Chapter 9

Test Case Selection and Adequacy

A key problem in software testing is selecting and evaluating test cases. This chapter introduces basic approaches to test case selection and corresponding adequacy criteria. This chapter serves as a general introduction to the problem and provides a conceptual framework for functional and structural approaches described in subsequent chapters.

Required Background

- Chapter 2
  The fundamental problems and limitations of test case selection are a consequence of the undecidability of program properties. A grasp of the basic problem is useful in understanding Section 9.3.

9.1 Overview

Experience suggests that software that has passed a thorough set of systematic tests is likely to be more dependable than software that has been only superficially or haphazardly tested. Surely we should require that each software module or subsystem undergo thorough, systematic testing before being incorporated into the main product. But what do we mean by thorough testing? What is the criterion by which we can judge the adequacy of a suite of tests that a software artifact has passed?

Ideally we should like an “adequate” test suite to be one that ensures correctness of the product. Unfortunately, that goal is not attainable. The difficulty of proving that some set of test cases is adequate in this sense is equivalent to the difficulty of proving that the program is correct. In other words, we could have “adequate” testing in this sense only if we could establish correctness without any testing at all.

In practice we settle for criteria that identify inadequacies in test suites. For example, if the specification describes different treatment in two cases, but the test suite does not check that the two cases are in fact treated differently, then we may conclude
that the test suite is inadequate to guard against faults in the program logic. If no test in the test suite executes a particular program statement, we might similarly conclude that the test suite is inadequate to guard against faults in that statement. We may use a whole set of (in)adequacy criteria, each of which draws on some source of information about the program and imposes a set of obligations that an adequate set of test cases ought to satisfy. If a test suite fails to satisfy some criterion, the obligation that has not been satisfied may provide some useful information about improving the test suite. If a set of test cases satisfies all the obligations by all the criteria, we still do not know definitively that it is a well-designed and effective test suite, but we have at least some evidence of its thoroughness.

9.2 Test Specifications and Cases

A test case includes not only input data but also any relevant execution conditions and procedures, and a way of determining whether the program has passed or failed the test on a particular execution. The term “input” is used in a very broad sense, which may include all kinds of stimuli that contribute to determining program behavior. For example, an interrupt is as much an input as is a file. The pass/fail criterion might be given in the form of expected output, but could also be some other way of determining whether a particular program execution is correct.

A test case specification is a requirement to be satisfied by one or more actual test cases. The distinction between a test case specification and a test case is similar to the distinction between a program specification and a program. A test case specification might be met by several different test cases, and vice versa. Suppose, for example, we are testing a program that sorts a sequence of words. “The input is two or more words” would be a test case specification, while test cases with the input values “alpha beta” and “Milano Paris London” would be two among many test cases satisfying the test case specification. A test case with input “Milano Paris London” would satisfy both the test case specification “the input is two or more words” and the test case specification “the input contains a mix of lower- and upper-case alphabetic characters.”

Characteristics of the input are not the only thing that might be mentioned in a test case specification. A complete test case specification includes pass/fail criteria for judging test execution and may include requirements, drawn from any of several sources of information, such as system, program, and module interface specifications; source code or detailed design of the program itself; and records of faults encountered in other software systems.

Test specifications drawn from system, program, and module interface specifications often describe program inputs, but they can just as well specify any observable behavior that could appear in specifications. For example, the specification of a database system might require certain kinds of robust failure recovery in case of power loss, and test specifications might therefore require removing system power at certain critical points in processing. If a specification describes inputs and outputs, a test specification could prescribe aspects of the input, the output, or both. If the specification is modeled as an extended finite-state machine, it might require executions corresponding to particular transitions or paths in the state-machine model. The general term for such
Testing Terms

While the informal meanings of words like “test” may be adequate for everyday conversation, in this context we must try to use terms in a more precise and consistent manner. Unfortunately, the terms we will need are not always used consistently in the literature, despite the existence of an IEEE standard that defines several of them. The terms we will use are defined below.

Test case: A test case is a set of inputs, execution conditions, and a pass/fail criterion. (This usage follows the IEEE standard.)

Test case specification: A test case specification is a requirement to be satisfied by one or more actual test cases. (This usage follows the IEEE standard.)

Test obligation: A test obligation is a partial test case specification, requiring some property deemed important to thorough testing. We use the term “obligation” to distinguish the requirements imposed by a test adequacy criterion from more complete test case specifications.

Test suite: A test suite is a set of test cases. Typically, a method for functional testing is concerned with creating a test suite. A test suite for a program, system, or individual unit may be made up of several test suites for individual modules, subsystems, or features. (This usage follows the IEEE standard.)

Test or test execution: We use the term test or test execution to refer to the activity of executing test cases and evaluating their results. When we refer to “a test,” we mean execution of a single test case, except where context makes it clear that the reference is to execution of a whole test suite. (The IEEE standard allows this and other definitions.)

Adequacy criterion: A test adequacy criterion is a predicate that is true (satisfied) or false (not satisfied) of a ⟨program, test suite⟩ pair. Usually a test adequacy criterion is expressed in the form of a rule for deriving a set of test obligations from another artifact, such as a program or specification. The adequacy criterion is then satisfied if every test obligation is satisfied by at least one test case in the suite.
Test specifications is “functional testing,” although the term “black-box testing” and more specific terms like “specification-based testing” and “model-based testing” are also used.

Test specifications drawn from program source code require coverage of particular elements in the source code or some model derived from it. For example, we might require a test case that traverses a loop one or more times. The general term for testing based on program structure is “structural testing,” although the term “white-box testing” or “glass-box testing” is sometimes used.

Previously encountered faults can be an important source of information regarding useful test cases. For example, if previous products have encountered failures or security breaches due to buffer overflows, we may formulate test requirements specifically to check handling of inputs that are too large to fit in provided buffers. These fault-based test specifications usually draw also from interface specifications, design models, or source code, but add test requirements that might not have been otherwise considered. A common form of fault-based testing is fault-seeding, purposely inserting faults in source code and then measuring the effectiveness of a test suite in finding the seeded faults, on the theory that a test suite that finds seeded faults is likely also to find other faults.

Test specifications need not fall cleanly into just one of the categories. For example, test specifications drawn from a model of a program might be considered specification-based if the model is produced during program design, or structural if it is derived from the program source code.

Consider the Java method of Figure 9.1. We might apply a general rule that requires using an empty sequence wherever a sequence appears as an input; we would thus create a test case specification (a test obligation) that requires the empty string as input. If we are selecting test cases structurally, we might create a test obligation that requires the first clause of the if statement on line 15 to evaluate to true and the second clause to evaluate to false, and another test obligation on which it is the second clause that must evaluate to true and the first that must evaluate to false.

9.3 Adequacy Criteria

We have already noted that adequacy criteria are really imperfect but useful indicators of inadequacies, so we may not always wish to use them directly to generate test specifications from which actual test cases are drawn. We will use the term “test obligation” for test specifications imposed by adequacy criteria, to distinguish them from test specifications that are actually used to derive test cases. Thus, the usual situation will be that a set of test cases (a test suite) is created using a set of test specifications, but then the adequacy of that test suite is measured using a different set of test obligations.

We say a test suite satisfies an adequacy criterion if all the tests succeed and if every test obligation in the criterion is satisfied by at least one of the test cases in the test suite. For example, the statement coverage adequacy criterion is satisfied by a particular test suite for a particular program if each executable statement in the program

---

1 Constructing and using catalogs of general rules like this is described in Chapter 10.
/**
 * Remove/collapse multiple spaces.
 * @param String string to remove multiple spaces from.
 * @return String
 */

public static String collapseSpaces(String argStr)
{
    char last = argStr.charAt(0);
    StringBuffer argBuf = new StringBuffer();

    for (int cldx = 0 ; cldx < argStr.length(); cldx++)
    {
        char ch = argStr.charAt(cldx);
        if (ch != ' ' || last != ' ')
        {
            argBuf.append(ch);
            last = ch;
        }
    }

    return argBuf.toString();
}

Figure 9.1: A Java method for collapsing sequences of blanks, excerpted from the StringUUtils class of Velocity version 1.3.1, an Apache Jakarta project. (c) Apache Group, used by permission.
(i.e., excluding comments and declarations) is executed by at least one test case in the test suite. A fault-based adequacy criterion that seeds a certain set of faults would be satisfied if, for each of the seeded faults, there is a test case that passes for the original program but fails for the program with (only) that seeded fault.

It is quite possible that no test suite will satisfy a particular test adequacy criterion for a particular program. For example, if the program contains statements that can never be executed (perhaps because it is part of a sanity check that can be executed only if some other part of the program is faulty), then no test suite can satisfy the statement coverage criterion. Analogous situations arise regardless of the sources of information used in devising test adequacy criteria. For example, a specification-based criterion may require combinations of conditions drawn from different parts of the specification, but not all combinations may be possible.

One approach to overcoming the problem of unsatisfiable test obligations is to simply exclude any unsatisfiable obligation from a criterion. For example, the statement coverage criterion can be modified to require execution only of statements that can be executed. The question of whether a particular statement or program path is executable, or whether a particular combination of clauses in a specification is satisfiable, or whether a program with a seeded error actually behaves differently from the original program, are all provably undecidable in the general case. Thus, while tools may be some help in distinguishing feasible from infeasible test obligations, in at least some cases the distinction will be left to fallible human judgment.

If the number of infeasible test obligations is modest, it can be practical to identify each of them, and to ameliorate human fallibility through peer review. If the number of infeasible test obligations is large, it becomes impractical to carefully reason about each to avoid excusing an obligation that really is feasible, though difficult to satisfy. A common practice is to measure the extent to which a test suite approaches an adequacy criterion. For example, if an adequacy criterion based on control flow paths in a program unit induced 100 distinct test obligations, and a test suite satisfied 85 of those obligations, then we would say that we had reached 85% coverage of the test obligations.

Quantitative measures of test coverage are widely used in industry. They are simple and cheap to calculate, provide some indication of progress toward thorough testing, and project an aura of objectivity. In managing software development, anything that produces a number can be seductive. One must never forget that coverage is a rough proxy measure for the thoroughness and effectiveness of test suites. The danger, as with any proxy measure of some underlying goal, is the temptation to improve the proxy measure in a way that does not actually contribute to the goal. If, for example, 80% coverage of some adequacy criterion is required to declare a work assignment complete, developers under time pressure will almost certainly yield to the temptation to design tests specifically to that criterion, choosing the simplest test cases that achieve the required coverage level. One cannot entirely avoid such distortions, but to the extent possible one should guard against them by ensuring that the ultimate measure of performance is preventing faults from surviving to later stages of development or deployment.
9.4 Comparing Criteria

It would be useful to know whether one test adequacy criterion was more effective than another in helping find program faults, and whether its extra effectiveness was worthwhile with respect to the extra effort expended to satisfy it. One can imagine two kinds of answers to such a question, empirical and analytical. An empirical answer would be based on extensive studies of the effectiveness of different approaches to testing in industrial practice, including controlled studies to determine whether the relative effectiveness of different testing methods depends on the kind of software being tested, the kind of organization in which the software is developed and tested, and a myriad of other potential confounding factors. The empirical evidence available falls short of providing such clear-cut answers. An analytical answer to questions of relative effectiveness would describe conditions under which one adequacy criterion is guaranteed to be more effective than another, or describe in statistical terms their relative effectiveness.

Analytic comparisons of the strength of test coverage depend on a precise definition of what it means for one criterion to be “stronger” or “more effective” than another. Let us first consider single test suites. In absence of specific information, we cannot exclude the possibility that any test case can reveal a failure. A test suite $T_A$ that does not include all the test cases of another test suite $T_B$ may fail revealing the potential failure exposed by the test cases that are in $T_B$ but not in $T_A$. Thus, if we consider only the guarantees that a test suite provides, the only way for one test suite $T_A$ to be stronger than another suite $T_B$ is to include all test cases of $T_B$ plus additional ones.

Many different test suites might satisfy the same coverage criterion. To compare criteria, then, we consider all the possible ways of satisfying the criteria. If every test suite that satisfies some criterion $A$ is a superset of some test suite that satisfies criterion $B$, or equivalently, every suite that satisfies $A$ also satisfies $B$, then we can say that $A$ “subsumes” $B$.

Test coverage criterion $A$ subsumes test coverage criterion $B$ iff, for every program $P$, every test set satisfying $A$ with respect to $P$ also satisfies $B$ with respect to $P$.

In this case, if we satisfy criterion $C_1$, there is no point in measuring adequacy with respect to $C_2$. For example, a structural criterion that requires exploring all outcomes of conditional branches subsumes statement coverage. Likewise, a specification-based criterion that requires use of a set of possible values for attribute $A$ and, independently, for attribute $B$, will be subsumed by a criterion that requires all combinations of those values.

Consider again the example of Figure 9.1. Suppose we apply an adequacy criterion that imposes an obligation to execute each statement in the method. This criterion can be met by a test suite containing a single test case, with the input value (value of argStr) being “doesn’tEvenHaveSpaces.” Requiring both the true and false branches of each test to be taken subsumes the previous criterion, and forces us to at least provide an input with a space that is not copied to the output, but it can still be satisfied by a suite with just one test case. We might add a requirement that the loop be iterated zero times, once, and several times, thus requiring a test suite with at least three test cases. The obligation to execute the loop body zero times would force us to add a test case with the
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empty string as input, and like the specification-based obligation to consider an empty sequence, this would reveal a fault in the code.

Should we consider a more demanding adequacy criterion, as indicated by the subsumes relation among criteria, to be a better criterion? The answer would be “yes” if we were comparing the guarantees provided by test adequacy criteria: If criterion $A$ subsumes criterion $B$, and if any test suite satisfying $B$ in some program is guaranteed to find a particular fault, then any test suite satisfying $A$ is guaranteed to find the same fault in the program. This is not as good as it sounds, though. Twice nothing is nothing. Adequacy criteria do not provide useful guarantees for fault detection, so comparing guarantees is not a useful way to compare criteria.

A better statistical measure of test effectiveness is whether the probability of finding at least one program fault is greater when using one test coverage criterion than another. Of course, such statistical measures can be misleading if some test coverage criteria require much larger numbers of test cases than others. It is hardly surprising if a criterion that requires at least 300 test cases for program $P$ is more effective, on average, than a criterion that requires at least 50 test cases for the same program. It would be better to know, if we have 50 test cases that satisfy criterion $B$, is there any value in finding 250 test cases to finish satisfying the “stronger” criterion $A$, or would it be just as profitable to choose the additional 250 test cases at random?

Although theory does not provide much guidance, empirical studies of particular test adequacy criteria do suggest that there is value in pursuing stronger criteria, particularly when the level of coverage attained is very high. Whether the extra value of pursuing a stronger adequacy criterion is commensurate with the cost almost certainly depends on a plethora of particulars, and can only be determined by monitoring results in individual organizations.

Open research issues

There has been a good deal of theoretical research on what one can conclude about test effectiveness from test adequacy criteria. Most of the results are negative: In general, one cannot be certain that a test suite that meets any practical test adequacy criterion ensures correctness, or even that it is more effective at finding faults than another test suite that does not meet the criterion. While theoretical characterization of test adequacy criteria and their properties was once an active research area, interest has waned, and it is likely that future theoretical progress must begin with a quite different conception of the fundamental goals of a theory of test adequacy.

The trend in research is toward empirical, rather than theoretical, comparison of the effectiveness of particular test selection techniques and test adequacy criteria. Empirical approaches to measuring and comparing effectiveness are still at an early stage. A major open problem is to determine when, and to what extent, the results of an empirical assessment can be expected to generalize beyond the particular programs and test suites used in the investigation. While empirical studies have to a large extent displaced theoretical investigation of test effectiveness, in the longer term useful empirical investigation will require its own theoretical framework.
Further Reading

Goodenough and Gerhart made the original attempt to formulate a theory of “adequate” testing [GG75]; Weyuker and Ostrand extended this theory to consider when a set of test obligations is adequate to ensure that a program fault is revealed [WO80]. Gourlay’s exposition of a mathematical framework for adequacy criteria is among the most lucid developments of purely analytic characterizations [Gou83]. Hamlet and Taylor show that, if one takes statistical confidence in (absolute) program correctness as the goal, none of the standard coverage testing techniques improve on random testing [HT90], from which an appropriate conclusion is that confidence in absolute correctness is not a reasonable goal of systematic testing. Frankl and Iakounenko’s study of test effectiveness [FI98] is a good example of the development of empirical methods for assessing the practical effectiveness of test adequacy criteria.

Related Topics

Test adequacy criteria and test selection techniques can be categorized by the sources of information they draw from. Functional testing draws from program and system specifications, and is described in Chapters 10, 11, and 14. Structural testing draws from the structure of the program or system, and is described in Chapters 12 and 13. The techniques for testing object-oriented software described in Chapter 15 draw on both functional and structural approaches. Selection and adequacy criteria based on consideration of hypothetical program faults are described in Chapter 16.

Exercises

9.1. Deterministic finite state machines (FSMs), with states representing classes of program states and transitions representing external inputs and observable program actions or outputs, are sometimes used in modeling system requirements. We can design test cases consisting of sequences of program inputs that trigger FSM transitions and the predicted program actions expected in response. We can also define test coverage criteria relative to such a model. Which of the following coverage criteria subsume which others?

**State coverage:** For each state in the FSM model, there is a test case that visits that state.

**Transition coverage:** For each transition in the FSM model, there is a test case that traverses that transition.

**Path coverage:** For all finite-length subpaths from a distinguished start state in the FSM model, there is at least one test case that includes a corresponding subpath.

**State-pair coverage:** For each state \( r \) in the FSM model, for each state \( s \) reachable from \( r \) along some sequence of transitions, there is at least one test case that passes through state \( r \) and then reaches state \( s \).
9.2. Adequacy criteria may be derived from specifications (functional criteria) or code (structural criteria). The presence of infeasible elements in a program may make it impossible to obtain 100% coverage. Since we cannot possibly cover infeasible elements, we might define a coverage criterion to require 100% coverage of feasible elements (e.g., execution of all program statements that can actually be reached in program execution). We have noted that feasibility of program elements is undecidable in general. Suppose we instead are using a functional test adequacy criterion, based on logical conditions describing inputs and outputs. It is still possible to have infeasible elements (logical condition $A$ might be inconsistent with logical condition $B$, making the conjunction $A \land B$ infeasible). Would you expect distinguishing feasible from infeasible elements to be easier or harder for functional criteria, compared to structural criteria? Why?

9.3. Suppose test suite $A$ satisfies adequacy criterion $C_1$. Test suite $B$ satisfies adequacy criterion $C_2$, and $C_2$ subsumes $C_1$. Can we be certain that faults revealed by $A$ will also be revealed by $B$?
Chapter 10

Functional Testing

A functional specification is a description of intended program behavior, distinct from the program itself. Whatever form the functional specification takes — whether formal or informal — it is the most important source of information for designing tests. Deriving test cases from program specifications is called functional testing.

Functional testing, or more precisely, functional test case design, attempts to answer the question “What test cases shall I use to exercise my program?” considering only the specification of a program and not its design or implementation structure. Being based on program specifications and not on the internals of the code, functional testing is also called specification-based or black-box testing.

Functional testing is typically the base-line technique for designing test cases, for a number of reasons. Functional test case design can (and should) begin as part of the requirements specification process, and continue through each level of design and interface specification; it is the only test design technique with such wide and early applicability. Moreover, functional testing is effective in finding some classes of fault that typically elude so-called “white-box” or “glass-box” techniques of structural or fault-based testing. Functional testing techniques can be applied to any description of program behavior, from an informal partial description to a formal specification, and at any level of granularity from module to system testing. Finally, functional test cases are typically less expensive to design and execute than white-box tests.

10.1 Overview

In testing and analysis aimed at verification — that is, at finding any discrepancies between what a program does and what it is intended to do — one must obviously refer to requirements as expressed by users and specified by software engineers. A

1We use the term “program” generically for the artifact under test, whether that artifact is a complete application or an individual unit together with a test harness. This is consistent with usage in the testing research literature.

2Here we focus on software verification as opposed to validation (see Chapter 2). The problems of validating the software and its specifications, i.e., checking the program behavior and its specifications with respect to the users’ expectations, is treated in Chapter 22.
functional specification, i.e., a description of the expected behavior of the program, is the primary source of information for test case specification.

Functional testing, also known as black-box or specification-based testing, denotes techniques that derive test cases from functional specifications. Usually functional testing techniques produce test case specifications that identify classes of test cases and are instantiated to produce individual test cases.

The core of functional test case design is partitioning the possible behaviors of the program into a finite number of homogeneous classes, where each such class reasonably be expected consistently to be correct or incorrect. In practice, the test case designer often must also complete the job of formalizing the specification far enough to serve as the basis for identifying classes of behaviors. An important side benefit of test design is highlighting weaknesses and incompleteness of program specifications.

Deriving functional test cases is an analytical process which decomposes specifications into test cases. The myriad aspects that must be taken into account during functional test case specification makes the process error prone. Even expert test designers can miss important test cases. A methodology for functional test design helps by decomposing the functional test design process into elementary steps. In this way, it is possible to control the complexity of the process and separate human intensive activities from activities that can be automated.

Sometimes, functional testing can be fully automated. This is possible for example when specifications are given in terms of some formal model, e.g., a grammar or an extended state machine specification. In these (exceptional) cases, the creative work is performed during specification and design of the software. The test designer's job is then limited to the choice of the test selection criteria, which defines the strategy for generating test case specifications. In most cases, however, functional test design is a human intensive activity. For example, when test designers must work from informal specifications written in natural language, much of the work is in structuring the specification adequately for identifying test cases.

### 10.2 Random versus Partition Testing Strategies

With few exceptions, the number of potential test cases for a given program is unimaginably huge — so large that for all practical purposes it can be considered infinite. For example, even a simple function whose input arguments are two 32-bit integers has $2^{64} \approx 10^{19}$ legal inputs. In contrast to input spaces, budgets and schedules are finite, so any practical method for testing must select an infinitesimal small portion of the complete input space.

Some test cases are better than others, in the sense that some reveal faults and others do not. Of course, we cannot know in advance which test cases reveal faults. At a minimum, though, we can observe that running the same test case again is less likely

---

3We are using the term “partition” in a common but rather sloppy sense. A true partition would form disjoint classes, the union of which is the entire space. Partition testing separates the behaviors or input space into classes whose union is the entire space, but the classes may not be disjoint.

4Note that the relative value of different test cases would be quite different if our goal were to measure dependability, rather than finding faults so that they can be repaired.
Functional vs. Structural Testing

Test cases and test suites can be derived from several sources of information, including specifications (functional and model-based testing), detailed design and source code (structural testing), and hypothesized defects (fault-based testing). Functional test case design is an indispensable base of a good test suite, complemented but never replaced by structural and fault-based testing, because there are classes of faults that only functional testing effectively detects. Omission of a feature, for example, is unlikely to be revealed by techniques which refer only to the code structure.

Consider a program that is supposed to accept files in either plain ASCII text, or HTML, or PDF formats and generate standard Postscript. Suppose the programmer overlooks the PDF functionality, so the program accepts only plain text and HTML files. Intuitively, a functional testing criterion would require at least one test case for each item in the specification, regardless of the implementation, i.e., it would require the program to be exercised with at least one ASCII, one HTML, and one PDF file, thus easily revealing the failure due to the missing code. In contrast, criteria based solely on the code would not require the program to be exercised with a PDF file, since each part of the code can be exercised without attempting to use that feature. Similarly, fault-based techniques, based on potential faults in design or coding, would not have any reason to indicate a PDF file as a potential input even if “missing case” were included in the catalog of potential faults.

Functional specifications often address semantically rich domains, and we can use domain information in addition to the cases explicitly enumerated in the program specification. For example, while a program may manipulate a string of up to nine alphanumeric characters, the program specification may reveal that these characters represent a postal code, which immediately suggests test cases based on postal codes of various localities. Suppose the program logic distinguishes only two cases, depending on whether they are found in a table of U.S. zip codes. A structural testing criterion would require testing of valid and invalid U.S. zip codes, but only consideration of the specification and richer knowledge of the domain would suggest test cases that reveal missing logic for distinguishing between U.S.-bound mail with invalid U.S. zip codes and mail bound for other countries.

Functional testing can be applied at any level of granularity where some form of specification is available, from overall system testing to individual units, although the level of granularity and the type of software influence the choice of the specification styles and notations, and consequently the functional testing techniques that can be used.

In contrast, structural and fault-based testing techniques are invariably tied to program structures at some particular level of granularity, and do not scale much beyond that level. The most common structural testing techniques are tied to fine-grain program structures (statements, classes, etc.) and are applicable only at the level of modules or small collections of modules (small subsystems, components, or libraries).
to reveal a fault than running a different test case, and we may reasonably hypothesize that a test case that is very different from the test cases that precede it is more valuable than a test case that is very similar (in some sense yet to be defined) to others.

As an extreme example, suppose we are allowed to select only three test cases for a program that breaks a text buffer into lines of 60 characters each. Suppose the first test case is a buffer containing 40 characters, and the second is a buffer containing 30 characters. As a final test case, we can choose a buffer containing 16 characters or a buffer containing 100 characters. Although we cannot prove that the 100 character buffer is the better test case (and it might not be; the fact that 16 is a power of 2 might have some unforeseen significance), we are naturally suspicious of a set of tests which is strongly biased toward lengths less than 60.

Accidental bias may be avoided by choosing test cases from a random distribution. Random sampling is often an inexpensive way to produce a large number of test cases. If we assume absolutely no knowledge on which to place a higher value on one test case than another, then random sampling maximizes value by maximizing the number of test cases that can be created (without bias) for a given budget. Even if we do possess some knowledge suggesting that some cases are more valuable than others, the efficiency of random sampling may in some cases outweigh its inability to use any knowledge we may have.

Consider again the line-break program, and suppose that our budget is one day of testing effort rather than some arbitrary number of test cases. If the cost of random selection and actual execution of test cases is small enough, then we may prefer to run a large number of random test cases rather than expending more effort on each of a smaller number of test cases. We may in a few hours construct programs that generate buffers with various contents and lengths up to a few thousand characters, as well as an automated procedure for checking the program output. Letting it run unattended overnight, we may execute a few million test cases. If the program does not correctly handle a buffer containing a sequence of more than 60 non-blank characters (a single "word" that does not fit on a line), we are likely to encounter this case by sheer luck if we execute enough random tests, even without having explicitly considered this case.

Even a few million test cases is an infinitesimal fraction of the complete input space of most programs. Large numbers of random tests are unlikely to find failures at single points (singularities) in the input space. Consider, for example, a simple procedure for returning the two roots of a quadratic equation $ax^2 + bx + c = 0$ and suppose we choose test inputs (values of the coefficients $a$, $b$, and $c$) from a uniform distribution ranging from $-10.0$ to $10.0$. While uniform random sampling would certainly cover cases in which $b^2 - 4ac > 0$ (where the equation has no real roots), it would be very unlikely to test the case in which $a = 0$ and $b = 0$, in which case a naive implementation of the quadratic formula

$$x = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}$$

will divide by zero (see Figure 10.1).

Of course, it is unlikely that anyone would test only with random values. Regardless of the overall testing strategy, most test designers will also try some "special" values. The test designer's intuition comports with the observation that random sam-
/** Find the two roots of ax^2 + bx + c, 
* that is, the values of x for which the result is 0. 
*/
class Roots {
    double root_one, root_two;
    int num_roots;
    public roots(double a, double b, double c) {
        double q;
        double r;
        // Apply the textbook quadratic formula:
        // Roots = -b +- sqrt(b^2 - 4ac) / 2a
        q = b*b - 4*a*c;
        if (q > 0 && a != 0) {
            // If b^2 > 4ac, there are two distinct roots
            num_roots = 2;
            r = Math.sqrt(q);
            root_one = ((0-b) + r)/(2*a);
            root_two = ((0-b) - r)/(2*a);
        } else if (q==0) {
            // The equation has exactly one root
            num_roots = 1;
            root_one = (0-b)/(2*a);
            root_two = root_one;
        } else {
            // The equation has no roots if b^2 < 4ac
            num_roots = 0;
            root_one = -1;
            root_two = root_one;
        }
    }
    public int num_roots() { return num_roots; }
    public double first_root() { return root_one; }
    public double second_root() { return root_two; }
}

Figure 10.1: The Java class “roots,” which finds roots of a quadratic equation. The
case analysis in the implementation is incomplete: It does not properly handle the case
in which b^2 - 4ac = 0 and a = 0. We cannot anticipate all such faults, but experience
teaches that boundary values identifiable in a specification are disproportionately valu-
able. Uniform random generation of even large numbers of test cases is ineffective at
finding the fault in this program, but selection of a few “special values” based on the
specification quickly uncovers it.
pling is an ineffective way to find singularities in a large input space. The observation about singularities can be generalized to any characteristic of input data that defines an infinitesimally small portion of the complete input data space. If again we have just three real-valued inputs \( a, b, \) and \( c \), there is an infinite number of choices for which \( b = c \), but random sampling is unlikely to generate any of them because they are an infinitesimal part of the complete input data space.

The observation about special values and random samples is by no means limited to numbers. Consider again, for example, breaking a text buffer into lines. Since line breaks are permitted at blanks, we would consider blanks a “special” value for this problem. While random sampling from the character set is likely to produce a buffer containing a sequence of at least 60 non-blank characters, it is much less likely to produce a sequence of 60 blanks.

The reader may justifiably object that a reasonable test designer would not create text buffer test cases by sampling uniformly from the set of all characters, but would instead classify characters depending on their treatment, lumping alphabetic characters into one class and white space characters into another. In other words, a test designer will partition the input space into classes, and will then generate test data in a manner that is likely to choose data from each partition. Test designers seldom use pure random sampling; usually they exploit some knowledge of application semantics to choose samples that are more likely to include “special” or trouble-prone regions of the input space.

Partition testing separates the input space into classes whose union is the entire space, but the classes may not be disjoint (and thus the term “partition” is not mathematically accurate, although it has become established in testing terminology). Figure 10.2 illustrates a desirable case: All inputs that lead to a failure belong to at least one class that contains only inputs that lead to failures. In this case, sampling each class in the quasi-partition selects at least one input that leads to a failure, revealing the fault. We could easily turn the quasi-partition of Figure 10.2 into a true partition, by considering intersections among the classes, but sampling in a true partition would not improve the efficiency or effectiveness of testing.

A testing method that divides the infinite set of possible test cases into a finite set of classes, with the purpose of drawing one or more test cases from each class, is called a partition testing method. When partitions are chosen according to information in the specification, rather than the design or implementation, it is called specification-based partition testing, or more briefly, functional testing. Note that not all testing of product functionality is “functional testing.” Rather, the term is used specifically to refer to systematic testing based on a functional specification. It excludes ad hoc and random testing, as well as testing based on the structure of a design or implementation.

Partition testing typically increases the cost of each test case, since in addition to generation of a set of classes, creation of test cases from each class may be more expensive than generating random test data. In consequence, partition testing usually produces fewer test cases than random testing for the same expenditure of time and money. Partitioning can therefore be advantageous only if the average value (fault-detection effectiveness) is greater.

If we were able to group together test cases with such perfect knowledge that the outcome of test cases in each class were uniform (either all successes, or all failures),
then partition testing would be at its theoretical best. In general we cannot do that, nor
even quantify the uniformity of classes of test cases. Partitioning by any means, includ-
ing specification-based partition testing, is always based on experience and judgment
that leads one to believe that certain classes of test case are “more alike” than others,
in the sense that failure-prone test cases are likely to be concentrated in some classes.
When we appealed above to the test designer’s intuition that one should try boundary
cases and special values, we were actually appealing to a combination of experience
(many failures occur at boundary and special cases) and knowledge that identifiable
cases in the specification often correspond to classes of input that require different
treatment by an implementation.

Given a fixed budget, the optimum may not lie in only partition testing or only
random testing, but in some mix that makes use of available knowledge. For example,
consider again the simple numeric problem with three inputs, $a$, $b$, and $c$. We might
consider a few special cases of each input, individually and in combination, and we
might consider also a few potentially-significant relationships (e.g., $a = b$). If no faults
are revealed by these few test cases, there is little point in producing further arbitrary
partitions — one might then turn to random generation of a large number of test cases.

10.3 A Systematic Approach

Deriving test cases from functional specifications is a complex analytical process that
partitions the input space described by the program specification. Brute force gen-
eration of test cases, i.e., direct generation of test cases from program specifications,
seldom produces acceptable results: Test cases are generated without particular criteria

Figure 10.2: A quasi-partition of a program’s input space. Black circles represent
inputs that lead to failures. All elements of the input domain belong to at least one
class, but classes are not disjoint.
and determining the adequacy of the generated test cases is almost impossible. Brute force generation of test cases relies on test designers’ expertise and is a process that is difficult to monitor and repeat. A systematic approach simplifies the overall process by dividing it into elementary steps, thus decoupling different activities, dividing brain intensive from automatable steps, suggesting criteria to identify adequate sets of test cases, and providing an effective means of monitoring the testing activity.

Although suitable functional testing techniques can be found for any granularity level, a particular functional testing technique may be effective only for some kinds of software or may require a given specification style. For example, a combinatorial approach may work well for functional units characterized by a large number of relatively independent inputs, but may be less effective for functional units characterized by complex interrelations among inputs. Functional testing techniques designed for a given specification notation, e.g., finite state machines or grammars, are not easily applicable to other specification styles. Nonetheless we can identify a general pattern of activities that captures the essential steps in a variety of different functional test design techniques. By describing particular functional testing techniques as instantiations of this general pattern, relations among the techniques may become clearer, and the test designer may gain some insight into adapting and extending these techniques to the characteristics of other applications and situations.

Figure 10.3 identifies the general steps of systematic approaches. The steps may be difficult or trivial depending on the application domain and the available program specifications. Some steps may be omitted depending on the application domain, the available specifications and the test designers’ expertise. Instances of the process can be obtained by suitably instantiating different steps. Although most techniques are presented and applied as stand-alone methods, it is also possible to mix and match steps from different techniques, or to apply different methods for different parts of the system to be tested.

**Identify Independently Testable Features** Functional specifications can be large and complex. Usually, complex specifications describe systems that can be decomposed into distinct features. For example, the specification of a web site may include features for searching the site database, registering users’ profiles, getting and storing information provided by the users in different forms, etc. The specification of each of these features may comprise several functionalities. For example, the search feature may include functionalities for editing a search pattern, searching the data base with a given pattern, and so on. Although it is possible to design test cases that exercise several functionalities at once, designing different test cases for different functionalities can simplify the test generation problem, allowing each functionality to be examined separately. Moreover, it eases locating faults that cause the revealed failures. It is thus recommended to devise separate test cases for each functionality of the system, whenever possible.

The preliminary step of functional testing consists in partitioning the specifications into features that can be tested separately. This can be an easy step for well designed, modular specifications, but informal specifications of large systems may be difficult to decompose into independently testable features. Some degree of formality, at least to
Figure 10.3: The main steps of a systematic approach to functional program testing.
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Units and Features

Programs and software systems can be decomposed in different ways. For testing, we may consider externally observable behavior (features), or the structure of the software system (units, subsystems, and components).

Independently testable feature: An independently testable feature (ITF) is a functionality that can be tested independently of other functionalities of the software under test. It need not correspond to a unit or subsystem of the software. For example, a file sorting utility may be capable of merging two sorted files, and it may be possible to test the sorting and merging functionalities separately, even though both features are implemented by much of the same source code. (The nearest IEEE standard term is “test item.”)

As functional testing can be applied at many different granularity levels, from unit testing through integration and system testing, so ITFs may range from the functionality of an individual Java class or C function up to features of an integrated system composed of many complete programs. The granularity of an ITF depends on the exposed interface at whichever granularity is being tested. For example, individual methods of a class are part of the interface of the class, and a set of related methods (or even a single method) might be an ITF for unit testing, but for system testing the ITFs would be features visible through a user interface or application programming interface.

Unit: We reserve the term “unit,” not for any fixed syntactic construct in a particular programming language, but for the smallest unit of work assignment in a software project. Defining “unit” in this manner, rather than (for example) equating units with individual Java classes or packages, or C files or functions, reflects a philosophy about test and analysis. A work unit is the smallest increment by which a software system grows or changes, the smallest unit that appears in a project schedule and budget, and the smallest unit that may reasonably be associated with a suite of test cases.

It follows from our definition of “unit” that, when we speak of unit testing, we mean the testing associated with an individual work unit.

We reserve the term function for the mathematical concept, i.e., a set of ordered pairs having distinct first elements. When we refer to “functions” as syntactic elements in some programming language, we will qualify it to distinguish that usage from the mathematical concept, e.g., a “function” is a set of ordered pairs but a “C function” is syntactic element in the C programming language.
the point of careful definition and use of terms, is usually required.

Identification of functional features that can be tested separately is different from module decomposition. In both cases we apply the divide and conquer principle, but in the former case, we partition specifications according to the functional behavior as perceived by the users of the software under test,\(^5\) while in the latter, we identify logical units that can be implemented separately. For example, a web site may require a sort function, as a service routine, that does not correspond to an external functionality. The sort function may be a functional feature at module testing, when the program under test is the sort function itself, but is not a functional feature at system test, while deriving test cases from the specifications of the whole web site. On the other hand, the registration of a new user profile can be identified as one of the functional features at system level testing, even if such functionality is spread across several modules. Thus, identifying functional features does not correspond to identifying single modules at the design level, but rather to suitably slicing the specifications to attack their complexity incrementally.

Independently testable features are described by identifying all the inputs that form their execution environments. Inputs may be given in different forms depending on the notation used to express the specifications. In some cases they may be easily identifiable. For example, they can be the input alphabet of a finite state machine specifying the behavior of the system. In other cases, they may be hidden in the specification. This is often the case for informal specifications, where some inputs may be given explicitly as parameters of the functional unit, but other inputs may be left implicit in the description. For example, a description of how a new user registers at a web site may explicitly indicate the data that constitutes the user profile to be inserted as parameters of the functional unit, but may leave implicit the collection of elements (e.g., database) in which the new profile must be inserted.

Trying to identify inputs may help in distinguishing different functions. For example, trying to identify the inputs of a graphical tool may lead to a clearer distinction between the graphical interface per se and the associated callbacks to the application. With respect to the web-based user registration function, the data to be inserted in the database are part of the execution environment of the functional unit that performs the insertion of the user profile, while the combination of fields that can be use to construct such data is part of the execution environment of the functional unit that takes care of the management of the specific graphical interface.

**Identify Representative Classes of Values or Derive a Model**  The execution environment of the feature under test determines the form of the final test cases, which are given as combinations of values for the inputs to the unit. The next step of a testing process consists of identifying which values of each input should be selected to form test cases. Representative values can be identified directly from informal specifications expressed in natural language. Alternatively, representative values may be selected indirectly through a model, which can either be produced only for the sake of testing

\(^5\)Here the word “user” designates the individual using the specified service. It can be the user of the system, when dealing with a system specification, but it can be another module of the system, when dealing with detailed design specifications.
or be available as part of the specification. In both cases, the aim of this step is to identify the values for each input in isolation, either explicitly through enumeration, or implicitly through a suitable model, but not to select suitable combinations of such values, i.e., test case specifications. In this way, we separate the problem of identifying the representative values for each input, from the problem of combining them to obtain meaningful test cases, thus splitting a complex step into two simpler steps.

Most methods that can be applied to informal specifications rely on explicit enumeration of representative values by the test designer. In this case, it is very important to consider all possible cases and take advantage of the information provided by the specification. We may identify different categories of expected values, as well as boundary and exceptional or erroneous values. For example, when considering operations on a non-empty list of elements, we may distinguish the cases of the empty list (an error value) and a singleton element (a boundary value) as special cases. Usually this step determines characteristics of values (e.g., any list with a single element) rather than actual values.

Implicit enumeration requires the construction of a (partial) model of the specifications. Such a model may be already available as part of a specification or design model, but more often it must be constructed by the test designer, in consultation with other designers. For example, a specification given as a finite state machine implicitly identifies different values for the inputs by means of the transitions triggered by the different values. In some cases, we can construct a partial model as a means for identifying different values for the inputs. For example, we may derive a grammar from a specification and thus identify different values according to the legal sequences of productions of the given grammar.

Directly enumerating representative values may appear simpler and less expensive than producing a suitable model from which values may be derived. However, a formal model may also be valuable in subsequent steps of test case design, including selection of combinations of values. Also, a formal model may make it easier to select a larger or smaller number of test cases, balancing cost and thoroughness, and may be less costly to modify and reuse as the system under test evolves. Whether to invest effort in producing a model is ultimately a management decision that depends on the application domain, the skills of test designers, and the availability of suitable tools.

**Generate Test Case Specifications**  Test specifications are obtained by suitably combining values for all inputs of the functional unit under test. If representative values were explicitly enumerated in the previous step, then test case specifications will be elements of the Cartesian product of values selected for each input. If a formal model was produced, then test case specifications will be specific behaviors or combinations of parameters of the model, and a single test case specification could be satisfied by many different concrete inputs. Either way, brute force enumeration of all combinations is unlikely to be satisfactory.

The number of combinations in the Cartesian product of independently selected values grows as the product of the sizes of the individual sets. For a simple functional unit with 5 inputs each characterized by 6 values, the size of the Cartesian product is $6^5 = 7,776$ test case specifications, which may be an impractical number for test
cases for a simple functional unit. Moreover, if (as is usual) the characteristics are not completely orthogonal, many of these combinations may not even be feasible.

Consider the input of a procedure that searches for occurrences of a complex pattern in a web database. Its input may be characterized by the length of the pattern and the presence of special characters in the pattern, among other aspects. Interesting values for the length of the pattern may be zero, one, or many. Interesting values for the presence of special characters may be zero, one, or many. However, the combination of value “zero” for the length of the pattern and value “many” for the number of special characters in the pattern is clearly impossible.

The test case specifications represented by the Cartesian product of all possible inputs must be restricted by ruling out illegal combinations and selecting a practical subset of the legal combinations. Illegal combinations are usually eliminated by constraining the set of combinations. For example, in the case of the complex pattern presented above, we can constrain the choice of one or more special characters to a positive length of the pattern, thus ruling out the illegal cases of patterns of length zero containing special characters.

Selection of a practical subset of legal combination can be done by adding information that reflects the hazard of the different combinations as perceived by the test designer or by following combinatorial considerations. In the former case, for example, we can identify exceptional values and limit the combinations that contain such values. In the pattern example, we may consider only one test for patterns of length zero, thus eliminating many combinations that would otherwise be derived for patterns of length zero. Combinatorial considerations reduce the set of test cases by limiting the number of combinations of values of different inputs to a subset of the inputs. For example, we can generate only tests that exhaustively cover all combinations of values for inputs considered pair by pair.

Depending on the technique used to reduce the space represented by the Cartesian product, we may be able to estimate the number of generated test cases generated and modify the selected subset of test cases according to budget considerations. Subsets of combinations of values, i.e., potential special cases, can often be derived from models of behavior by applying suitable test selection criteria that identify subsets of interesting behaviors among all behaviors represented by a model, for example by constraining the iterations on simple elements of the model itself. In many cases, test selection criteria can be applied automatically.

**Generate Test Cases and Instantiate Tests** The test generation process is completed by turning test case specifications into test cases and instantiating them. Test case specifications can be turned into test cases by selecting one or more test cases for each test case specification. Test cases are implemented by creating the scaffolding required for their execution.

### 10.4 Choosing a Suitable Approach

In the next chapters we will see several approaches to functional testing, each applying to different kinds of specifications. Given a specification, there may be one or more
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Techniques well suited for deriving functional test cases, while some other techniques may be hard or even impossible to apply, or may lead to unsatisfactory results. Some techniques can be interchanged, i.e., they can be applied to the same specification and lead to similar results. Other techniques are complementary, i.e., they apply to different aspects of the same specification or at different stages of test case generation.

The choice of approach for deriving functional test cases depends on several factors: the nature of the specification, the form of the specification, expertise and experience of test designers, the structure of the organization, availability of tools, budget and quality constraints, and the costs of designing and implementing scaffolding.

**Nature and form of the specification** Different approaches exploit different characteristics of the specification. For example, the presence of several constraints on the input domain may suggest using a partitioning method with constraints, such as the category-partition method described in Chapter 11, while unconstrained combinations of values may suggest a pairwise combinatorial approach. If transitions among a finite set of system states are identifiable in the specification, a finite state machine approach may be indicated, while inputs of varying and unbounded size may be tackled with grammar based approaches. Specifications given in a specific format, e.g., as decision structures, suggest corresponding techniques. For example, functional test cases for SDL specification of protocols are often derived with finite state machine based criteria.

**Experience of test designers and organization** Experience of testers and company procedures may drive the choice of the testing technique. For example, test designers expert in category partition may prefer that technique over a catalog based approach when both are applicable, while a company that works in a specific application area may require the use of domain-specific catalogs.

**Tools** Some techniques may require the use of tools, whose availability and cost should be taken into account when choosing a testing technique. For example, several tools are available for deriving test cases from SDL specifications. The availability of one of these tools may suggest the use of SDL for capturing a subset of the requirements expressed in the specification.

**Budget and quality constraints** Different quality and budget constraints may lead to different choices. For example, if the primary constraint is rapid, automated testing, and reliability requirements are not stringent, random test case generation may be appropriate. In contrast, thorough testing of a safety critical application may require the use of sophisticated methods for functional test case generation. When choosing an approach, it is important to evaluate all relevant costs. For example, generating a large number of random test cases may necessitate design and construction of sophisticated scaffolding.

---

6SDL (Specification Description Language) is a formal specification notation based on extended finite-state machines, widely used in telecommunication systems and standardized by the International Telecommunication Union.
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Choosing a Suitable Approach

Many engineering activities require careful analysis of trade-offs. Functional testing is no exception: Successfully balancing the many aspects is a difficult and often underestimated problem that requires skilled designers. Functional testing is not an exercise of choosing the optimal approach, but a complex set of activities for finding a suitable combination of models and techniques that yield a set of test cases to satisfy cost and quality constraints. This balancing extends beyond test design to software design for test. Appropriate design not only improves the software development process, but can greatly facilitate the job of test designers, and lead to substantial savings.

Open research issues

Functional testing is by far the most common way of deriving test cases in industry, but neither industrial practice nor research have established general and satisfactory methodologies. Research in functional testing is increasingly active and progresses in many directions.

Deriving test cases from formal models is an active research area. In the past three decades, formal methods have been mainly studied as a means for proving software properties. Recently, attention has moved towards the use of formal methods for deriving test cases. There are three main open research topics in this area:

- **Definition of techniques for automatically deriving test cases from particular formal models.** Formal methods present new challenges and opportunities for deriving test cases. We can both adapt existing techniques borrowed from other disciplines or research areas and define new techniques for test case generation. Formal notations can support automatic generation of test cases, thus opening additional problems and research challenges.

- **Adaptation of formal methods to be more suitable for test case generation.** As illustrated in this chapter, test cases can be derived in two broad ways, either by identifying representative values or by deriving a model of the unit under test. A variety of formal models could be used in testing. The research challenge lies in identifying a trade-off between costs of creating formal models and savings in automatically generating test cases.

- **Development of a general framework for deriving test cases from a range of formal specifications.** Currently research addresses techniques for generating test cases from individual formal methods. Generalization of techniques will allow more combinations of formal methods and testing.

Another important research area is fed by interest in different specification and design paradigms, e.g., software architectures, software design patterns, service-oriented applications, etc. Often these approaches employ new graphical or textual notations. Research is active in investigating different approaches to fully or semi-automatically deriving test cases from these artifacts and studying the effectiveness of existing test case generation techniques.
Increasing size and complexity of software systems is a challenge to testing. Existing functional testing techniques do not take advantages of test cases available for parts of the artifact under test. Compositional approaches for deriving test cases for a given system taking advantage of test cases available for its subsystems is an important open research problem.

**Further Reading**

Functional testing techniques, sometimes called “black-box testing” or “specification-based testing,” are presented and discussed by several authors. Ntafos [DN81] makes the case for random, rather than systematic testing; Frankl, Hamlet, Littlewood and Strigini [FHLS98] is a good starting point to the more recent literature considering the relative merits of systematic and statistical approaches.

**Related topics**

Readers interested in practical technique for deriving functional test specifications from informal specifications and models may continue with the next two chapters, which describe several functional testing techniques. Reader interested in the complementarities between functional and structural testing may continue with Chapters 12 and 13 which describe structural and data flow testing.

**Exercises**

10.1. In the “Extreme Programming” (XP) methodology (see the sidebar on page 383), a written description of a desired feature may be a single sentence, and the first step to designing the implementation of that feature is designing and implementing a set of test cases. Does this aspect of the XP methodology contradict our assertion that test cases are a formalization of specifications?

10.2. (a) Compute the probability of selecting a test case that reveals the fault in line 19 of program Root of Figure 10.1 by randomly sampling the input domain, assuming that type double has range \(-2^{31} \ldots 2^{31} - 1\).

(b) Compute the probability of randomly selecting a test case that reveals a fault if line 13 and line 19 were both missing the condition \(a \neq 0\).

10.3. Identify independently testable units in the following specification.

**Desk calculator** Desk calculator performs the following algebraic operations: sum, subtraction, product, division, and percentage on integers and real numbers. Operands must be of the same type, except for percentage, which allows the first operator to be either integer or real, but requires the second to be an
integer that indicates the percentage to be computed. Operations on integers produce integer results. Program Calculator can be used with a textual interface that provides the following commands:

**Mx=N** where Mx is a memory location, i.e., M0,… M9 and N is a number. Integers are given as non-empty sequences of digits, with or without sign. Real numbers are given as non-empty sequences of digits that include a dot “.”, with or without sign. Real numbers can be terminated with an optional exponent, i.e., character “E” followed by an integer. The command displays the stored number.

**Mx=display**, where Mx is a memory location and display indicates the value shown on the last line.

**operand1 operation operand2**, where operand1 and operand2 are numbers or memory locations or display and operation is one of the following symbols: “+”, “-”, “\*”, “/”, “%”, where each symbol indicates a particular operation.

Operands must follow the type conventions. The command displays the result or the string **Error**.

or with a graphical interface that provides a display with 12 characters and the following keys:

- 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, the 10 digits
- +, -, *, /, %, the operations
- =, to display the result of a sequence of operations
- C, to clear display

**M**, **M+**, **MS**, **MR**, **MC**, where **M** is pressed before a digit to indicate the target memory, 0…9, keys **M+**, **MS**, **MR**, **MC** pressed after **M** and a digit indicate the operation to be performed on the target memory: add display to memory, store display in memory, restore memory, i.e., move the value in memory to the display and clear memory.

**Example:** 5 => 1 0 M 3 MS 8 0 C M 3 MR = prints 65 (the value 15 is stored in memory cell 3 and then retrieved to compute 80 - 15).