coverage} = \frac{\text{\#statements executed by all tests}}{\text{total number of statements}} \%$$

- If statement coverage is not 100%, then there is a possibility of a fault existing in the code that will not be detected by the test suite
- a measure of test suite quality
- Example: Statement coverage = $\frac{13}{14} = 93\%$ (roughly)

Test Suite Quality

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Input = (" Lorem", 4), Expected Output: 1
- Input = ("\\tLorem", 4), Expected Output: 4
- Input = (" \\tLorem", 4), Expected Output 8 \Rightarrow Actual output 7 — **Failure!**
- 100% statement coverage

How good is Statement Coverage?

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Suppose we had added a different test case
 - Input = (" Lorem", 4), Expected Output: 1
 - Input = ("\tLorem", 4), Expected Output: 4
 - Input = (" Lorem", 4), Expected Output 4 \Rightarrow Actual output 4 — Pass!
 - Also 100% statement coverage
 - All tests pass
 - **but!** we know the implementation has at least one fault
- \Rightarrow 100% statement coverage is not enough
- In fact, 100% statement coverage is not always possible, e.g. dead code

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Dead Code

```

    public static int leadingSpacesCount(String text, int tabstop) {
A       int index = 0;
B       int count = 0;
C       int interTab = 0;
D       char[] chars = text.toCharArray();
E       while (index < chars.length &&
              Character.isWhitespace(chars[index])) {
F           if (index >= chars.length) {
G               break;
              }
H           if (chars[index] == '\t') {
I               count += tabstop - interTab;
J               interTab = 0;
              }else {
K                   if (interTab == tabstop - 1) {
L                       interTab = 1;
                      }else {
M                          interTab++;
                          }
N                      count++;
                      }
O                  index++;
              }
P       return count;
    }

```

Test Strategies

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- To improve test suites, we need to consider both the artifact we are testing (code) and the quality attribute we are trying to establish (correctness)
- White (clear, glass) box testing — performing tests based on **how** the component is implemented \Rightarrow artifact focus
 - decide on tests based on the code itself
 - E.g., statement coverage
 - not good at detecting faults relating to requirements
- Black box testing — performing tests based on **what** the component is supposed to do \Rightarrow quality attribute focus
 - decide on tests based on the requirements independent of the code
 - not good at detecting faults in implementation decisions
- Black box versus White box now something of an old-fashioned view of testing. The **process** for developing a test suite is essentially the same for both—it is the **inputs** that are different (requirements versus code).

- [Agenda](#)
- [Good Tests](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Example solution](#)
- [Test Suite Quality](#)
- [Intuition](#)
- [Statement coverage](#)
- [Coverage Example](#)
- [Test Strategies](#)
- [Key Points](#)

Key Points

- If there is a statement that is not executed by the existing test suite, then adding a test that causes that statement to be executed **increases the probability of causing a failure**
- 100% statement coverage is neither sufficient or always possible
- But,
 - a good start
 - example of general strategy — find situations where faults may lie and develop tests to expose them

Journal Discussion (5-10 mins)

- [PAQ](#)
- [Agenda](#)
- [V & V](#)
- [The V Model](#)
- [Quality](#)
- [Correctness](#)
- [Terminology](#)
- [Example](#)
- [RIP model](#)
- [“Faults” not “Bugs”](#)
- [Fault-free code](#)
- [Testing vs. Debugging](#)
- [Testing](#)
- [Terminology](#)
- [Reality](#)
- [Bugs](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- In groups of 2-3, share your journals/notes with your peers and discuss them.
 - What? – what others wrote and you did not
 - Why? – why did you not write what you did not
 - How? – given the same content, how your notes differ from your peers’ notes; different forms of representation? drawings? short-hands? what else?
 - Learn to **note** better!!!

Post-it notes...

- [PAQ](#)
- [Agenda](#)
- [V & V](#)
- [The V Model](#)
- [Quality](#)
- [Correctness](#)
- [Terminology](#)
- [Example](#)
- [RIP model](#)
- [“Faults” not “Bugs”](#)
- [Fault-free code](#)
- [Testing vs. Debugging](#)
- [Testing](#)
- [Terminology](#)
- [Reality](#)
- [Bugs](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Please take a moment to write a one sentence answer to each of the following questions:
 - What is your primary takeaway from this lecture? (one sentence)
 - What did you not understand from this lecture? (one sentence)

Rate this Lecture

- [PAQ](#)
- [Agenda](#)
- [V & V](#)
- [The V Model](#)
- [Quality](#)
- [Correctness](#)
- [Terminology](#)
- [Example](#)
- [RIP model](#)
- [“Faults” not “Bugs”](#)
- [Fault-free code](#)
- [Testing vs. Debugging](#)
- [Testing](#)
- [Terminology](#)
- [Reality](#)
- [Bugs](#)
- [Key Points](#)

- Go to **www.menti.com** and enter code **76 08 03**
- See you next week!
- *Meanwhile*
 - Utilize office hours (Tuesdays and Fridays 2:00 – 3:00 pm)
 - **Zoom** – See Canvas
 - Discuss with your peers and the teaching team on **Piazza**
 - Work on **Assignment 1** and practice **Lab** exercises
- And most importantly
 - Stay safe and maintain good hygiene