

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

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

Example

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 \t	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