



BTECH3618 • Software Testing and Reliability

CHAPTER 6

Testing Object-Oriented Software

Motivation

- Object-Oriented software testing issues
- How to test OO software
- How to test ?? software

Basic Terminology

- Class
- Instantiate
- Object
- Identity
- Has
 - Member Functions(methods)
 - Defines
 - Behavior
 - State
 - Yields

Encapsulation and Data Abstraction

- Encapsulation
 - Prevents clients from knowing about or depending on the implementation of the class.
- Data Abstraction
 - Creation of a new data type from previously existing components

Inheritance Terminology

- Parent class and Superclass refer to the class from which another inherits
- Child class, derived class, and subclass refer to a class that inherits from one or more classes.

Inheritance

- Allows common features of many classes to be defined in one class.
 - A child class can inherit features from a parent class.
 - A child class can also enhance, restrict derived
- features, and add new features

Polymorphism

- A subclass redefines or replaces a function
- derived from its parent
 - Override – same name and signature
 - Overload – same name but different signature

Impacts

- What are the difference between procedural
- programs and OO programs?
 - Traditional procedural programs allow easy access to internal state information, data information is often global, program control flow is deterministic.
 - OO programs emphasized information hiding and data encapsulation, private data is not directly accessible during testing, non deterministic.

Impacts

- Can we directly adopt previous unit testing
- strategies? If we can, are they sufficient?
 - Black-box testing
 - SC,BC, and other path testing strategies
 - Data-flow testing
 - What is the scope of unit testing and integration testing

Are they sufficient?

- OO faults that do not occur in traditional
- software system
 - Encapsulation faults
 - Inheritance faults
 - Polymorphism faults
- • What shall we do?

Encapsulation

- Involves violations of encapsulation, or
- information hiding.
 - Returning a pointer to a hidden object.
 - Memory Management Faults
 - Implicit Function Faults

Example – Inheritance Faults

```

• Class Parent {
  int v;
  Parent() { v = 1; }
  void k() {
    return 1/v;
  }
}

Class Child extends {
  Child() { v = 0; }
  void new_function() {
    ... ..
  }
}

```

Unit Testing Issues for OO SW

- Based class
 - Test each function with traditional testing strategies.
- Derived classes
 - Don't forget about base class methods
- They may be available as is
- They may have been replaced in an inherited class
 - Test all overloads as separate functions
 - Inline functions are still functions
 - Watch for overloaded operators

OO Coverage Criterion

- All – binding:
- Every possible binding of each object must
- be exercised at least once when the object is
- defined or used. If a statement involves
- multiple objects, then every combination of
- a possible binding needs to be tested at least
- once.

Example

```
Shape {
double() {
perimeter /= 2;
}
Class Square extends Shape {
draw(x,y,perimeter) {... ...}
}
Class Circle extends Shape {
draw(x,y,radius) {... ...}
}
Class MainClass {
main() {
Read(shape,perim,x,y)
if (shape == 1)
ob = new Square(..)
else ob = new Circle(...);
ob.draw()
if (perim > 10) {
ob.double();
ob.draw()
}
}
}
```

Class Testing

- Base class testing
 - Exhaustive testing
 - 10 methods, $10! = 3628800$ test cases
 - Divide and conquer
 - A class can be viewed as composition of a set of **slices**: a quantum of a class with only a single data member and a set of member functions such that each member functions can manipulate the values associated with this data member.

Testing for Sequencing Constrains

- Many errors are a result of incorrect
- sequencing of operations
- Combination of the previous two
- methodologies

Example

- File class with 3 operations
 - Open (def)
 - Close (kill)
 - Write (use)
- Must open before write or close (du)
- Must not write after close (ku)
- Should write before close (dk)
- This is an outgrowth of data flow analysis

Testing Inherited Classes

- Should you retest inherited methods?
- Can you reuse superclass tests for inherited and overridden methods?
- To what extent should you exercise interaction among methods of all superclasses and of the subclass under test?

Testing Inherited Classes

- No member function overloading or
- overriding, no change states of the parent
- data members.
- *Parent class member functions need not to be retested*
- • New overloading, overriding function, or
- new functions that will change states of the
- parent data members.
- *No unit testing necessary for parent class member*
- *functions, but further class testing are needed.*

Example

- Class Account {
- int amount; Vector transactions;
- int calculate() {
- amount =
- }
- void PrintTransaction() {
- print amount;}
- }
- Class Checking extends Account {
- void PrintCheckingTransaction()
- {... ..}
- }

Class Saving extends Account {
int interest;
int calculate() { amount = ... }
}

For Checking class,
Account.calculate and
Account.PrintTransaction do
need to be retested.
For Saving class,
Account.PrintTransaction needs
to be retested.

Inheriting Class Test Suites

- Can you reuse superclass method tests?
 - Inherited methods Yes
 - Override methods Probably
 - Overloaded methods No
 - New methods No
- Do you need to develop new test cases?
 - Inherited methods Maybe
 - Override methods Yes
 - Overloaded methods Yes
 - New methods Yes

Example – Step (8)

- Step 0: Derive all the def, use set
 - Step 1: Initialization, make all $\text{mindef}(i) = \{\text{ALL}\}$, $\text{defclear}(i) = \{\}$.
 - Step 2: $\text{mindef}(\text{start}) = \cap \{\} = \{\}$
 $\text{defclear}(\text{start}) = \cup \{\} - \text{use}(\text{start}) = \{\}$
 - Step 3: $\text{mindef}(1) = [\text{mindef}(\text{start}) \cup \text{def}(\text{start})] = \{\}$
 $\text{defclear}(1) = [\text{defclear}(\text{start}) \cup \text{def}(\text{start})] - \text{use}(1) = \{\}$
 - Step 4: $\text{mindef}(2) = [\text{mindef}(1) \cup \text{def}(1)] \cap [\text{mindef}(4) \cup \text{def}(4)] \cap [\text{mindef}(5) \cup \text{def}(5)]$
 $= \{\text{A}\} \cap \{\text{ALL}\} \cap \{\text{ALL}\} = \{\text{A}\}$
 $\text{defclear}(2) = [\text{defclear}(1) \cup \text{def}(1)] \cup [\text{defclear}(4) \cup \text{def}(4)] \cup [\text{defclear}(5) \cup \text{def}(5)] - \text{use}(2)$
 $= \{\text{A}\} \cup \{\text{A}\} \cup \{\text{B}\} - \{\text{A}\} = \{\text{B}\}$
 - Step 5: $\text{mindef}(3) = [\text{mindef}(2) \cup \text{def}(2)] = \{\text{A}\}$
 $\text{defclear}(3) = [\text{defclear}(2) \cup \text{def}(2)] - \text{use}(3) = \{\text{B}\} - \{\text{A}\} = \{\text{B}\}$
 - Step 6: $\text{mindef}(4) = [\text{mindef}(3) \cup \text{def}(3)] = \{\text{A}\}$
 $\text{defclear}(4) = [\text{defclear}(3) \cup \text{def}(3)] - \text{use}(4) = \{\text{B}\} - \{\text{A}, \text{B}\} = \{\}$
 - Step 7: $\text{mindef}(5) = [\text{mindef}(3) \cup \text{def}(3)] = \{\text{A}\}$
 $\text{defclear}(5) = [\text{defclear}(3) \cup \text{def}(3)] - \text{use}(5) = \{\text{B}\} - \{\text{B}\} = \{\}$
 - Step 8: $\text{mindef}(6) = [\text{mindef}(2) \cup \text{def}(2)] = \{\text{A}\}$
 $\text{defclear}(6) = [\text{defclear}(2) \cup \text{def}(2)] - \text{use}(6) = \{\text{B}\} - \{\text{A}, \text{B}\} = \{\}$
 $\text{mindef}(\text{end}) = [\text{mindef}(6) \cup \text{def}(6)] = \{\text{A}\}$
 $\text{defclear}(\text{end}) = [\text{defclear}(6) \cup \text{def}(6)] - \text{use}(\text{end}) = \{\} - \{\} = \{\}$
- When trying to calculate for the second time, all sets remain the same, stop.

Identify Faults and Data Flow Anomalies

d- : defclear(exitnode) $\neq \{\}$

dd: defclear(i) \cap def(i) $\neq \{\}$

-u: use(i) - mindef(i) $\neq \{\}$

Identify Faults and data Flow Anomalies

- NODE 1 dd: $\text{defclear}(1) \cap \text{def}(1) = \{\} \cap \{A\} = \{\} \checkmark$
 -u: $\text{use}(i) - \text{mindef}(i) = \{\} - \{\} = \{\} \checkmark$
- NODE 2 dd: $\text{defclear}(2) \cap \text{def}(2) = \{A\} \cap \{\} = \{\} \checkmark$
 -u: $\text{use}(i) - \text{mindef}(i) = \{A\} - \{A\} = \{\} \checkmark$
- NODE 3 dd: $\text{defclear}(3) \cap \text{def}(3) = \{\} \cap \{\} = \{\} \checkmark$
 -u: $\text{use}(i) - \text{mindef}(i) = \{A\} - \{A\} = \{\} \checkmark$
- NODE 4 dd: $\text{defclear}(4) \cap \text{def}(4) = \{\} \cap \{A\} = \{\} \checkmark$
 -u: $\text{use}(i) - \text{mindef}(i) = \{A,B\} - \{A\} = \{B\} \times$ -u type Fault
- NODE 5 dd: $\text{defclear}(5) \cap \text{def}(5) = \{A\} \cap \{B\} = \{\} \checkmark$
 -u: $\text{use}(i) - \text{mindef}(i) = \{B\} - \{A\} = \{B\} \times$ -u type Fault
- NODE 6 dd: $\text{defclear}(6) \cap \text{def}(6) = \{\} \cap \{\} = \{\} \checkmark$
 -u: $\text{use}(i) - \text{mindef}(i) = \{A,B\} - \{A\} = \{B\} \times$ -u type Fault
- EndNode d-: $\text{delclear}(\text{end}) = \{\} \checkmark$

Discussion

- Unachievable d-u pair
- Array, pointer
- Inter – procedure data-flow analysis