Assignment #4 Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technique | Comments |
| BVA Normal | Had statistics of ECT Strong Normal but more effort. |
| BVA Robust | 7th Best. Had effectiveness of BVA Worst Case by less efficiency. |
| BVA Worst Case | 6th Best. Had effectiveness of ECT Weak-Robust but more effort and less path coverage. |
| BVA Worst Case Robust | 3rd Best. Had exposed all faults and covered all paths but had more effort than special value and decision table combined. |
| ECT Weak-Normal | Worst. Little effort but horrible effectiveness and efficiency. |
| ECT Strong-Normal | 8th best. Had low effort and still exposed ok amount of faults and covered passable amount of paths. |
| ECT Weak-Robust | 4th best. Matches Statistics of Strong-Robust but had less effort |
| ECT Strong-Robust | 5th best. Exposed good amount of faults and covered good amount of all paths. Effort was okay. |
| Decision Table | 2nd best. Exposed all faults, covered all paths, but had more effort than special. |
| Special Value | Best one by far. Had least effort and great minimality and optimality, and exposed all faults and covered all paths |

So overall with my findings, here is what I felt about the testing techniques and my opinion on which one is better than which. My data showed me that with Special Value testing as long as the tester is experienced, all the paths can be covered and faults can be shown with very little effort. And that just because a lot of effort is required doesn’t mean that all the paths will be covered (ECT Worst Case Robust) nor faults exposed (BVA Worst Case)