Introduction to Software Testing
(*2nd edition*)
Chapter 5

Criteria-Based Test Design

Paul Ammann & Jeff Offutt

http://www.cs.gmu.edu/~offutt/softwaretest/

20 September 2015

Changing Notions of Testing

- Old view focused on testing at each software development phase as being very different from other phases
  - Unit, module, integration, system …
- New view is in terms of structures and criteria
  - input space, graphs, logical expressions, syntax
- Test design is largely the same at each phase
  - Creating the model is different
  - Choosing values and automating the tests is different

Model-Driven Test Design



New : Test Coverage Criteria

A tester's job is simple : Define a model of the software, then find ways to cover it

- Test Requirements : A specific element of a software artifact that a test case must satisfy or cover

- Coverage Criterion : A rule or collection of rules that impose test requirements on a test set

Example : Jelly Bean Coverage

Flavors :

1. Lemon
2. Pistachio
3. Cantaloupe
4. Pear
5. Tangerine
6. Apricot

Colors :

1. Yellow (Lemon, Apricot)
2. Green (Pistachio)
3. Orange (Cantaloupe, Tangerine)
4. White (Pear)

- Possible coverage criteria :
  1. Taste one jelly bean of each flavor
     - Deciding if yellow jelly bean is Lemon or Apricot is a controllability problem
  2. Taste one jelly bean of each color

Test Coverage Criteria

Testing researchers have defined dozens of criteria, but they are all really just a few criteria on four types of structures …

Criteria Based on Structures

Structures : Four ways to model software

1. Input Domain Characterization (sets)

   A: {0, 1, >1}
   B: {600, 700, 800}
   C: {swe, cs, isa, infs}

2. Graphs



3. Logical Expressions

   (not X or not Y) and A and B

4. Syntactic Structures (grammars)

```
if (x > y)
    z = x - y;
else
   z = 2 * x;
```

1. Input Domain Characterization

- Describe the input domain of the software
  - Identify input parametrs
  - Partition each input into finite sets of representative values
  - Choose combinations of values
- Example
  - Parameters *F (int X, int Y)*
  - Possible values *X: { <0, 0, 1, 2, >2 }, Y : { 10, 20, 30 }*
  - Tests
    - *F (-5, 10), F (0, 20), F (1, 30), F (2, 10), F (5, 20)*

2. Graph Coverage

to test all nodes: num path = 2 = num reqsto test all edges: num path = 2 = num reqsto



This graph may represent

- **statements & branches**
- **methods & calls**
- **states and transitions**

Path

Cover every path

- **12567**
- **1257**
- **13567**
- **1357**
- **1343567**
- **134357 …**

3. Logical Expressions

((a > b) or G) and (x < y)

num clauses = 3If each clause must be tested with one False and one True values: num of requiremer

Transitions

Program Decision Statements

Software Specifications

Logical Expressions

3. Logical Expressions

$$((a > b) \text{ or } G) \text{ and } (x < y)$$

- **Example:**
  - **Predicate Coverage : Each predicate must be true and false**
    - *((a>b) or G) and (x < y)* = True, False
  - **Clause Coverage : Each clause must be true and false**
    - *(a > b)* = True, False
    - *G* = True, False
    - *(x < y)* = True, False

4. Syntactic Structures

- Based on a grammar, or other syntactic definition
- Primary example is mutation testing
  1. Induce small changes to the program: mutants
  2. Find tests that cause the mutant programs to fail: killing mutants
  3. **Killing mutants** is defined as different output from the original program
- In practice, if the software contains a fault, there will usually be a set of mutants that can only be killed by a test case that also detects that fault
- Example program and mutants

```
if (x > y)
   z = x - y;
else
   z = 2 * x;
```

```
if (x > y)
Δif (x >= y)
   z = x - y;
else
   z = 2 * x;
```

Coverage

Given a set of test requirements *TR* for coverage criterion *C*, a test set *T* satisfies *C* coverage if and only if for every test requirement *tr* in *TR*, there is at least one test *t* in *T* such that *t* satisfies *tr*

- Infeasible test requirements : test requirements that cannot be satisfied
  - No test case values exist that meet the test requirements
  - Example: Dead code
  - Detection of infeasible test requirements is formally undecidable for most test criteria
- Thus, 100% coverage is impossible in practice

More Jelly Beans

T1 = { three Lemons, one Pistachio, two Cantaloupes, one Pear, one Tangerine, four Apricots }

- Does test set T1 satisfy the flavor criterion ? ✓

T2 = { One Lemon, two Pistachios, one Pear, three Tangerines }

- Does test set T2 satisfy the flavor criterion ? ✗ c = 4 / 6 = 66%
- Does test set T2 satisfy the color criterion ? ✓

Coverage Level

The ratio of the number of test requirements satisfied by *T* to the size of *TR*

- T2 on the previous slide satisfies 4 of 6 test requirements

Comparing Criteria with Subsumption (5.2)

- Criteria Subsumption : A test criterion *C1* subsumes *C2* if and only if every set of test cases that satisfies criterion *C1* also satisfies *C2*
- Must be true for every set of test cases
- *Examples* :

ex: Nodes cannot subsume edges.

  - The flavor criterion on jelly beans subsumes the color criterion … if we taste every flavor we taste one of every color
  - If a test set has covered every branch in a program (satisfied the branch criterion), then the test set is guaranteed to also have covered every statement

Advantages of Criteria-Based Test Design (5.3)

- Criteria maximize the "bang for the buck"
  - Fewer tests that are more effective at finding faults
- Comprehensive test set with minimal overlap
- Traceability from software artifacts to tests
  - The "why" for each test is answered
  - Built-in support for regression testing
- A "stopping rule" for testing—advance knowledge of how many tests are needed
- Natural to automate

Criteria Summary

- Many companies still use "monkey testing"
  - A human sits at the keyboard, wiggles the mouse and bangs the keyboard
  - No automation
  - Minimal training required
- Some companies automate human-designed tests
- But companies that use both automation and criteria-based testing

Save money

Find more faults

Build better software

Structures for Criteria-Based Testing