CS1632, LECTURE 2: TESTING THEORY AND TERMINOLOGY

Wonsun Ahn

Key () concept to the course

Expected behavior vs observed behavior

Expected behavior vs observed behavior

You need to know what "should" happen under some circumstances, then check to see if that behavior actually occurred.

For example, assume I have a function foo, which accepts an integer, a, and returns a float. What should happen if I send in the value a = 42?

This is a simple idea, but it's the "Fundamental Theorem of Testing" (although note that we may violate it later...)

Example

Assume foo is supposed to return the square root of the passed in value a.

When I send in the value a = 42, then I expect to be returned the value 6.48074069841.

When I send in the value a = 9, then I expect to be returned the value 3.

When I send in the value a = -1, then I expect....

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF EXHAUSTIVE TESTING

- Let's say we want to ensure that our square root method will never fail, no matter what we send in. Assume we are using a standard Java int (signed 32-bit integer)
- How many values do we have to test?

4,294,961,296

What if there are a 1000 method calls?

- Assume each method call accepts one 32-bit int argument
- Remember that methods in a Java-like language can have side-effects (in other words, they are not pure functions)
 - Can access / modify global variables, global data structures
 - Means a method call is affected by all previous method calls

4,294,961,296 \ 1000

THAT'S EQUAL TO...

What if the argument is an object reference?

- That object could be a list data structure, a tree, a graph, ...
- How many shapes can a tree take?

Would testing all the combinations of arguments guarantee that there are no problems?

- Compiler issues
- Parallel programming issues
- Non-functional issues (performance, usability, etc.)
- Floating-point issues
- Integration issues
- Systems-level issues
- Ambiguous or misunderstood requirements

- Compiler issues
 - Your source code does not run on the computer, the compiled binary does
 - Depending on compiler and compile options, many different binaries can be produced! Besides the binary you used for testing.
 - What if the compiler has a bug? (Rare)
 - What if the compiler exposes a bug in your program? (More frequent) int add_up_to (int count) {
 int sum, i; /* some C compilers will init sum to 0, some will not */

for(i = 0; i <= count; i++) sum = sum + i;
return sum;

 Big problem for C/C++, less of a problem for Java since all bytecode is run on JVM (In above example, Java Virtual Machine always initializes all variables to 0)

- Compiler issues
- Parallel programming issues
 - If there is a data race, the result of your program is undefined
 - Doesn't matter whether you are using C/C++ or Java
 - Worst part: for many data races, result is correct 99% of time, masking the bug
 - Even with no data race, the result of your program is often nondeterministic (Depending upon the respective speed of each thread)
 - To thoroughly test, you have to vary the speed of each thread, even for same input

- Compiler issues
- Parallel programming issues
- Non-functional issues (performance, usability, etc.)
- Floating-point issues
- Integration issues
- Systems-level issues
- Ambiguous or misunderstood requirements

Testing = ART + SCIENCE

- There are techniques for testing which can reduce the number of tests necessary for sufficient test coverage.
- Defining what "sufficient test coverage" means is subjective.
- We must rely on domain knowledge to decide.

Equivalence class partitioning

- We can partition the testing parameters into "equivalence classes"
 - Equivalence class = a natural grouping of values with similar behavior
- For example, in our square root method:
 - Negative numbers (input) -> Imaginary numbers (output)
 - 0 -> 0
 - Positive numbers -> Positive numbers

Equivalence classes are strictly partitioned

- For any given input value, it must belong to one and ONLY one equivalence class (strictly partitioned)
- If there are values that belong to multiple equivalence classes, you probably need another equivalence class
- Example:
 - Right handed people -> writes with right hand
 - Left handed people -> writes with left hand
 - Jane can write with both hands. Which equivalence class does she belong to?
 - Solution: add "Ambidextrous people -> writes with both hands"

Multiple partitionings

- Assume in the previous square root method, if the result contains a decimal point (e.g. 1.3 or 2.23i), it prints in red, otherwise in black.
- Now we have two partitionings:
 - The positive / 0 / negative partitioning on the previous slide
 - The decimal / non-decimal partitioning on this slide:
 - Number contains decimal -> output printed in red
 - Number does not contain decimal -> output printed in black
- Therefore, a value now belongs to two equivalence classes, but in different partitionings (e.g. value 1.3 belongs to "positive" and "decimal" classes)
- A set of values can be partitioned in limitless ways

Values do not have to be numeric

- On Twitter, if you follow somebody, you see all of their tweets, unless they are writing directly to somebody you do not follow.
- Equivalence classes:
 - You do not follow person A -> DO NOT see the tweet
 - You do follow person A, they are not writing directly to somebody -> see the tweet
 - You do follow person A, they are writing directly to person B, whom you also follow
 -> see the tweet
 - You do follow person A, they are writing directly to person B, whom do you not follow -> DO NOT see tweet

Values do not have to be numeric

- Suppose Twitter only allows alphanumeric [A-Za-z0-9] characters, and tweets must contain at least one character. Tweets that contain any invalid characters are not posted.
- Equivalence classes (NV = number of valid characters, NI = number of invalid characters):
 - (NV >= 1, NI == 0) -> Post the tweet
 - (NV == 0, NI == 0) -> DO NOT post the tweet
 - (NI >= 1) -> DO NOT post the tweet (note NV is irrelevant here)

Test Each Equivalence Class

- Pick at least one value from each equivalence class
- This will ensure you capture behavior from each "class" of possible behavior
- Will find a good percentage of defects without exhaustive testing!
- We reduced the problem something a human can do! Woo-hoo!
- How to pick the input? Well, that is part of the art.
 - However, there are some good guidelines!

Interior and boundary values

 Theory: Problems are more prevalent on the boundaries of equivalence classes than in the middle.

Why?

- Suppose expected behavior is:
 - Method shall take citizenship and age as arguments
 - Method shall determine whether a person can be US president according to a set of rules
 - Rule 1: Person must be a US citizen to be US president
 - Rule 2: Person must be 35 years or older to be US president
- Suppose implementation is:

```
boolean canBePresident(int age, boolean citizen) {
   return age > 35 && citizen;
}
```

Is observed behavior the same as expected behavior?

Equivalence class partitioning

```
CANNOT_BE_PRESIDENT = [...19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34]
```

```
CAN_BE_PRESIDENT = [35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50...]
```

Try to test both boundary and interior values

```
CANNOT_BE_PRESIDENT = [...19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34]
```

```
CAN_BE_PRESIDENT = [35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50...]
```

- At the boundary values (shown in red)
- In fact, there is a bug at: age > 35

Try to test both boundary and interior values

```
CANNOT_BE_PRESIDENT = [...19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34]
```

```
CAN_BE_PRESIDENT = [35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50...]
```

• Testing interior values is also important to see behavior in interior

Try to test both boundary and interior values

```
CANNOT_BE_PRESIDENT = [...19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34]
```

```
CAN_BE_PRESIDENT = [35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50...]
```

• Are we done?

"Hidden" (IMPLICIT) boundary values

- The boundary values we have gone over already are explicit that is, they are defined by the requirements of the problem itself.
- Some boundaries are implicit they are generated from the domain, architecture, hardware, or other elements:
 - MAXINT, MININT
 - Maximum precision of a floating point value
 - Allocation limitation (memory, hard drive space, network bandwidth, etc.)
 - Physical world boundaries (weight can't be negative, Y2K won't happen, etc.)
 - Side note: Y2K did happen and anti-gravity may yet happen

Add implicit boundary values

```
CANNOT_BE_PRESIDENT = [MININT,...,-1,0,1,...19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34]
```

```
CAN_BE_PRESIDENT = [35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,...,MAXINT]
```

- MININT, MAXINT: hardware boundaries
- 0: physical world boundaries (age cannot be negative)

Base, edge, and corner cases

- Base case An element in an equivalence class that is not around a boundary (interior value), OR an expected use case.
- Edge case An element in an equivalence class that is next to a boundary (boundary value), OR an unexpected use case.
- Corner case (or pathological case) A case which can only occur outside of normal operating parameters, or a combination of multiple edge cases.

Black-, white, and grey-box testing

• Black-box testing:

- Testing with no knowledge of the interior structure or code of the application
- Tests are performed from the user's perspective, looking at the system as a whole

• White-box testing:

- Testing with explicit knowledge of the interior structure and codebase
- Tests are performed at the code-level (e.g. testing individual methods or classes)

Grey-box testing:

- Testing with some knowledge of the interior structure and codebase
- Knowledge may come from partial inspection of code or a design document
- Tests are performed from the user's perspective, but informed by tester's knowledge

Black-box testing examples

- Accessing a website, using a browser, to look for flaws
- Running a script against an API endpoint
- Checking to see that changing fonts in a word processor works

White-box testing examples

- Testing that a function returns the correct result
- Testing that instantiating an object creates a valid object
- Checking that there are no unused variables in a method
- Checking that exceptions are properly caught and handled

Grey-box testing examples

- Reviewing code and noticing that bubble sort is used. Then write a user-facing test involving a large input size.
- Reviewing code in a web app and noticing user input is not properly sanitized of code. Then write a user-facing test which attempts SQL code injection or cross site scripting.
- Reading a design document and noticing a critical network connection through which a lot of data passes through. Then write a user-facing test that stresses that network connection.

Static vs dynamic testing

 Dynamic testing = code is executed (at least the part that is exercised in that test run)

Static testing = code is not executed

Dynamic testing

- If you're thinking about testing, probably what you are thinking about.
 - Code is executed under certain circumstances
 (e.g. input values, environment variables, compiler, OS, runtime library, etc.)
 - Observed results are then compared with expected results
- Much more commonly used in industry
- The majority of the class will be about dynamic testing

Static testing

- Code is reviewed by a person or testing tool, without being executed
- Examples:
 - Code walkthroughs and reviews
 - Source Code Analysis
 - Linting
 - Model checking
 - Complexity analysis
 - Code coverage
 - Finite state analysis
 - ... COMPILING!