



Goal

The first step to any formal process is **understanding the underlying domain**. Therefore, a systematic and rigorous understanding of software testing approaches is needed to develop formal tools to test software. In our specific case, our motivation was seeing **which kinds of testing can be generated automatically by Drasil**, “a framework for generating all of the software artifacts for (well understood) research software” [1].

Problem

Most software testing ontologies seem to focus on the high-level testing process rather than the testing techniques themselves. For example:

- [2] mainly focuses on parts of the testing process (e.g., test goal, testable entity)
- [3] provides a foundation for classification but “does not aim at providing a systematic and exhaustive state-of-the-art survey of [either domain]” (p. A:2)

Methodology

Since a taxonomy doesn’t already exist, we should create one!

- We started with an ad hoc approach, focusing on textbooks trusted at McMaster
- We then realized that this was too arbitrary, so we started from more established sources, such as IEEE and SWEBOK
- The goal of this approach is to iterate, eventually revisiting the original textbooks, until enough knowledge is built up to encounter diminishing returns (ideally no returns!)
- Since there are many standardized documents about software testing (or software in general), this should be trivial, no?

In Our Experience

NO.

Examples

[4] is a standard for general concepts related to software testing. However, it is not comprehensive. For example, as shown in Figure 1, most (55 out of 99) testing approaches mentioned in this standard do not have an accompanying definition! Eight of these were present in the previous version of this standard [5], and nine were present in another IEEE standard [6] that would have been available upon publication of this one. However, the presence of a definition does not guarantee that it is useful! See Figure 1 for some examples.




Figure 1: Breakdown of testing approach definitions from [4].

Figure 2: Some less-than-helpful definitions from [6].

Conclusions & Future Work

- Current software testing taxonomies are incomplete, inconsistent, and/or incorrect
- For one to be useful, it needs to be built systematically from a large body of established sources
- We will continue investigating how the literature defines and categorizes software testing approaches to analyze any discrepancies and structure these ideas coherently

References

[1] J. Carette, S. Smith, J. Balaci, T.-Y. Wu, S. Crawford, D. Chen, D. Szymczak, B. MacLachlan, D. Scime, and M. Niazi, “Drasil,” Feb. 2021.

[2] G. Tebes, L. Olsina, D. Peppino, and P. Becker, “TestTDO: A Top-Domain Software Testing Ontology,” (Curitiba, Brazil), pp. 364–377, May 2020.

[3] M. Unterkalmsteiner, R. Feldt, and T. Gorschek, “A Taxonomy for Requirements Engineering and Software Test Alignment,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, vol. 23, pp. 1–38, Mar. 2014, arXiv:2307.12477 [cs].

[4] ISO/IEC and IEEE, “ISO/IEC/IEEE International Standard - Systems and software engineering –Software testing –Part 1: General concepts,” *ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-1:2022(E)*, Jan. 2022.

[5] ISO/IEC and IEEE, “ISO/IEC/IEEE International Standard - Systems and software engineering –Software testing –Part 1: General concepts,” *ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-1:2013*, Sept. 2013.

[6] ISO/IEC and IEEE, “ISO/IEC/IEEE International Standard - Systems and software engineering–Vocabulary,” *ISO/IEC/IEEE 24765:2017(E)*, Sept. 2017.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Government of Ontario for OGS funding.