

Chapter 6: Testing

- "I can only test my code"
 - Not true
 - What can be tested
 - Code
 - Design Artifacts
 - Pretty much everything we make
 - The testing itself
- Testing
 - Two basic types
 - Execution-based testing
 - Non-execution-based testing
 - V & V
 - Verification: Is the software doing things right?
 - Determine if the workflow was completed correctly
 - Ensures the software is designed to deliver all functionality according to the requirements
 - Validation: Is the software doing the right things?
 - Determine if the product as a whole satisfies the requirements
 - Ensures the functionality, as defined by the requirements, is the intended behavior of the software
 - Software Quality
 - Not "excellence"
 - The extend to which the software satisfies its specifications
 - Every software professional is responsible for ensuring that his or her work is correct
 - Quality must be built in from the beginning
 - Software Quality Assurance
 - The members of the SQA group must ensure that the developers are doing high-quality work
 - At the end of each workflow
 - When the product is complete
 - In addition, quality assurance must be applied to the process itself
 - Ex. Standards
 - Managerial Independence

- There must be managerial independence between the:
 - development group
 - SQA group
 - Neither group should have power over the other
 - More senior management must decide whether to
 - Deliver the product on time but with faults, or
 - Test further and deliver the product late
 - The decision must take into account the interests of the client and the development organization
- Non-Execution-Based Testing
- Underlying principles
 - We should not review our own work
 - Group synergy (developers and SQA)
 - Testing software without running test cases: Carefully read through it
 - Review software: Carefully read through it
 - Verify all artifacts produced from each workflow for each increment
 - Walkthroughs
 - A walkthrough team consists of four to six members
 - It includes representatives from
 - The current workflow team
 - The next workflow team
 - The SQA team
 - The walkthrough team is chaired by the SQA team
 - In a walkthrough, we *detect* faults, not correct them
 - A correction produced by a committee is likely to be of low quality
 - the cost of a committee correction is too high
 - Not all items flagged are actually incorrect
 - A walkthrough should not last longer than two hours
 - There is no time to correct faults as well
 - Inspections
 - Inspection Team
 - Moderator
 - Member of current workflow team
 - Member of next workflow team
 - Member of SQA team
 - An inspection has five formal steps

- Overview of artifact to review
- Preparation of list of types found
 - Statistics of fault types
 - Concentrate on areas where most faults have occurred
- Inspection
 - Meticulous walkthrough of artifact
- Rework
 - Responsible for artifact to resolve faults
- Follow-up
- Fault Statistics
 - Faults are recorded by severity
 - Not a Fault
 - Enhancement
 - Trivial
 - Minor
 - Major
 - Critical
 - Blocking
 - Assign *priorities*
 - Faults are recorded by fault type
 - For a given workflow, we compare current fault rates with those of previous products
 - We take action if there are disproportionate number of faults in an artifact
 - Redesigning from scratch is a good alternative
 - We carry forward fault statistics to the next workflow
 - We may not detect all faults of particular type in the current inspection
- Comparison of Inspections and Walkthroughs
 - Walkthrough
 - Two Step, informal process
 - Preparation
 - Analysis
 - Inspection
 - Five-step, formal process
 - Overview
 - Preparation
 - Inspection

- Rework
 - Follow-up
- Strengths and Weaknesses of Reviews
 - Review can be effective
 - Faults are detected early in the process
 - Reviews are less effective if the process is inadequate
 - Large-Scale software should consist of smaller, largely independent pieces
 - The documentation of the previous workflows has to be complete and available online
 - Code reviews lead to rapid and thorough fault detection
 - Up to 95% reduction in maintenance costs
- Non-execution VS Execution Based Testing
 - Non-execution based testing used when testing artifacts of the requirements, analysis, and design workflows
 - Execution based testing applied to only the source code of implementation workflow
 - Non execution based testing of code (code review) has been shown to be as effective as execution-based testing (running test cases)
- Execution-Based Testing
 - Organizations spend up to 50% of their software budget on testing
 - But delivered software is frequently unreliable
 - Testing is the process of *finding differences between the expected behavior and the observed behavior*
 - fault detection technique that tries to create failures or erroneous states in a planned way
 - A test is successful if it identifies faults or proves that no fault are present
 - What should be tested?
 - Correctness
 - Requirement satisfaction
 - Utility
 - Extent to which the product meets the user's needs
 - Ease of use, useful functionalities, cost effectiveness
 - Reliability
 - Measure of the frequency and criticality of failure
 - Robustness

- The range of operating conditions
- The possibility of unacceptable results with valid input
- The effect of invalid input
- Performance
 - Extent to which space and time constraints are met
 - Real and Hard time constraints, data loss because software is slow
- Who Should Perform Execution Based Testing?
 - Programming is constructive
 - Testing is destructive
 - A successful test finds a fault
 - So, programmers should not test their own code
 - Solution
 - The programmer does informal testing
 - The SQA group then does systematic testing
 - The programmer debugs the module
 - All test cases must be
 - Planned beforehand, including the expected output
 - Retained afterwards
- When Testing Stops
 - Only when the product has been irrevocably discarded