### Lecture 6

OCL Use cases: managing requirements

> Testing Reusable Software Object-Based Software Object-Oriented Software Collaborations

### Testing Object-Based Software: chapter 21

- OO without inheritance and virtual functions
- classes with data and function members
- pre- and post-conditions for methods, class invariants (design by contract: book is not precise here!)

### Subsystem Size and Test Implementation

- Class: smallest reasonable subsystem
  - testing methods in isolation: would require stubs
  - but we are looking for interaction errors
  - class too small a test unit

### Groups of classes

- Often designed to work together
- Test them together
- Often have their own collective invariant

- Three classes
  - Object\_to\_be\_displayed, Visual\_representation,
- Invariant
  - any object to be displayed has at most one

keyboard controllers

• Makes no sense to test in isolation

### Testing a group of methods of a

- Will often still test group of classes since methods use other classes
- Create pairs of sequences which are supposed to give same object
  - example: o1 and o2 should be the same

# Class Requirement Catalog (21.3)

• Integration requirements should be listed once and for all in a class requirement catalog for "important" classes

# Organization of class requirement catalog

- Object use requirements
- State machine requirements
- Member function requirements

# Organization of class requirement catalog

from class invariant: useful independent of member function called

if class has state machine or statechart

- Member function requirements – preconditions,
- Collaborations of objects



- Inheritance structure of object-oriented software leads to inheritance structure in test design documents
  - Class A => Extended Class A1
  - A test requirements => A1 test requirements
  - A test specifications => A1 test specifications









## Test requirement checklist for subclass

#### • B inherits from A

```
class A {
  public:
        virtual void member1();
        virtual void member2();
  protected:
        Count count1;
        Count count2;}
  class B : public A {
  public:
        void member1();
        void member2()
  protected:
        Count count3;}
```



### What is gained?

• New checklist for B contains only requirements for new code and inherited code affected by the change: might require much less work than testing B from scratch

### Reuse tests for superclass

Tests for A may satisfy some of the new test requirements: saving test specifications Can be a cheap way to exercise B thoroughly

### Design for Testability

- Implementation of concrete class must obey constraints described by its abstract superclass.
  - Constraint checks
    - self-check functions
  - Trace checks
    - check effects of a sequence of operations



Are all cardinality constraints satisfied?

• Self-check functions are also very useful during debugging: Demeter/C++





### Testing collaborations

- Testing as an opportunity to improve the design
- How to describe the improved the design which is used to develop the test requirements and the test specifications
- This is a common theme: have to develop a model of the software under test



### Modeling collaborations

- Write down group of collaborating classes
- Separate code for pure navigation through classes from code which does interesting work
- Write test requirements for navigation
  does code go to right objects in correct order?
- Write test requirements for interesting code

### Modeling collaborations

- Do similar collaborations occur for similar sets of collaborating classes? They may have completely different names and different detailed connections but the connectivity relationships at a suitable level of abstraction are identical
- Study paper on modeling collaborations