

Key Tradeoffs in High Volume Test Automation

Dan Hoffman

Driving Questions

- ▶ Is it better to use testing or source code review?
- ▶ Is it better to test through an API or the GUI?
- ▶ Is it better to test a GUI using capture/playback or manually?
- ▶ What is the small scope hypothesis?

C Input/output

<pre>#include <stdio.h> int main(int argc, char* argv[]) { int a,b; scanf("%d",&a); scanf("%d",&b); if (a < b) printf("Minimum: %d\n", a); else printf("Minimum: %d\n", b); return 0; }</pre>	Input/output	
	Command line arguments	
	Standard input	
	1 2	
Standard output		
Minimum: <input type="text"/>		
<input type="button" value="Previous"/>	<input type="button" value="Check answer"/>	<input type="button" value="Next"/>
Message:	Question 1 of 4 (1 Marks)	

C Bullseye

<pre>int binsearch(int x, int v[], int n) { int low = 0, high = n, mid; while (low <= high) { mid = (low + high) / 2; if (x < v[mid]) { high = mid - 1; } else if (x > v[mid]) { low = mid + 1; } else { return mid; } } return -1; } int main(int argc, char* argv[]) { int a[] = {1, 3, 5, 7, 9}; binsearch(<input type="text"/>, a, 5); binsearch(<input type="text"/>, a, 5); return 0; }</pre>	Bullseye
	Command line arguments
	Standard input
	Standard output

Message:	Question 3 of 4 (1 Marks)
-----------------	---------------------------

Hamming Codes

Fill in the bits for a valid Hamming code using **even** parity:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
0	0	0	0	1	0	1		0	1	0

Previous

Check answer

Next

Message:

Question 4 of 4 (1 Marks)

Hamming Code Example (Even Parity)

Message: 10010

0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
0001	0010	0011	0100	0101	0110	0111	1000	1001

Testing or Source Code Review?

```
def generate_code_word(message,parity):  
    ...  
    code_word = [None] * \  
        (get_code_word_length(len(message))+1)  
  
    data_bit_indexes = \  
        get_data_bit_indexes(len(code_word)-1)  
    m_i = 0  
    for d_i in data_bit_indexes:  
        code_word[d_i] = int(message[m_i])  
        m_i += 1  
    ...
```

Test GUI with Capture/playback or Manually?

```
http://localhost:8080/cqg/quiz?spec=test_hamming
```

```
---- screen
```

```
PF  A Hamming code question appears
```

```
PF  One column, with two full-width cells at bottom
```

```
PF  All cells have black border
```

```
---- bottom of screen
```

```
PF  Message cell is 1 line containing "Message: "
```

```
PF  "Check answer" button is present
```

Test Through API or GUI?

- ▶ Initially developed many automated GUI tests with Selenium
 - ▶ tedious to generate; still omitted many interesting cases
 - ▶ extremely tedious to maintain
- ▶ Switched focus: test only GUI/API data transfer
 - ▶ when student clicks check, does the API get the codeword?
 - ▶ after API checks answer does the GUI display the message?
- ▶ New tests simple to create and maintain
 - ▶ only four test cases in total

The Small Scope Hypothesis

Message	Parity	Code word
'0'	0	'000'
'1'	0	'111'
'00',	0	'00000'
'01',	0	'10011'
'10',	0	'11100'
'11',	0	'01111'
'000',	0	'000000'
'001',	0	'010101'
'010',	0	'100110'
'011',	0	'110011'
...

Driving Questions Revisited

- ▶ Is it better to use testing or source code review?
 - ▶ testing unless the fault class is hard to reveal with testing
 - ▶ or other benefits of review are desired
- ▶ Is it better to test through an API or the GUI?
 - ▶ API is better unless the GUI-to-API transfer is the test target
 - ▶ or there is no suitable API
- ▶ Is it better to test a GUI using capture/playback or manually?
 - ▶ capture/playback better unless test focus is look and feel
 - ▶ or GUI changes frequently and significantly
- ▶ What is the small scope hypothesis?
 - ▶ most of the bugs can be found by testing a program on all test inputs within some small scope