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Most software applications feature a Graphical User Interface (GUI) front-end as the main, and often the only, method for the user to interact with the software. System-testing a software application requires it to be tested as a whole through the GUI. Testers need to generate sequences of GUI events (e.g., mouse clicks and menu selections) to exercise various behaviors of the application. Because the input space of a typical GUI (i.e., the space of all possible GUI events and their interactions) is often enormous, manual GUI testing is impractical. Model-based testing is a new approach that automatically and systematically generates a large number of test cases by leveraging a formal model representing the GUI input space. Unfortunately, modern applications often have a “context-sensitive reachability GUI,” in which the GUI components are only reachable with some particular state or environment constraints. Thus, it is challenging to determine the GUI input space and obtain a GUI model for automated GUI testing.

This research proposes new testing techniques to tackle the challenges in
model-based GUI testing. The central thesis is this: GUI-based applications can be effectively and efficiently tested by systematically and incrementally leveraging the application runtime execution observations.

To explore the thesis, a novel model-based testing paradigm called Observer-Model-Exercise* (OME*) is developed. This paradigm relies on the opportunistic observations obtained during test case execution to incrementally explore the GUI input space and construct a GUI model for test case generation.

To evaluate OME*, an open-source automated model-based GUI testing framework called GUITAR is developed. An empirical study with 8 widely-used open-source applications demonstrated that the OME* approach is feasible. Compared to previous model-based testing approaches, OME* was able to increase the GUI input space discovered by as much as 1,044%. As a result, 34 new faults were detected in the subject applications.
Testing GUI-based Software With Undetermined Input Spaces

by

Bao N. Nguyen

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2013

Advisory Committee:
Professor Atif M. Memon, Chair and Advisor
Professor Ashok K. Agrawala
Professor Pete Keleher
Professor Alan Sussman
Professor Gang Qu
Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have been possible without the help, encouragement, and support of many other people.

I would like to thank my advisor, Atif Memon, for his continuous advice, support, and encouragement since I first came to UMD. I was very fortunate to have Atif as my advisor. I would also like to thank my other thesis committee members, Ashok Agrawala, Pete Keleher, Alan Sussman and Gang Qu, for giving me valuable feedback on the thesis, and selfless support in the process.

Many of my colleagues commented on my ideas, critiqued my drafts, directed me to related work, or provided bug patches for my programs. I am grateful to Penelope Brooks, Jaymie Strecker, Scott McMaster, Xun Yuan, Mike Lam, Ishan Banerjee, Ethar Elsaka, Leslie Milton, Bryan Robbins, and Bryan Ta.

Special thanks to the students in two classes CMSC 435 and CMSC 737 for their contributions to the GUITAR project. I would also like to acknowledge the open-source community for making their software publicly available. Without their products, I would not be able to conduct my experiments to validate my research.

Part of my research was funded by the National Science Foundation and the Vietnam Education Foundation. I am grateful to all the folks in these organizations. Their financial support allowed me to concentrate on research.

Finally, I own my deepest thanks to my family, especially my parents and my loving wife, Trang. Their exceptional support, love, and understanding have been a constant source of encouragement for me during my PhD.
# Table of Contents

List of Tables v

List of Figures vi

1 Introduction 1
   1.1 Thesis Statement ................................................. 7
   1.2 Approach ..................................................... 7
   1.3 Related Work .................................................... 9
   1.4 Dissertation Outline ............................................. 12

2 Background 13
   2.1 Running Example ................................................ 14
   2.2 Test Case Generation Techniques ................................. 16
      2.2.1 State Machines ................................................ 16
         2.2.1.1 Finite State Machines ..................................... 17
         2.2.1.2 Variable Finite State Machines .......................... 20
         2.2.1.3 Complete Interaction Sequences ........................... 22
         2.2.1.4 Off-nominal Finite State Machines ....................... 26
      2.2.2 Workflows ................................................... 28
         2.2.2.1 Event Flow Graph ........................................... 29
         2.2.2.2 Event Interaction Graph ................................... 31
         2.2.2.3 Event Semantic Interaction Graph .......................... 34
         2.2.2.4 Off-nominal Event Graph ................................... 40
      2.2.3 Pre-Post-Condition Models .................................... 43
      2.2.4 Event Sequence-Based Models ................................. 46
      2.2.5 Probabilistic Models ......................................... 49
      2.2.6 Combinatorial Interaction Models ........................... 53
         2.2.6.1 Latin Squares .............................................. 53
         2.2.6.2 Covering Arrays ............................................ 55
      2.2.7 Hierarchical Models .......................................... 56
         2.2.7.1 Keyword-driven Models ..................................... 57
         2.2.7.2 Hierarchical Finite State Machines ....................... 61
         2.2.7.3 UML Diagram-based ......................................... 63
   2.3 Summary ........................................................ 66

3 Observe-Model-Exercise* Testing Paradigm 68
   3.1 Overview ........................................................ 69
   3.2 Realizing the OME* Paradigm ..................................... 75
      3.2.1 Contribution 1: Context-Aware Mapping ..................... 75
      3.2.2 Contribution 2: Simultaneously Extracting New Model Elements During Test Execution ........................... 78
      3.2.3 Contribution 3: Unique Widget Signatures .................. 81
      3.2.4 Contribution 4: Incremental EFG+ Enhancements ............. 84
List of Tables

2.1 GUI Testing Techniques Discussed. ................................. 13
2.2 Technique Taxonomy. .................................................. 14
2.3 Events available on each widget. ................................. 15
3.1 Partial Mapping. ......................................................... 76
4.1 Accessing GUI component information .......................... 105
4.2 Mapping the internal GUI objects ................................. 106
4.3 Performing GUI events ............................................... 106
4.4 GUI platforms supported by GUITAR ......................... 107
5.1 Subject applications .................................................. 115
5.2 Automated Widget/Window Identification vs. Manual Oracle. 118
5.3 Test Cases Generated and Execution Time ..................... 121
5.4 Data for RQ1 and RQ2. ............................................. 123
5.5 Summary of faults detected in the iterative phases of OME* 129
## List of Figures

1.1 MS Word 2010 motivating example. 

1.2 The Radio Button Demo Application. 

1.3 Variable Finite State Machine. 

1.4 FSM for the *create a new shape* responsibility. 

1.5 Faulty Complete Interaction Sequence - dotted edges are transitions in the CIS. 

1.6 Event Flow Graph. 

1.7 Event Interaction Graph. 

1.8 Event semantic interaction example. 

1.9 Event Semantic Interaction Graph. 

1.10 Inverse Event Sequence Graph. 

1.11 A Task Specification. 

1.12 AI Planning. 

1.13 Example test cases. 

1.14 Probabilistic Event Flow Graph with history $H = 2$. 

1.15 2-way Covering and Covering Array. 

1.16 Label Transition Systems. 

1.17 Hierarchical Finite State Machine (self-loops are omitted for readability). 

1.18 Use case diagram. 

3.1 Running example. 

3.2 Available Events Observed During Execution. 

3.3 Code to collect GUI widget states. 

3.4 A partial window hierarchy of MS Word. 

4.1 GUITAR component architectures. 

4.2 The *Executor* component. 

4.3 A simple GUITAR-based testing workflow. 

4.4 Customized component in JabRef Preferences window. 

5.1 Continuous Integration Testing System. 

5.2 OME* sees more of the EFG with each iteration.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Graphical User Interface (GUI) is an integral component of contemporary software applications. To the end-users, the GUI is the only part of the software that they can actually “see” and interact with. A GUI abstracts away the complexity of the back-end components such as databases, communication systems and hardware. Because the only way to access the functionalities of GUI-based software is through its GUI, system testing a software often means ensuring it works properly and reliably as a whole at the GUI level. GUI testing is the process of executing sequences of GUI events\(^1\) (i.e., GUI test cases) on the software’s GUI front-end to reveal any possible defect.

The most prominent features of a GUI are the ease-of-use and the flexibility that it offers to both software users and software developers. Unfortunately, these features also create many challenges for software testing. Testing an application with a GUI front-end requires testers to handle (1) the enormous number of GUI components, (2) the complexity and diversity of GUI behaviors, and (3) the susceptible-to-change nature of GUI designs. Over the last decades, there have been many advances in automation for “behind-the-scenes” software testing activi-

\(^1\)A GUI event (e.g., click-on-Cancel-button, select-Radio-button) is the action that a user performs on a widget (e.g., Cancel button, Radio button). Whenever the context is clear, we use the terms “event” and “widget” interchangeably; e.g., when we say “the user performs the Cancel event” we actually means that “the user performs the action click-on the Cancel button widget.”
ties such as unit testing [1, 2, 3], concurrency testing [4, 5], security testing [6, 7], and performance testing [8, 9]. However, GUI testing still remains a largely manual and ad hoc process [10, 11, 12, 13]. This research aims to address the challenges in GUI testing automation.

Why is the automation of GUI testing so difficult? Consider how GUI-based software applications are tested today. Most often, a tester is given a set of tasks with the goal of verifying that these tasks can be performed using the software; and that the software does not “behave badly.” Sometimes, the tester is also given a set of use cases with high-level descriptions of their steps (e.g., “save the file”, “load the document”). The tester executes these high-level steps by using GUI widgets on which events can be performed. The choice of which events to execute is most often left to the tester. For example, the tester may perform “save the file” in one of three ways: (1) click on the Save icon in the toolbar, (2) use menu items File→Save, or (3) use alternative menu items File→Save As followed by a file name in the text-box. During this process, the tester may discover new ways to combine certain events to perform a task.

The tester does not always have a complete picture of the GUI’s input space (i.e., the space of all possible GUI events and their interactions). In many software development environments, the tester is not usually supplied a blueprint of the GUI or its set of allowable workflows. In principle, the tester has no idea of what event sequences were missed during the testing process. End-users may execute untested event sequences and encounter failures. Moreover, the implemented GUI may allow event sequences that the designers never wanted to allow. But there is no way for a
tester to determine which sequences are missed and which should not be allowed.

Human testers have the experience and domain knowledge to navigate through and verify the correctness of such systems with unknown or partially known input spaces without the aforementioned blueprint [10]. For example, a human tester who clicks on a button labeled Close expects that something (most often the current window) in the GUI to close, and all of its constituent events to become subsequently unavailable. Similarly, in MS Word 2010, Figure 1.1(a), a human tester creating a new document will expect the menu structure (and corresponding set of available events) to be different for a blog type of document versus a conventional blank document.

However, automated test harnesses and tools lack the experience and domain knowledge of humans. Without a representation of allowed and disallowed workflows, they are unable to reason their way out of an unexpected situation. This causes many GUI testing tools to either (1) rely on a human tester or (2) perform very limited automated testing tasks. An example of the former is the capture/replay (record/playback) tools [14] to recreate manually pre-recorded (or programatically coded) event sequences. An example of the latter is the random testing tools such as the Monkey\(^2\) and Eclipse-based GUIDancer\(^3\) to perform simple random walks of the user interface, execute events as encountered and detect crashes.

Recently, a new GUI testing approach called model-based testing [15, 16, 17] has been developed. This approach creates a graphical model of the GUI input

\(^2\)http://developer.android.com/guide/developing/tools/monkey.html
\(^3\)http://www.guidancer.com
(a) The Create button (top) is context-driven; the selected document type, either Blank document or Blog post, creates different events (bottom-left for Blog; bottom-right for regular document).

(b) The partial event-flow graph.

Figure 1.1: MS Word 2010 motivating example.

space and obtains test cases by automatically and systematically traversing the model. The most popular GUI model used is the event-flow graph (EFG) [18].
An EFG is essentially a type of GUI blueprint containing all workflows allowed by the GUI’s structure and events. More specifically, it is a directed graph structure with nodes that represent events, and edges that represent the follows relationship. The relationship “\( e_x \) follows \( e_y \)” means that event \( e_x \) may be executed immediately after event \( e_y \) along some execution path in the GUI. This is represented as an edge from node \( n_x \) to \( n_y \), where \( n_x \) represents \( e_x \) and \( n_y \) represents \( e_y \). Part of the EFG for the GUI of Figure 1.1(a) is shown in Figure 1.1(b). The EFG contains edges from Create to Publish, Home Page, and Insert (in Blog post window) ; and to Page Layout, References, Mailings, Review, Insert, and View (in Blank Document window). Each of these events may be executed immediately after Create in the GUI.

It is not straightforward to create an EFG for a GUI. In previous work, a reverse engineering technique called GUI Ripping was developed to automatically create an approximation of the EFG [19]. The GUI Ripper dynamically traverses the GUI, opening windows, performing events, keeping track of all windows seen, and using algorithms to construct an EFG. The goal of Ripping is not to test the GUI’s events; rather, it attempts to open as many windows as possible, extracting events from each, and computing the follows relationship. Because the Ripper performs a generalized, fully automatic traversal, it may miss application-specific parts of the GUI that are “guarded” with very specific inputs (such as a password) or behavior that requires very specific combinations of inputs, such as context-sensitive menu items. In our example of Figure 1.1(a), starting with the top-most window, the Ripper would select Blank document (because it is the first icon in the list) and then
click *Create*. This opens a new window. After the *Ripper* has finished interacting with this window and of its all sub-windows, it returns to the top window and performs all remaining events. Unfortunately, without any human intervention, the *Ripper* does not know that it needs to perform *Create* again, and in a specific context where the *Blog post* icon is selected, to reveal the bottom-right state of the main window. Hence, this window part will never be reached and events *Page Layout*, *References*, *Mailings*, *Review*, and *View* will be missed.

Existing testing approaches assume that it is straightforward to *fully* determine the GUI input space and to create a GUI model for testing. Unfortunately, this assumption does not hold true for most modern software. Today, software often has a “context-sensitive reachability GUI,” in which GUI components are only reachable under some certain state and environment conditions. In our example, depending on the document options selected, clicking on the *Create* button will lead to different sets of GUI components. Another example is on the GUI of mobile devices where GUI components are often hidden and only pop up in specific scenarios. With such complex and dynamic GUIs, it is not easy to determine which GUI events are available and how they are related. The current GUI testing approaches rely on an incomplete GUI input space; thus, they are unable to adequately test the GUI. As a result, GUI defects are still very common [20, 21].
1.1 Thesis Statement

This work aims to overcome the limitations in the current model-based GUI testing approaches. The key idea is that the runtime information available during software execution can be valuable in understanding the structure of the GUI input space. By systematically leveraging this information, the GUI input space can be incrementally determined as the software runs.

This leads to the following thesis statement:

*GUI-based applications can be effectively and efficiently tested by systematically and incrementally leveraging the application runtime execution observations.*

1.2 Approach

To prove the above thesis, we develop a new paradigm *Observe-Model-Exercise* (OME*) for GUI testing. Starting with an incomplete model of the GUI’s input space, a set of coverage elements to test, and test cases, OME* iteratively (1) *observes* the existence of new events during execution of the test cases, (2) expands the *model* of the GUI’s input space, computing new coverage elements, and (3) obtains new test cases to *exercise* the new elements. The star in the paradigm’s name represents the iterative nature of the testing process.

This work makes 5 main contributions, corresponding to 5 challenges for testing applications with a context-sensitive GUI:

**Challenge 1:** It is challenging to generate specific event sequences to replicate context-sensitive behaviors. Because events and event sequences are context
sensitive, they may have been observed due to the execution of particular prior event
sequences.

**Contribution 1:** We make use of a new context-aware mapping that maintains
information about the event sequences that were used to reach model elements.

**Challenge 2:** It is challenging to devise new event sequences that reveal new
parts of the input space and help to enhance the model without incurring significant
additional cost.

**Contribution 2:** We simultaneously extract new GUI model elements–events
and **follows** relationships–during test execution.

**Challenge 3:** It is challenging to identify new events, i.e., to determine in
multiple contexts whether an event has already been seen before.

**Contribution 3:** We develop a unique signature for each widget and matching
heuristics to help detect new widgets.

**Challenge 4:** It is challenging to incrementally make changes to the model
to add new elements.

**Contribution 4:** We develop new operations on the EFG+ to incrementally
enhance the model as new information becomes available.

**Challenge 5:** It is challenging to incrementally generate new test cases.

**Contribution 5:** We develop an algorithm to compute new test requirements
from recent model enhancements and generate test cases to satisfy the requirements.

Our final contribution is our experiment, involving 8 open-source applications
on which we executed over 400,000 test cases and consumed almost 1000 machine
days. We compared OME* with the current state-of-the-art. We saw significant
improvements, both in terms of new areas of the input space that we explored, and fault detection – we fully automatically detected 34 new faults in these applications.

1.3 Related Work

The *GUI Ripping* technique proposed in 2003 [19] set the stage for using the executing GUI software itself to *automatically* model its own input space. In summary, the Ripper starts at the main window of a software application under test, automatically detects all ‘clickable’ GUI widgets and exercises the application by systematically executing these elements. The GUI structure obtained is then converted to an EFG, which is subsequently used to systematically generate test cases. Since then, several techniques have been developed to augment the EFG model using annotations. For example, Yuan et al. [22] annotated the EFG with semantic information derived from the runtime state of the GUI. However, these approaches were unable to discover unexplored parts of the input space.

A technique called *exploratory testing* [5, 10] is closest to our current approach. In exploratory testing, human testers manually explore the system under test without fully knowing its input space. As the system is being tested, they learn the system’s behaviors and manually decide what to do next. There is no predetermined test script or test input. This technique takes advantage of the testers’ experiences and provides rapid feedback to the developers. However, because it relies heavily on human skills, the results are often subjective, hard to replicate [23], and difficult to apply to large systems [13].
Extending the work on GUI ripping, Mesbah et al. [24] leverage a crawl-based technique to reverse engineer the structure of a website under test. A tool called Crawljax automatically detects all ‘clickable’ web elements and crawls the website by exercising these elements. The website structure is then analyzed to construct an intermediate abstract state machine model, which is used as a skeleton to systematically generate test cases. Saxena et al. [6] extend this technique by adding a string constraint solver to the crawler to better explore the event space.

The remainder of the related work we discuss here shares a common theme. During test execution, these approaches keep track of all new event handlers, object states and web services observed during execution and try to generate additional test cases to exercise these new elements.

In web application testing, Artzi et al. [25] use execution states to generate additional test inputs. Due to the nature of the web applications, the event handlers can be dynamically registered to and removed from the client at runtime. An execution unit dynamically monitors the set of events registered at a particular time and attempts to exercise them.

In object-oriented unit testing, Dallmeier et al. [26] dynamically synthesize a state-machine model by monitoring the object states in different executions. As test cases are executed, new object states are observed and incrementally incorporated into the original model. The extended model is then used to generate additional test cases until some stopping criterion is met. To further enhance the model, a source code scanning technique is used to extract all available method calls. The methods are invoked from all obtained states in a trial-and-error process, to reveal
possibly unobserved class behaviors. Zhang et al. [9] present a similar approach but use advanced static analysis techniques to infer the constraints between method calls and their arguments. The constraints help to avoid generating illegal test cases as well as to direct test case generation toward unexplored program behaviors to achieve higher code coverage. At the system level, Walkinshaw et al. [27] propose a similar approach but for embedded system testing.

In service oriented application (SOA) testing, Bartolini et al. [28] introduce an approach to “whiten” the binary services from the external, third-party libraries to support testing the service consumers. An intermediate agent is added to the services through instrumentation to expose their coverage level as the test cases are executed. Based on the data collected, the test case generator can infer the internal behaviors of the services and decide how to generate test cases for the service consumers.

Our work differs from the above approaches in several ways. First, our target domain is that of GUIs, which have enormous, possibly infinite, input spaces. GUI applications increasingly integrate multiple source code languages and object code formats, along with virtual function calls, reflection, multi-threading, and event-handler callbacks. These features severely impair the applicability of techniques that rely on static analysis or the availability of platform-specific and format-specific instrumentation tools. Second, we have a fully automated and scalable technique. Our underlying model is an EFG rather than a state machine, which, for reasons discussed in prior work [29] are more appropriate for this domain. Third, our model enhancement is based on new events, not states. In other words, we are extending
the input alphabet which is often considered unchanged in the state machine models. Finally, most of the above approaches rely on code instrumentation. Our approach, in contrast, does not require any knowledge of intermediate binary code or source code.

1.4 Dissertation Outline

The remainder of this dissertation is structured as follows. Chapter 2 provides a background review and discusses the existing related work in more detail. Then we present the formal models and algorithms to realize the OME* testing paradigm (Chapter 3). We describe our experimentation tool implementation (Chapter 4) and an empirical evaluation for OME* (Chapter 5). Finally, we conclude with a discussion of our testing approach and provide directions for future work (Chapter 6).
Chapter 2

Background

The testing approaches presented in this work belong to the family of *model-based* techniques for testing GUI-based applications. This chapter presents a survey on existing model-based GUI testing techniques to provide a research context for this work. The techniques surveyed are summarized in Table 2.1.

In summary, all techniques require the creation of a model of the software or its GUI, and algorithms to use the model to generate test cases. The techniques of interest to us employ 6 distinct models, shown in Column 1 of Table 2.1; the “hierarchical” model uses a combination of these models organized in a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State machine</td>
<td>Finite State Machine</td>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>2.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable Finite State Machine</td>
<td>VFSM</td>
<td>2.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Interaction Sequence</td>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>2.2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faulty Complete Interaction Sequence</td>
<td>FCIS</td>
<td>2.2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>Event Flow Graph</td>
<td>EFG</td>
<td>2.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event Interaction Graph</td>
<td>EIG</td>
<td>2.2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback based</td>
<td>ESIG</td>
<td>2.2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faulty Event Sequence Graph</td>
<td>FESG</td>
<td>2.2.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post-condition</td>
<td>AI Planning</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event sequence</td>
<td>Genetic Models</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probabilistic</td>
<td>Probabilistic Event Flow Graph</td>
<td>PEFG</td>
<td>2.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combinatorial</td>
<td>Latin Squares</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.2.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coverage Arrays</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Keyword-driven Model</td>
<td>KW</td>
<td>2.2.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical Finite State Machines</td>
<td>HFSM</td>
<td>2.2.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UML-Diagram Based</td>
<td>UML</td>
<td>2.2.7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: GUI Testing Techniques Discussed.

There are two important aspects of each technique that we discuss. First is the model that it employs. In some cases, the models are created manually; in
others, they are derived in an automated manner. The second important aspect
is the test-case generation approach, which, for some techniques is manual; but
for most is automated. Table 2.2 shows the set of techniques discussed in this
chapter, partitioned along two dimensions: (model creation \{manual, automated\};
test generation \{manual, automated\}).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test generation</th>
<th>Model creation</th>
<th>Manual</th>
<th>Automated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>FSM, VFSM, CIS, FCIS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated</td>
<td>KW, FESG, AI, GA, PEFG, LS, CA, HFSM, UML</td>
<td>EFG, EIG, ESIG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Technique Taxonomy.

The remainder of this chapter presents these techniques. But first, we present
a small GUI application, that we use as a running example. This running example is
used to illustrate the important aspects of each technique, and its relative strengths
and weaknesses.

2.1 Running Example

The simple running example application called “Radio Button Demo” is seen in
Figure 2.1. The GUI contains 9 widgets labeled $w_0$ through $w_8$. A user can perform
events on almost all the widgets (there is no event available on $w_4$). Table 2.3 shows
the events associated with each widget. We note that in this simple example, each
widget has at most one associated event. In a more complex GUI, a widget may
have multiple associated events.

The application’s functionality is very straightforward – the initial state has
Figure 2.1: The Radio Button Demo Application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widget</th>
<th>Event name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w_1$</td>
<td>circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_2$</td>
<td>square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_3$</td>
<td>create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_5$</td>
<td>reset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_0$</td>
<td>exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_6$</td>
<td>(un)check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_7$</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_8$</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Events available on each widget.

Circle (corresponding to $w_1$) selected, the Rendered Shape area (widget $w_4$) is empty and the Reset button is disabled. Events are used to change the state of the GUI. Event circle sets the radio button setting to circle; if there is already a square in the Rendered Shape area, then the shape is immediately changed to a circle. Event square is similar to circle, except that it changes the shape to a square. Event create creates a shape in the Rendered Shape area according to current settings of $w_1$ and $w_2$. Event reset resets the entire software to its initial state. This event is only available when there is an existing shape. Event exit opens a modal “Exit
Confirmation” window that contains widgets $w_6$, $w_7$, and $w_8$. This window blocks all widgets in the main window when open. Event (un)check changes the status of the check-box $w_6$ (originally unchecked) so that when it is checked the exiting time will be logged to a file before the application is terminated. Event no closes the window and moves focus back to the main window; and event yes closes the entire application.

The GUI of this application is simple, yet quite flexible. The numbers of 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-way unique event sequences (and hence possible test cases) that may be executed in the initial state of the GUI are 4 (remember that the Exit Confirmation window is initially closed and $w_5$ is disabled), 17, 66, 253, and 798 respectively.

2.2 Test Case Generation Techniques

This section presents an overview of all the techniques listed in Table 2.1. The techniques are classified according to the underlying model used.

2.2.1 State Machines

Because GUIs are composed of objects (i.e., the widgets) that maintain state, in terms of widget-properties (e.g., Enabled, Caption, Width) and their values (e.g., TRUE, “Cancel”, 20), many researchers have found it natural to model GUIs using state machines [30, 31, 32, 33]. For example, the GUI of Figure 2.1 starts in an “initial state” in which, among other widgets, widget $w_3$ is not selected and
$w_5$ is disabled. If one were to model the state of the GUI as a set of triples 
\((\text{widget}, \text{property}, \text{value})\), the initial state could be represented as \{\ldots, (w_3, \text{Selected}, \text{FALSE}), (w_3, \text{Enabled}, \text{TRUE}), (w_5, \text{Enabled}, \text{FALSE}), \ldots\}. As can be imagined, depending on how one models the state, such machines can get extremely large for non-trivial GUIs. In this section, we present several techniques that researchers have employed to control this state space explosion. Esmelioglu et al. [30] use constraints, Shehady et al. [31] use global variables, White et al. [32] focus on a part of the state machine, and Belli et al. [33] develop off-nominal test cases. We present these techniques next.

2.2.1.1 Finite State Machines

In this section, we present details of the approach taken by Esmelioglu et al. [30], who model the GUI as a finite state machine (FSM). Formally, a FSM can be represented as a quintuple $FSM = (S, I, O, T, \Phi)$, where $S$ is the finite set of GUI states, $I$ is the set of inputs, i.e., events that may be performed on the GUI, $O$ is the finite set of outputs, $T$ is the transition function $S \times I \rightarrow S$ that specifies the next state as a function of the current state and input event, $\Phi$ is the output function $S \times I \rightarrow O$ that specifies the resulting output from a transition.

For GUI testing, a tester is free to select certain aspects of the software to model in the state. For example, we choose to represent the state of the GUI using 4 of its elements: (1) log, which is 1 if $w_6$ is checked, 0 otherwise; (2) exitWinOpen, which is 1 if the Exit Confirmation window is open, 0 otherwise; (3) created which
Figure 2.2: The Finite State Machine for Radio Button Demo.

is 1 if a shape is created, 0 otherwise; (4) shape which is either Circle or Square.

We can then represent the state of the GUI using a length 4 vector consisting of the above 4 elements in the order specified above. For example, state $S_{000C}$ is the initial state in which $w_6$ is unchecked, the exit confirmation window is closed, no shape is created at $w_4$, and the shape radio button for circle is set. Similarly, $S_{111S}$ is the state in which $w_6$ is checked, the exit confirmation window is open, a shape is visible at $w_4$, and the shape radio button for square is set.
We use the above definition of GUI state to create an FSM. Figure 2.2 shows the FSM of the GUI of Figure 2.1. Nodes in the graph represent states and edges represent transitions; there are two special states (shaded nodes) in the FSM: the initial state right after the software starts (\(S_{000C}\)), and the terminal state when the software has been terminated (\(S_t\)). Some of the state transitions are as follows: If the Create button has never been clicked, then the user can transit between \(S_{000x}\) states by selecting different radio button options (\(x\) represents any value of the corresponding state element, in this case \(x\) is either \(C\) or \(S\)). Once Create has been clicked, the GUI transits to a new state where the third state element turns from 0 is 1 (i.e., a new shape has been created). The user can transit back and forth between \(S_{x0zC}\) and \(S_{x0zS}\) by selecting different radio button options (\(x\) represents any value of the corresponding state element). However, the user cannot do the same for the pair \((S_{01zC}, S_{01zS})\) or \(S_{11zC}\) states because the Exit Confirmation window blocks all widgets in the main window.

Once the FSM has been created, test case generation from an FSM is very intuitive. The test designer may start at the initial state, traverse edges of the FSM as desired and record the transitions as events. For example, in Figure 2.2, a test case could be: \(\langle\text{square, circle, create, exit, (un)check, yes}\rangle\) which takes the software through states \(S_{000S}, S_{000C}, S_{001C}, S_{011C}, S_{111C},\) and \(S_t\).

Although FSMs are easy to create, they suffer from some major problems. First, they do not scale for large GUIs. Moreover, the states may not have any relationship to the structure of the GUI. Hence they can be difficult to maintain. A new model called variable finite state machines (VFSMs), developed by Shehady et
2.2.1.2 Variable Finite State Machines

Shehady et al. [31] use Variable Finite State Machines (VFSMs) for testing GUIs. The key difference between VFSMs and FSMs is that VFSMs allow a number of global variables, each of which takes values from a finite domain. The values of the variables are used to compute the next state and the output in response to an input. Transitions may also modify the values of these variables. In principle, the space of GUIs that can be modeled using VFSMs is the same as those that can be modeled using FSMs.

Formally, a VFSM is represented as a 7-tuple $VFSM = (S, I, O, T, \Phi, V, \zeta)$, where $S$, $I$, $O$ are similar to their counterparts in FSMs, $V = \{V_1, V_2, V_3, \ldots, V_n\}$ (each $V_i$ is the set of values that the $i$th variable may assume) and $n$ is the total number of variables in the VFSM. Let $D = S \times I \times V_1 \times V_2 \times \ldots \times V_n$ and $D_T \subseteq D$; $T$ is the transition function $D_T \rightarrow S$ and $\Phi$ is a function $D_T \rightarrow O$. Hence the current state of each of the variables affects both the next state and the output of the VFSM. $\zeta$ is the set of variable transition functions. At each transition, $\zeta$ is used to determine whether any of the variables’ values have been modified. Each variable has an initial state at startup.

Figure 2.3 shows an VFSM of the Radio Button Demo’s GUI. The VFSM is much smaller than the corresponding FSM (Figure 2.2) because the states have been simplified. Each state is simply represented by a length 3 vector, i.e., that specifies
whether log needs to be maintained, the Exit Confirmation window is open, and the type of shape that has been selected.

The states have been simplified because the element created has been removed from the state. This information is now maintained in a variable V that can take values 0 and 1. Edges of the VFSM are annotated with predicates (shown in parenthesis placed before the edge label) and assignments to the variables (shown in square brackets placed after the edge label). Initially, V is set to 0. Transitions are taken depending on the outcome of the predicates. For example, the reset transition is taken from S00C only if V == 1; once taken, it changes V to 0. Similarly, create changes V to 1.

The VFSM created is much more concise (it has 9 states) than the original FSM in Figure 2.2 (which has 17 states). This is because several states in the FSM are grouped and represented by a single state in the VFSM. VFSMs can be converted into their equivalent FSMs for test case generation. The key idea is to fold the
information of $V$ and $\zeta$ into $S$ and $T$. Given a VFSM’s $S$ and $V = \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\}$, the new FSM’s set of states $S_{eq}$ is obtained as $S_{eq} = \{S_i | S_i \in S \times V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \times \ldots \times V_n\}$, i.e., this creates a set of states that combines the information of the states and the variables into one state. Similarly, the new FSM’s transition function $T_{eq} : S_{eq} \times I \rightarrow S_{eq}$ may be created by combining the $T$ and $\zeta$ functions of the VFSM. Since the range of $T$ is $S$ and the range of $\zeta$ is $V = \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\}$, $S_{eq}$ is the Cartesian product of the two ranges; also $T$ and $S$ have the same domain.

2.2.1.3 Complete Interaction Sequences

Another approach to restrict the state space of a state machine is by employing software usage information. The method proposed by White et al. [32] solves the FSM’s state explosion problem by focusing on a subset of interactions performed on the GUI. They key idea is to identify responsibilities for a GUI; a responsibility is a GUI activity that involves one or more GUI objects and has an observable effect on the surrounding environment of the GUI, which includes memory, peripheral devices, underlying software, and application software. For each responsibility, a complete interaction sequence (CIS), which is a sequence of GUI objects and selections that will invoke the given responsibility, is identified. Parts of the CIS are then used for testing the GUI.

The GUI testing steps for CIS are as follows.

1. Manually identify responsibilities in the GUI.

2. For each responsibility, identify its corresponding CIS.
3. Create an FSM for each CIS.

4. Apply transformations to the FSM to obtain a reduced FSM. These transformations include the following.

   (a) Abstracting strongly connected components into a superstate.

   (b) Merging CIS states that have structural symmetry.

5. Use the reduced FSM to test the CIS for correctness.

The two abstractions mentioned above (Steps 4a and 4b) are interesting from a modeling point of view. They are described in more detail next.

Definition: A part of a FSM, called a subFSM, is a strongly connected component if for every pair \((S_1, S_2)\), \(S_1, S_2 \in S\), there exists a directed path from \(S_1\) to \(S_2\). Each such component is then replaced by a superstate and tested in isolation.

A subFSM has structural symmetry if the following conditions hold.

1. it contains states \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) such that \(S_1\) has one incoming transition, \(S_2\) has one outgoing transition, and a number of paths reach \(S_2\) from \(S_1\);

2. for each path in the subFSM, context (the path taken to get to \(S_1\) from outside the subFSM) has no effect on the states/transitions or output;

3. no transition or state encountered after \(S_2\), is affected by paths taken inside the subFSM.

Such a subFSM can be reduced into a superstate and tested in isolation.
Given a GUI, the test designer first reduces the FSM after applying the above transformations, thereby reducing the total number of states in the FSM. This results in smaller number of paths in the FSM, hence reducing the number of test cases. Without any loss of generality, each FSM is assumed to have a distinct start state and distinct terminating state.

As was the case before, a test is a path through the FSM. The test designer creates two types of tests: *design tests* that assume that the FSM is a faithful representation of the GUI's specifications, and *implementation tests* that for each CIS, consider the possibility that potential transitions not described in the design may occur in the implementation.

For design tests, the test designer creates sufficient number of tests starting at the initial state and ending at the termination state so that the following conditions hold:

- all distinct paths in the reduced FSM are executed; each time a path enters a superstate corresponding to a component, an appropriate test path of the component is inserted into the test case at that point,

- all the design subtests of each component are included in at least one test, which may require additional tests of the reduced FSM to satisfy this constraint.

The key idea of conducting implementation testing is to check all GUI events in the CIS to determine whether they invoke any new transitions in the reduced FSM. To implement test the reduced FSM, the test designer must construct sufficient test
sequences at the initial state and stopping at the terminal state so that the following conditions hold:

- all the paths of the reduced FSM are executed, and

- all the implementation tests for each remaining component are included at least once.

By using the CIS concept, the test designer can test a GUI from various perspectives, each defined by the CIS. These CIS can also be maintained in a library to be reused across various GUIs.

For example, in the Radio Button Demo application, the tester may design a “create a new shape” responsibility that involves 4 objects \( w_1, w_2, w_3, \) and \( w_5 \) (assuming that the Rendered Shape area is empty and the Exit Confirmation window is not opened). Figure 2.4 shows an FSM for this responsibility where each node represents a GUI state and each edge represents a state transition. Note that the states in this FSM are abstract states representing several states in the FSM in Section 2.2.1.1. For example, \( S_{x00C} \) is an abstraction of all states where the Circle radio button is selected (\( x \) can be replaced by any value of the corresponding state element).

The subFSM consisting of the two states \( S_{x00C} \) and \( S_{x00S} \) is a strongly connected component. Thus, this subFSM can be tested in isolation and then replaced it by a superstate \( S_{x00x} \) (i.e., a shape is selected). To test the internal behaviors of the subFSM, the state sequence needed to be covered is \( \langle S_{x00C}, S_{x01S} \rangle \); which is obtained by the event sequence \( \langle \text{square, circle} \rangle \). With an assumption that the sub-
Figure 2.4: FSM for the *create a new shape* responsibility.

FSM is well tested, state sequence needed to test the reduced FSM is \( \langle \text{Initial}, S_{x00x}, S_{x01x}, S_{x00x}, S_{x01x}, \text{Terminal} \rangle \). This sequence is then translated to an executable test case taking the GUI from the initial state to the terminal state: \( \langle \text{create}, \text{reset}, \text{create} \rangle \).

2.2.1.4 Off-nominal Finite State Machines

The three approaches discussed thus far generate test cases to test the GUI for legal event sequences specified in the state machine model. However, the GUI might have been coded incorrectly to allow other sequences left unspecified in the state machine. For example, in our Radio Button Demo GUI, does the GUI allow the user to click on the *reset* button when the application is launched, or after *reset* has been executed once? For example, is the sequence \( \langle \text{reset}, \text{reset}, \text{reset} \rangle \) allowed?

The implicit assumption is that such off-nominal sequences are illegal and should not be allowed by the GUI. Belli et al. [33] argue that these sequences should also be tested in addition to the legal sequences. They augment the *Complete In-*
teraction Sequence approach to test the GUI system’s robustness by generating such off-nominal test cases. The augmented model is called Faulty Complete Interaction Sequence (FCIS).

As was the case for the CIS, each FCIS can be specified by an FSM. This FSM is constructed by the following steps:

1. Build the CIS and the corresponding FSM consisting of all legal sequences of user-system interactions. Each edge of the FSM is called an Interaction Pair (IP).

2. Identify Faulty Interaction Pairs (FIPs) consisting of inputs that are not legal. These are all the “missing” IPs in the original FSM. Note that FIPs and IPs together define a complete FSM called the Complete Finite State Automata (CFSA).

Figure 2.5 shows an FSM of the FCIS corresponding to the CIS in Figure 2.4. The solid lines in the graph represent the FIPs and the dotted lines represent the edges in the CIS’s FSM.

Test case generation for a FCIS is straightforward. The tester can systematically design test cases for various undesired system behaviors by covering all possible FIPs. One way to do this is to select an untested FIP, i.e., an edge in the FCIS, generate a sequence of events from the FSM’s start state to the first event in the selected edge, and prepend this sequence to the edge, creating a test case that will test the selected FIP. Once this is done for each FIP, all of them would be tested and covered.
As we can see in Figure 2.5, there is one FIP in the FSM: \( \langle S_{x01x}, S_{x00S} \rangle \). By prefixing this FIP with the state sequence \( \langle Initial, S_{x00C}, S_{x01x} \rangle \), we get a complete sequence in the CFSA to examine the illegal behavior: \( \langle Initial, S_{x00C}, S_{x01x}, S_{x00S} \rangle \). The sequence can be translated to a test case which is a sequence of events starting at the initial state: \( \langle create, reset \rangle \).

2.2.2 Workflows

Some researchers have used the GUI’s business workflow, i.e., a sequence of connected steps, for test case generation. A typical GUI workflow is represented by a set of events (the steps) and some type of sequencing relationship between the events. In this section, we describe the Event Flow Graph model [34], a seminal work in this category. Then, we present two variants of this model: the Event Interaction Graph [35] and the Event Semantic Interaction Graph [22]. Finally, we discuss the Faulty Event Sequence Graph [33], an off-nominal model for the workflow-based
approach.

2.2.2.1 Event Flow Graph

Intuitively, an Event Flow Graph (EFG) represents all possible event sequences that may be executed on a GUI [34]. The graph nodes represent events in the GUI and the graph edges represent a sequencing relationship that shows the set of events that may be performed immediately after a given event. The concept of the EFG is similar to that of a control-flow or program-flow graph [36] that capture the flow of all possible executions of program statements, except that an EFG represents the flow of events, not code, in a GUI.

Definition: An EFG for a GUI $G$ is formally defined as a triple $<V, E, B>$ where:

1. $V$ is a set of vertices representing all the events in $G$. Each $v \in V$ represents an event in $G$.

2. $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of directed edges between vertices. Event $e_j$ follows $e_i$ (or equivalently $e_j = \text{follows}(e_i)$) iff $e_j$ may be performed immediately after $e_i$. An edge $(v_x, v_y) \in E$ iff the event represented by $v_y$ follows the event represented by $v_x$.

3. $B \subseteq V$ is a set of vertices representing initial events of $G$ that are available to the user when the GUI is first invoked.
The EFG for the Radio Button Demo application is shown in Figure 2.6. The events are shown as oval nodes. The shaded nodes are *initial events*, i.e., they are available to the user when the GUI is first launched. The directed edges show the *follows* relationship between events. For example, a user can click on the Yes button in the Exit Confirmation window either immediately after clicking on the Exit button or immediately after clicking on \( w_6 \); hence there is an edge from *exit* to *yes*, and from *(un)check* to *yes*. The user cannot click on the Yes button after the No button because *no* closes the dialog; there is no edge from *no* to *yes*. Similarly, there is no edge from *no* to *no*; nor is there an edge from *yes* to *yes*.

![Figure 2.6: Event Flow Graph.](image)

An approximation of the EFG for a GUI can be automatically obtained by a reverse engineering process called GUI ripping [19]. All events available in the GUI are automatically performed to open the hidden widgets and windows in a depth-
first manner. During the GUI ripping process, the key attributes of each widget are captured (e.g., whether it opens a modal/modeless window, it opens a menu, it closes a window). These attributes are then used to automatically construct the EFG. Because such a process is unable to infer complex state-based relationships between events, e.g., one enables/disables the other, a tester has to manually check and edit it to obtain the final EFG.

Because the EFG captures all possible sequences of events that may be executed by a user on the GUI, any path in the EFG is a valid user-executed event sequence, and hence, a potential test case. Moreover, any graph traversal technique on the EFG can be used to yield test cases. Examples of some techniques that have been used in the past are goal-directed search [37], random-walk [35], and bounded breadth-first search [38]. For example, a random walk of the EFG of Figure 2.6 may yield the test case \(\langle \text{square, square, circle, square, create, reset, exit, yes} \rangle\).

### 2.2.2.2 Event Interaction Graph

Because the EFG captures all possible event sequences that may be executed on the GUI, the number of event sequences that may be generated from an EFG becomes extremely large. In fact, the number grows exponentially with sequence length [39, 34]. It is important to reduce this number for practical reasons. To address this issue, Xie et al. [38] conducted several empirical studies on the characteristics of test cases derived from the EFG model. The experiments showed that a large number of faults were detected by the test cases that tested interactions between certain type
of events which (1) close a modal window (*termination events*) or (2) interact with
the underlying code (*system-interaction events*). Other events used to manipulate
the GUI structure such as open or close menu/modeless windows, called *structural
events*, are unlikely to reveal faults. One possible explanation for these results was
that the code for structural events is usually simple and generated automatically
by visual GUI-building tools; therefore it is less likely to be faulty. Based on these
results, a new model called the Event Interaction Graph (EIG) was developed.

Intuitively, an EIG contains only *termination* and *system-interaction* events;
an edge between two nodes in the EIG shows that one event might be executed
after (not necessarily immediately after) the other along some execution path. Form-
ally, EIG edges are defined by an *interacts-with* relation through the following
definitions:

**Definition:** There is an *event-flow-path* from node \( n_x \) to node \( n_y \) iff there
exists a (possibly empty) sequence of nodes \( n_j; n_{j+1}; n_{j+2}; \ldots; n_{j+k} \) in the event-flow
graph \( E \) such that \( \{(n_x, n_j), (n_{j+k}, n_y)\} \subseteq \text{edges}(E) \) and \( \{(n_{j+i}, n_{j+i+1}) \mid 0 \leq i \leq (k - 1)\} \subseteq \text{edges}(E) \).

**Definition:** An event-flow-path \(< n_1; n_2; \ldots; n_k >\) is *interaction-free* iff none
of \( n_2, \ldots, n_{k-1} \) represent termination or system-interaction events.

**Definition:** A system-interaction (or termination) event \( e_x \) *interacts-with* system-
interaction and termination event \( e_y \) iff there is at least one interaction-free event-
flow-path from the node \( n_x \) (that represents \( e_x \)) to the node \( n_y \) (that represents
\( e_y \)).

The EIG edges actually represent the above *interacts-with* relationship between
events. An EFG can be automatically transformed into an EIG by using graph-
rewriting rules (details are presented in [40]). The EIG for the Radio Button Demo
application is shown in Figure 2.7. Note that the EIG does not contain the window-
opening exit event. The graph-rewriting rule used to obtain this EIG was to (1)
delete exit because it is a window-open event, (2) for all remaining events $e_x$ replace
each edge $(e_x, exit)$ with edge $(e_x, e_y)$ for each occurrence of edge $(exit, e_y)$, and (3)
for all $e_y$, delete all edges $(exit, e_y)$.

![Event Interaction Graph](image)

Figure 2.7: Event Interaction Graph.

As was the case with EFGs, a test case in the EIG model is also a path in the
EIG, starting with an initial event. One possible test case might be $\langle square, square, circle, yes \rangle$. Because EIG nodes do not represent events to open or close menus/windows, the
sequences obtained from the EIG may not be executable. For example, the test case
$\langle square, square, circle, yes \rangle$ will not execute because yes is not available for execu-
tion after circle. For that reason, at execution time, other events needed to reach the EIG events are automatically inserted using the original EFG. During the test-case execution, the EIG test case above will be expanded to \( (square, square, circle, exit, yes) \)

### 2.2.2.3 Event Semantic Interaction Graph

Although the EIG model is smaller than the EFG, it is still a dense graph and suffers from the same problems as does the EFG – the number of generated event sequences grows exponentially with length. In more recent work, Yuan et al. [22] create a sparse graph, where events are connected by edges only if they were shown to influence each other’s execution behavior. Consider the **Radio Button Demo** example. The top-left GUI in Figure 2.8 shows the initial state \( (S_0) \) of the application. After an event **square** is executed, the GUI changes its state to the one shown in the top-right \( (square(S_0)) \). In this state, the **Square** radio button is selected. Starting from \( S_0 \), one can execute another event (**create**) and obtain the state shown in the bottom-left \( (create(S_0)) \); a circle is created by clicking the **Create** button. If, however, the sequence \( (square; create) \) is executed in \( S_0 \), a new state \( (create(square(S_0))) \), shown in the bottom-right is obtained; a square has been created. This execution is equivalent to the execution of event **create** in the state \( square(S_0) \). The event **square** clearly influences the event **create**. We say that event **square** “interacts with” event **create**, and should be tested together to check for interaction problems.

The main idea behind observing GUI run-time states and using them to determine which events to test together can also be justified by examining the code
of event handlers. For example, the event handlers for *square* and *create* share two variables *created*, which indicates if a shape is created, and *currentShape*, which specifies the current selected shape; *create* sets *created* to TRUE and influences *square*’s flow of control; *square* sets *currentShape* to a square, which *create* uses as a parameter to create a shape; hence it’s not surprising that they influence each other’s execution.

![Event semantic interaction example.](image)

Figure 2.8: Event semantic interaction example.

The example illustrated in Figure 2.8 is just one case of how the GUI state may be used to pinpoint interactions between event handlers. Yuan et al. formally define six cases that describe (as evaluative predicates) situations in which two events, called *e*<sub>1</sub> and *e*<sub>2</sub>, interact, i.e., *e*<sub>1</sub> influences *e*<sub>2</sub>. In these six cases, *e*<sub>1</sub> and *e*<sub>2</sub> are system-interaction events in modeless windows; this situation is referred as *Context 1*. 
Case 1: $\mathcal{P}_1(1)(e_1, e_2) = \exists w \in W, p \in P_w, v \in V_p, v' \in V_p, \text{s.t. } ((v \neq v') \land ((w, p, v) \in \{S_0 \cap e_1(S_0) \cap e_2(S_0)\}) \land ((w, p, v') \in e_2(e_1(S_0))))$; there is at least one widget $w$ with property $p$ with initial value $v$ (hence the triple $(w, p, v)$ is in $S_0$), which is not affected by the individual events $e_1$ or $e_2$ (the triple is also in $e_1(S_0)$ and $e_2(S_0)$); however, it is modified when the sequence $\langle e_1; e_2 \rangle$ is executed, i.e., the value of $w$’s property $p$ changes from $v$ to $v'$.

Case 2: $\mathcal{P}_2(1)(e_1, e_2) = \exists w \in W, p \in P_w, v \in V_p, v' \in V_p, v'' \in V_p, \text{s.t. } ((v \neq v') \land (v' \neq v'') \land ((w, p, v) \in \{S_0 \cap e_2(S_0)\}) \land ((w, p, v') \in e_1(S_0)) \land ((w, p, v'') \in e_2(e_1(S_0))))$ there is at least one widget $w$ with property $p$ that has an initial value $v$, which is not modified by the event $e_2$; it is modified by $e_1$; however, it is modified differently by the sequence $\langle e_1; e_2 \rangle$. Note that this case is different from Case 2 because the event sequence remains the same, i.e. $e_1$ is executed before $e_2$.

In our running example, widget $w_4$, in the GUI’s initial state, is not modified by event $square$, i.e., it remains empty; it is modified by event $create$, i.e., a circle is shown; however, $w_4$ is modified differently by the sequence $\langle create; square \rangle$. Hence, Case 2 applies to $create$ and $square$.

Case 3: $\mathcal{P}_3(1)(e_1, e_2) = \exists w \in W, p \in P_w, v \in V_p, v' \in V_p, v'' \in V_p, \text{s.t. } ((v \neq v') \land (v' \neq v'') \land ((w, p, v) \in \{S_0 \cap e_1(S_0)\}) \land ((w, p, v') \in e_2(S_0)) \land ((w, p, v'') \in e_2(e_1(S_0))))$ there is at least one widget $w$ with property $p$ that has an initial value $v$, which is not modified by the event $e_1$; it is modified by $e_2$; however, it is modified differently by the sequence $\langle e_1; e_2 \rangle$. Note that this case is different from Case 2 because the event sequence remains the same, i.e. $e_1$ is executed before $e_2$.

In our running example, widget $w_4$, in the GUI’s initial state, is not modified by event $square$, i.e., it remains empty; it is modified by event $create$, i.e., a circle is
shown; however, \( w_4 \) is modified differently by the sequence \( \langle \text{square}; \text{create} \rangle \). Hence, Case 3 applies to \textit{square} and \textit{create}.

**Case 4:** \( \mathcal{P}_{4(1)}(e_1, e_2) = \exists w \in W, p \in P_w, v \in V_p, v' \in V_p, v'' \in V_p, \bar{v} \in V_p, \text{s.t. } ((v \neq v') \land (v \neq v'') \land (v'' \neq \bar{v}) \land ((w, p, v) \in S_0) \land ((w, p, v') \in e_1(S_0)) \land ((w, p, v'') \in e_2(S_0)) \land ((w, p, \bar{v}) \in e_2(e_1(S_0)))) \); there is at least one widget \( w \) with property \( p \) that has an initial value \( v \), which is modified by individual events \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \); however, it is modified differently by the sequence \( \langle e_1; e_2 \rangle \).

The above four cases all handle widgets that persist across the four states being considered, i.e., \( S_0, e_1(S_0), e_2(S_0), \) and \( e_2(e_1(S_0)) \). In many cases, event execution “creates” new widgets, e.g., by opening menus; the next case handles newly created widgets.

**Case 5:** \( \mathcal{P}_{5(1)}(e_1, e_2) = \exists w \in W, p \in P_w, v \in V_p, v' \in V_p, \text{s.t. } ((v \neq v') \land ((w, p, v) \in e_x(S_0)) \land ((w, p, v) \not\in S_0) \land ((w, p, v') \in e_2(e_1(S_0)))) \); there is at least one new widget \( w \) with property \( p \) and value \( v \) in \( e_x(S_0) \), i.e., it was created by event \( e_x \) (either \( e_1 \) or \( e_2 \)) but did not exist in state \( S_0 \); it was created by the sequence \( \langle e_1; e_2 \rangle \) but with a different value for some property.

A common occurrence of event interaction in GUIs is enabling/disabling widgets, which may be modeled as the widget’s \texttt{ENABLED} property being set to \texttt{TRUE} or \texttt{FALSE}.

**Case 6:** \( \mathcal{P}_{6(1)}(e_1, e_2) = \exists w \in W, \text{ENABLED} \in P_w, \text{TRUE} \in V_{\text{ENABLED}}, \text{FALSE} \in V_{\text{ENABLED}}, \text{s.t. } (((w, \text{ENABLED}, \text{FALSE}) \in S_0) \land ((w, \text{ENABLED}, \text{TRUE}) \in e_1(S_0)) \land \text{EXEC}(e_2, w)); \) there exists at least one widget \( w \) that was disabled in \( S_0 \) but enabled by \( e_1 \). Event \( e_2 \) is performed on \( w \), represented by a predicate \texttt{EXEC}(\( e_2, w \)).
In our running example, create enables reset; hence Case 6 applies.

Modal windows create special situations for Cases 1 through 6 due to the presence of termination events. User actions in these windows do not cause immediate state changes; they typically take effect after a termination event has been executed, leading to contexts 2 and context 3.

**Context 2:** If both $e_1$ and $e_2$ are associated with widgets that are contained in one modal window with termination event $\text{TERM}$, then the definitions of $e_1(S_0)$, $e_2(S_0)$, and $e_2(e_1(S_0))$ are modified as follows: $e_1(S_0)$ is the state of the GUI after the execution of the event sequence $\langle e_1; \text{TERM} \rangle$, $e_2(S_0)$ is the state of the GUI after the execution of the event sequence $\langle e_2; \text{TERM} \rangle$, and $e_2(e_1(S_0))$ is the state of the GUI after the execution of the event sequence $\langle e_1; e_2; \text{TERM} \rangle$. All the predicates defined in Cases 1 through 6 apply, using these modified definitions, for $e_1$ and $e_2$ in the same modal window. The notation used for these predicates when applied in Context 2 is $\mathcal{P}_{n(2)}(e_1, e_2)$, where $n$ is the case number.

**Context 3:** If $e_1$ is associated with a widget contained in a modal window with termination event $\text{TERM}$, and $e_2$ is associated with a widget contained in the modal window’s parent window (i.e., the window that was used to open the modal window) then $e_1(S_0)$ is the state of the GUI after the execution of the event sequence $\langle e_1; \text{TERM} \rangle$, $e_2(S_0)$ is the state of the GUI after the execution of the event $e_2$, and $e_2(e_1(S_0))$ is the state of the GUI after the execution of the event sequence $\langle e_1; \text{TERM}; e_2 \rangle$. All the predicates defined in Cases 1 through 6 apply. The notation used for these predicates when applied in Context 3 is $\mathcal{P}_{n(3)}(e_1, e_2)$, where $n$ is the case number.
There is an Event Semantic Interaction relationship between two events $e_1$ and $e_2$ at least one of the predicates in Cases 1 through 6 evaluates to \textsc{true} in at least one context. If multiple cases apply, then one of the case numbers is used. Due to the specific ordering of the events in the sequence $\langle e_1; e_2 \rangle$, the ESI relationship is not symmetric. As demonstrated earlier, for our Radio Button Demo application: $\text{square} \rightarrow \text{create}$, $\text{create} \rightarrow \text{square}$, and $\text{create} \rightarrow \text{reset}$.

Once all of the cases have been implemented, the feedback-based process execution is straightforward. The steps of the execution are as follows.

1. The seed suite consisting of all 2-way interactions $\langle e_x; e_y \rangle$ between GUI events is executed on the software in state $S_0$; these test cases are simple enumerations of all EIG edges. All events $e_y$ are also executed in $S_0$. The state information $e_x(S_0)$, $e_y(S_0)$, $e_y(e_x(S_0))$ is collected and stored.

2. The above predicates are evaluated for each pair of system-interaction events in the EIG that are either (1) directly connected by an edge (Context 1) or (2) connected by a path that does not contain any intermediate system-interaction events (contexts 2 and 3), i.e., there is at least one termination event that closes a modal window on this path. If one of the predicates evaluates to \textsc{true}, the two events are ESI-related.

Once all the ESIs in a GUI have been identified, a graph model called the ESI graph (ESIG) is created. The ESIG contains nodes that represent events; a directed edge from node $n_x$ to $n_y$ shows that there is an ESI relationship from the event represented by $n_x$ to the event represented by $n_y$. Figure 2.9 shows the ESIG of the
Radio Button Demo GUI. The solid lines are ESIG edges; for comparison, we also show the EFG edges (dotted lines) and EIG edges (dashed lines).

Figure 2.9: Event Semantic Interaction Graph.

As was the case for EFGs and EIGs, the ESIG may be traversed using different graph traversal algorithms to generate test cases. For our example ESIG in Figure 2.9, two test cases are \( \langle \text{create}; \text{reset} \rangle \) and \( \langle \text{square}; \text{create}; \text{square}; \text{create}; \text{reset} \rangle \).

2.2.2.4 Off-nominal Event Graph

Belli et al. develop a technique to generate off-nominal test cases using the GUI’s workflow [33]. They define the workflow as an Event Sequence Graph (ESG).

Definition: An event sequence graph \( ESG = (V, E) \) is a directed graph where \( V \neq \emptyset \) is a finite set of vertices (nodes), \( E \subseteq V \times V \) is a finite set of arcs (edges), and \( \Xi, \Gamma \subseteq V \) are finite sets of distinguished vertices with \( \xi \in \Xi \) and \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) called entry
nodes and exit nodes, respectively, wherein $\forall v \in V$ there is at least one sequence of vertices $< \xi, v_0, ..., v_k >$ from each $\xi \in \Xi$ to $v_k = v$ and one sequence of vertices $< v_0, ... , v_k >$ from $v_0 = v$ to each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$, for $i = 0, ..., k - 1$ and $v \neq \xi, \gamma$.

Intuitively, the ESG is similar to the event-flow graph, except that there is a notion of exit nodes in an ESG. Such a workflow allows the definition of an event sequence (ES).

**Definition:** Let $V, E$ be as defined above. Then any sequence of vertices $< v_0, ... , v_k >$ is called an event sequence ES if $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$, for $i = 0, ... , k$.

This definition is used to define a complete event sequence (CES) in the ESG.

**Definition:** An ES is a complete ES (or, it is called a complete event sequence, CES), if $\alpha(ES) = \xi \in \Xi$ is an entry and $\beta(ES) = \gamma \in \Gamma$ is an exit.

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are the manually defined functions used to determine the entry and exit vertex of an ES.

These above definitions allow the formal definition of an off-nominal test case (or faulty event sequence) based on the ESG.

**Definition:** For an $ESG = (V, E)$, its completion is defined as $\widehat{ESG} = (V, \widehat{E})$ with $\widehat{E} = V \times V$.

**Definition:** The inverse (or complementary) $ESG$ is then defined as $\overline{ESG} = (V, \overline{E})$ with $\overline{E} = \widehat{E} \setminus E$.

Figure 2.10 shows the inverse ESG of the Radio Button Demo GUI. The dotted edges are ESG (EFG) edges. The oval shaded nodes represent initial events while the octagon nodes represent exit events.
Figure 2.10: Inverse Event Sequence Graph.

The solid edges in Figure 2.10 are the ones that are absent from the ESG. More formally, they represent faulty event pairs.

Definition: Any edge of the ESG is a faulty event pair (FEP) for the ESG.

Definition: Let $ES = v_0, \ldots, v_k$ be an event sequence of length $k + 1$ of an ESG and $FEP = < v_k, v_m >$ a faulty event pair of the corresponding ESG. The concatenation of the $ES$ and $FEP$ then forms a faulty event sequence $FES = < v_0, \ldots, v_k, v_m >$.

Such an FES can be used as an off-nominal test case. An example of such a test case for our running example is $\langle \text{square,circle,reset,no} \rangle$. The pair $(\text{reset,no})$ should not be executable because of the Exit Confirmantion modal dialog.
2.2.3 Pre- Post-Condition Models

In an approach presented by Memon et al. [34], the test designer models the GUI in terms of pre- and post-conditions for each event. The test designer then identifies commonly used tasks for the GUI; these are then input to the test case generator. The generator employs the pre- and post-conditions and specifications to generate event sequences to achieve the tasks.

The motivating idea behind this approach is that GUI test designers will often find it easier to specify typical user goals than to specify sequences of GUI events that users might perform to achieve those goals. The software underlying any GUI is designed with certain intended uses in mind; thus the test designer can describe those intended uses. However, it is difficult to manually obtain different ways in which a user might interact with the GUI to achieve typical goals. Users may interact in idiosyncratic ways, which the test designer might not anticipate. Additionally, there can be a large number of ways to achieve any given goal, and it would be very tedious for the GUI tester to specify even those event sequences that s/he can anticipate. The test case generator described in this section uses AI planning to generate GUI test cases for commonly used tasks using a GUI model based on pre- and post-conditions of all GUI events.

The test case generation process is partitioned into two phases, the setup phase and plan-generation phase. In the first step of the setup phase, the GUI representation is employed to identify planning operators, which are used by the planner to generate test cases. By using knowledge of the GUI, the test designer
defines the preconditions and effects of these operators. During the second or plan-
generation phase, the test designer describes scenarios (tasks) by defining a set
of initial and goal states for test case generation. Finally, the AI planning system
generates a test suite for the tasks using the plans. The test designer can iterate
through the plan-generation phase any number of times, defining more scenarios
and generating more test cases.

Formally, a planning problem $P(\Lambda, D, I, G)$ is a 4-tuple, where $\Lambda$ is the set of
operators, $D$ is a finite set of objects, $I$ is the initial state, and $G$ is the goal state.
Note that an operator definition may contain variables as parameters; typically an
operator does not correspond to a single executable action but rather to a family
of actions, one for each different instantiation of the variables. The solution to a
planning problem is a plan: a tuple $<S, O, L, B>$ where $S$ is a set of plan steps
(instances of operators, typically defined with sets of preconditions and effects),
$O$ is a set of ordering constraints on the elements of $S$, $L$ is a set of causal links
representing the causal structure of the plan, and $B$ is a set of binding constraints
on the variables of the operator instances in $S$. Each ordering constraint is of the
form $S_i < S_j$ (read as “$S_i$ before $S_j$”) meaning that step $S_i$ must occur sometime
before step $S_j$ (but not necessarily immediately before). Typically, the ordering
constraints induce only a partial ordering on the steps in $S$. Causal links are triples
$<S_i, c, S_j>$, where $S_i$ and $S_j$ are elements of $S$ and $c$ represents a proposition that
is the unification of an effect of $S_i$ and a precondition of $S_j$. Note that corresponding
to this causal link is an ordering constraint, i.e., $S_i < S_j$. The reason for tracking a
causal link $<S_i, c, S_j>$ is to ensure that no step “threatens” a required link, i.e.,
no step $S_k$ that results in $\neg c$ can temporally intervene between steps $S_i$ and $S_j$.

For the Radio Button Demo application, one possible task may be to create a square shape for $w_4$. This task is shown in Figure 2.11. Even with this simple application, there are several ways to perform this task. In fact, there are an infinite number of ways—in principle, a user can click on the Square radio button an arbitrary number of times. This task is input to the planner by describing the state of all the widgets in the initial and goal states.

![Initial State](image1) ![Goal State](image2)

Figure 2.11: A Task Specification.

Together with a specification of all pre- and postconditions of the events, the task is used by the planner to output the plan shown in Figure 2.12(a). As mentioned above, most AI planners produce partially-ordered plans, in which only some steps are ordered with respect to one another. The plan in Figure 2.12(a) is one such plan. The ordering constraints are shown as edges and also explicitly stated in Figure 2.12(b).

A total-order plan can be derived from a partial-order plan by adding ordering constraints, induced by removing threats. Each total-order plan obtained in such a way is called a linearization of the partial-order plan. A partial-order plan is a solution
to a planning problem if and only if every consistent linearization of the partial-order plan meets the solution conditions. Figure 2.12(c) shows the two linearizations of the plan; each of these linearizations can be used as a test case.

2.2.4 Event Sequence-Based Models

Because GUI test cases are sequences of events, Kasik et al. [41] manipulate such sequences of events to obtain new test cases. Their approach is based on genetic algorithms. The key motivation behind using genetic algorithms is that there is a need to test the GUI from the perspective of different groups of users, e.g., experts and novice users. Unsophisticated and novice users often exercise GUI applications in ways that the designer, the developer, and the tester did not anticipate. An
expert user or tester usually follows a predictable path through an application to accomplish a familiar task. The developer knows where to probe, to find the potentially problematic parts of an application. Consequently, applications are well tested for state transitions that work well for predicted usage patterns but become unstable when given to novice users. Novice users follow unexpected paths in the application, causing program failures. Such failures are difficult to predict at design and testing time.

One approach to test the GUI for novice interactions is to release the software to a small community for beta testing. However, this approach is expensive and time-consuming. Kasik et al.’s approach generates test cases that mimic a novice user. The key idea behind this approach is that expert users take short paths through an application’s GUI, using short-cuts when available and perform their tasks quickly. Novice users, on the other hand, take longer, exploratory paths to complete a task and gradually build better ways as they learn more about the application. It is challenging to automatically generate these paths for GUI testing.

In its simplest form, a genetic algorithm manipulates a table of random numbers; each row of the table represents a gene. The individual elements of a row (gene) contain a numeric genetic code and are called alleles. Allele values start as numbers that define the initial genetic code. The genetic algorithm lets genes that contain “better” alleles survive to compete against new genes in subsequent generations.

The basic genetic algorithm is as follows:
• Initialize the alleles with valid numbers.

• Repeat the following until the desired goal is reached:
  
  – Generate a score for each gene in the table.
  
  – Reward the genes that produce the best results by replicating them and allowing them to live in a new generation. All others are discarded using a death rate.
  
  – Apply two operators, mutation and crossover, to create new genes.

For GUIs testing, the event sequence is represented by a gene, each element being an event. The primary task of setting up the genetic algorithm is to set the death rates, crossover styles, and mutation rates so that novice behavior is generated. Also, to use genetic algorithms to generate meaningful interactions mimicking novice users, a clear and accurate specification of both the user interface dialog and the program state information is needed. The state information controls the legality of specific dialog components and the names of a legal command during an interaction. Without access to the state information, the generator may produce many meaningless input events.

For our running example, the Radio Button Demo GUI, an expert might use \( \langle \text{square}, \text{create} \rangle \) to create a square. The genetic algorithm may convert this sequence into the longer sequence \( \langle \text{circle}, \text{create}, \text{square}, \text{create} \rangle \), thereby mimicking a novice user.
2.2.5 Probabilistic Models

As seen in this chapter, there are several techniques to generate GUI test cases based on a model of the GUI. In practice, a GUI test designer may use a mix of these techniques to obtain several test suites. The test designer is faced with two significant challenges:

- **Overlaps in test suites**: As can be imagined, many of these techniques often overlap in what they test. A test designer who uses two or more GUI testing techniques may waste valuable resources testing and retesting the same parts of the GUI. Ideally, the test designer would like to consolidate all the test suites and obtain one suite that minimizes overlaps.

- **Large number of short tests and few long tests**: The sheer size of the individual suites presents practical problems for test execution. Because each test case requires significant overhead in terms of setup and teardown, having a large number of short tests is inefficient. Ideally, the test designer would like to obtain longer sequences that combine the strengths of individual short-sequence suites.

Consider for example, the three test suites shown in Figure 2.13, each generated using a different technique. It may be expensive to execute and maintain all these test cases. Brooks et al. [42] employ a probabilistic model of the GUI to combine these suites.

The probabilistic model is based on the event-flow graph model. The model contains a collection of $R$ paths through the EFG called $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R$. Each path
\[ r_i \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq R, \text{ consists of a sequence of } n \text{ events in addition to } INIT \text{ and } FINAL: \]

\[ r_i = INIT, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n, FINAL; \]

\[ \forall j \ e_j \in \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}\} \land \]

\[ \text{follows}(e_{j+1}, e_j) \]

where \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \) and \( e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1} \) are events in the EFG, \( r_i \) denotes a path, and each path \( r_i \) contains only events with a \text{follows} relationship between them. Valid paths can also be formed by the concatenation of two paths, \( e.g., r_a \) and \( r_b \), provided the first event of \( r_b \) \text{follows} the last event of \( r_a \) in the EFG.

Let \( \text{count}(e_i) \) return the number of times event \( e_i \) occurs in the paths \( r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R \). The prior probability that a randomly selected event from any of \( r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R \) is \( e_i \) is:

\[ P(e_i) = \frac{\text{count}(e_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{E} \text{count}(e_j)}. \]

Now, \( \text{count}(e_i) \) and the prior probability calculation are extended from single events to sequences of events. Let \( s \) be a length-\( S \) subsequence of some path through

Figure 2.13: Example test cases.
the EFG (not necessarily in $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R$):

\[
s_i = x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_S
\]

forall $j$ $e_j \in \{INIT, e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, FINAL\}$ \&

follows($e_{j+1}, e_j$).

The prior probability that a randomly selected, length-$S$ subsequence from any of $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R$ turns out to be $s$ is

\[
P(s) = \frac{\text{count}(s)}{\sum_{s_i \in \text{subs}(S)} \text{count}(s_i)},
\]

where \( \text{count}(s) \) returns the number of times $s$ occurs as a subsequence of $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R$ and $\text{subs}(S)$ is the set of all length-$S$ subsequences in $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R$.

Given that $s$ immediately precedes $e_i$, the conditional probability of $e_i$ is

\[
P(e_i|s) = \frac{P(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_S, e_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{E} P(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_S, e_j)}.
\]

Note that $P(e_i|s)$ can be thought of as $P(e_i)$ when $s$ has length $0$. This is not the same as $P(e_i|INIT)$, which is the probability that event $e_i$ is the first event in the sequence, occurring immediately after $INIT$. Rather, $P(e_i|s)$ is the probability of $e_i$ given no information about the events that precede it.

A probabilistic EFG (PEFG) is created by annotating each event (node) in the EFG with a table containing the event’s prior probability and its probability con-
ditioned on each subsequence in \{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_R\} up to some maximum subsequence length, or history, \(H\).

Figure 2.14 shows the PEFG obtained for the test suites of Figure 2.13. Column 2 of each table associated with every node shows the probability of executing the event associated with the node after the length 2 sequence shown in Column 1 of the table. For example, the entry for node (un)check corresponding to row exit, (un)check is 0.5. This is because the subsequence exit, (un)check appears twice in the original test suites. Once exit, (un)check has been executed, there is a 0.5 probability that the next event will be (un)check. These probabilities can be used to generate event sequences. One example sequence is INIT, exit, (un)check, FINAL. The resulting test case is \(\langle\text{exit, (un)check}\rangle\).

Figure 2.14: Probabilistic Event Flow Graph with history \(H = 2\).
2.2.6 Combinatorial Interaction Models

Software system faults are not only caused by individual components working in isolation but also caused by the interactions between them [43, 44]. In its basic form, GUI interaction testing consists of testing for interactions between all GUI components and their selections. However, since the number of GUI components is often huge, the number of tests required to cover the combinational interactions grows large very quickly [22]. Several combinational interaction models have been proposed to model GUI component interactions and reduce the number of test cases. This section presents two combinatorial models used for test case generation – a Latin square to cover pair-wise interactions [39] and a Covering Array to cover multi-way interactions with an arbitrary coverage strength [45].

2.2.6.1 Latin Squares

White [39] proposes the use of Latin squares to model the GUI inputs and generate test cases. He identifies two ways in which GUI interactions can arise: statically and dynamically (or a combination of both). Static interactions are restricted to one screen whereas dynamic interactions move from one screen to another to perform events on GUI objects. White makes the assumption that it is enough to test pair-wise interactions of GUI events. Similar assumptions have led to success in finding errors efficiently for conventional software [46].

The concept of Latin square is used to maintain the pairwise interaction coverage while keeping the number of test cases minimized.
Definition: A Latin square, of order $n$, is a matrix of $n$ symbols in a $n \times n$ cells, arranged in $n$ rows and $n$ columns, such that every symbol exactly once in each row and once in each column.

Definition: A pair of Latin squares $A = (a_{ij})$ and $B = (b_{ij})$ are orthogonal iff the ordered pairs $(a_{ij}, b_{ij})$ are distinct for all $i$ and $j$. In other words, when superimposed on each other, the ordered elements pairs of two orthogonal squares created in each cell cover all $n^2$ pairs.

Given $k$ factors $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_k$, where each factor is a GUI component from which selections are made. The GUI inputs are modeled as follow:

- Reorder $k$ factors by cardinality: $|F_1| \geq |F_2| \geq \cdots \geq |F_k|$.

- Construct $k-2$ orthogonal Latin squares with size $n$, where $n$ is the cardinality of $|F_1|$.

To test $k$ GUI components with maximum $n$ level, we need $k-2$ orthogonal Latin squares. The cell entries of the superimposed square represent $k-2$ components in the test and the row and column indices represent the additional 2 components. Since the generated triples (row index, column index, cell entry) are unique, the pairwise coverage requirement is guaranteed.

The original model proposed by White only considered menu items. Because our running example does not have menus, we cannot use this approach to test our example GUI.
2.2.6.2 Covering Arrays

Yuan et al. [45] use covering arrays [34] to generate test cases. The key motivation behind using covering arrays is to generate longer sequences that are systematically sampled at a particular coverage strength. This approach is a generalization of the Latin square discussed in the previous section; a fundamental difference is that in covering arrays, the coverage strength is not limited to 2-way interactions. Furthermore, the use of covering arrays allows fine control over the location of each event in the test case.

**Definition:** A covering array $CA(N; t, k, v)$ is an $N \times k$ array on $v$ symbols with the property that every $N \times t$ sub-array contains all ordered subsets of size $t$ of the $v$ symbols at least once. In other words, any subset of $t$-columns of this array will contain all $t$-combinations of the symbols.

Constructing a covering array with a minimal number of rows is an optimization problem. There are both mathematical algorithms as well as computational techniques such as greedy and meta-heuristic search [44] for this problem.

This test case generation technique leverages covering arrays to keep the number of test cases minimized while maintaining a required $t$-way coverage is between GUI events. A GUI is taken as input and first partitioned into different parts. Then, for each GUI part, a covering array is constructed to cover all events inside it. The output of this process is a set of covering arrays for all GUI partitions. Each array row becomes a GUI test case.

For our example Radio Button Demo application, we first partition the events
into different groups. For example, the three events \((un)\text{check}, \text{yes}\) and \(\text{no}\) in the Exit Confirmation window can form the ‘Exit’ group.

Suppose we are interested in 2-way coverage (i.e., test all possible 2-way interactions shown in Figure 2.15(a)) such that each event occupies all four positions in a length 4 sequence. If we used exhaustive enumeration, we need \(3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 3 = 81\) test cases. Formulating the problem as a covering arrays \(CA(N; 2, 4, 3)\), Figure 2.15(b), the number of test cases is only nine, each of which becomes a test case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\text{yes})</th>
<th>((un)\text{check})</th>
<th>(\text{yes})</th>
<th>(\text{yes})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(\text{no})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>((un)\text{check})</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 2-way covering.

Figure 2.15: 2-way Covering and Covering Array.

2.2.7 Hierarchical Models

All of the testing techniques discussed thus far use a single model of the GUI. However, using only one model may be impractical for a large GUI. Several researchers have addressed this problem by modeling the GUI at multiple levels of abstraction. The GUI is broken down into different components and modeled hierarchically.

We now discuss three such hierarchies, namely Keyword-driven hierarchy [47], Hierarchical finite state machines [48], and UML-diagram based hierarchy [49].
2.2.7.1 Keyword-driven Models

*Keyword-driven testing* [50] is a script-based testing technique widely used in industry. This technique divides the test case generation process into two phases: test plan and test implementation. In the test plan phase, the test designers design test cases using high-level activities called *action words*. In the test implementation phase, the test engineers transform the action words into executable events called *keywords*. To avoid ambiguities, the selected keywords are unique.

The idea behind using abstract test cases, i.e., those that contain high-level action words, is that domain experts, without any implementation skills, can easily design test cases using only the action words. This step can be done early, even before the system implementation has been started. The abstract test cases are also easier to comprehend; test maintenance is also more efficient.

Inspired by the keyword-driven testing technique, Antti et al. [47] propose a GUI testing model using Label Transition Systems (LTS). A LTS is a state machine whose transition names are taken from an alphabet. Formally, a LTS is defined as:

*Definition:* A *labeled transition system* (LTS) is a quadruple \((S, \Sigma, \Delta, \hat{s})\) where \(S\) is a set of states, \(\Sigma\) is a set of actions (alphabet), \(\Delta \subseteq S \times \Sigma \times S\) is a set of transitions and \(\hat{s} \in S\) is an initial state.

A GUI is modeled using two sets of LTSs corresponding to the two levels of abstraction in the keyword driven approach. The LTSs for the action word level are called *action machines* and the LTSs for the keyword level are called *refinement machines*. The action machines provide an overview of the system while
each refinement machines describes GUI navigation for certain parts of the GUI.

Figure 2.16(a) presents an action machine $\mathcal{A}$ for the Radio Button Demo application GUI. The labels in this machine represent the action words. Figure 2.16(b) is a refinement machine for the main window. The labels in this machine are keywords describing the actual GUI events.

These machines are automatically composed to an executable LTS by a parallel composition operator defined as follows.

**Definition:** $\parallel_R(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_n)$ is the parallel composition of $n$ LTSs according to
rules $R$ where LTS $L_i = (S_i, \Sigma_i, \Delta_i, \hat{s}_i)$ if let $\Sigma_R$ be a set of resulting actions and $\sqrt{\cdot}$ be a “pass” symbol such that $\forall i : \sqrt{\cdot} \not\in \Sigma_i$. The rule set $R \subseteq (\Sigma_1 \cup \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}) \times \cdots \times (\Sigma_n \cup \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}) \times \Sigma_R$. Now $||_R(L_1, \ldots, L_n) = (S, \Sigma, \Delta, \hat{s})$ where:

- $S = S_1 \times \cdots \times S_n$

- $\Sigma = \{a \in \Sigma_R | \exists a_1, \ldots, a_n : (a_1, \ldots, a_n, a) \in R\}$

- $((s_1, \ldots, s_n), a, (s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)) \in \Delta$ if and only if there is $(a_1, \ldots, a_n, a) \in R$ such that for every $i$ ($1 < i < n$)

  $\neg (s_i, a_i, s'_i) \in \Delta$ or

  $a_i = \sqrt{\cdot}$ and $s_i = s'_i$

- $\hat{s} = (\hat{s}_1, \ldots, \hat{s}_n)$

A rule in a parallel composition associates an array of actions (or “pass” symbol $\sqrt{\cdot}$) of input LTSs to an action in the resulting LTS. The action is the result of the synchronous execution of the actions in the array. If there is a $\sqrt{\cdot}$ instead of an action, the corresponding LTS will not participate in the synchronous execution described by the rule.
Assuming that we have the following composition rules:

\[ R = \{ \begin{align*}
(1) & \langle awCreateShape, kwClickCreate, kwClickCreate \rangle \\
(2) & \langle awCreateShape, kwSelectCircle, kwClickCircle \rangle \\
(3) & \langle awCreateShape, kwSelectSquare, kwClickSquare \rangle \\
(4) & \langle awReset, kwClickReset, kwClickReset \rangle \\
(5) & \langle awCancel, √, awCancel \rangle \\
(6) & \langle awQuit, √, awQuit \rangle \} \\
\] 

Figure 2.16(c) shows the composition machine \( C \) synthesized using the above rules. As we can see, the states in \( C \) are a combination (product) of \( A \)'s states and \( R \)'s states. By applying rules (1)-(4), two action words \( awCreateShape \) and \( awReset \) are refined to the corresponding keywords in \( C \). However, the action words \( awCancel \) and \( awQuit \) still remain unchanged. The rules (5) and (6) only copy them from \( A \) to \( C \). To refine those action words we need other refinement machines and composition rules.

After the composition machine is created, the test case generation is straightforward. Each path in the composition machine will become a GUI test case, which is a sequence of keywords. For our example, one possible test case might be \( \langle kwClickCreate, kwSelectSquare, kwSelectCircle, kwClickReset \rangle \), which translates to \( \langle create, square, circle, reset \rangle \).
2.2.7.2 Hierarchical Finite State Machines

Paiva et al. [48] use the hierarchy of GUI dialogs to create a hierarchical state-machine model for testing. In particular, the GUI is modeled as a hierarchy of FSMs whose vertices can either represent single states or groups of states in the original FSM. The model consisting of these FSMs is called a Hierarchical Finite State Machine (HFSM).

The hierarchy is based on GUI dialogs. Consider a GUI represented by $k$ dialogs $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_k$ which manipulate a set of variable $V$: $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{|V|}\}$. From the complete FSM of the application, the tester manually specifies the state machine $F_i$ for each dialog $D_i$. Given the $FSM_{D_i}$ for a dialog $D_i$, it is possible to deduce the variables manipulated that dialog. A variable $v_i$ is written by (or is affected by) a dialog $D$ if there is a transition in $FSM_D$ that changes the value of $v_i$. A variable $v_i$ is read by (or influences the behavior of) a dialog $D$ if at least one of the following conditions holds:

1. there are two transitions $T$ and $T'$ in $FSM_D$ and a variable $v_k$ in $V$ (not necessarily $i \neq k$) such that: (i) the source states of $T$ and $T'$ are different only in the value of $v_i$; (ii) $T$ and $T'$ have the same triggering action (name and arguments); (iii) the destination states of $T$ and $T'$ have different values of $v_k$; and (iv) at least one of the transitions (say $T$) changes the value of $v_k$;

2. there are two states $S$ and $S'$ and a transition $T$ with source $S$ in $FSM_D$ such that: (i) $S$ and $S'$ are different only in the value of $v_i$; (ii) there is no transition $T'$ with source $S'$ and the same action as $T$. 


Let $PFSM_{D_i}$ be the projection of $FSM_{D_i}$ onto the variables manipulated by dialog $D_i$ then we can use $PFSM_{D_i}$ to describe the internal behaviors of $D_i$. Also from $PFSM_{D_i}$, it is possible to reconstruct $FSM_{D_i}$ by taking the union of the instances of $PFSM_{D_i}$ for all possible combinations of variable values that are not manipulated by it.

Using the notation of PFSMs, the original state machine can be organized into a 3-level HFSM:

1. The *top level* is an abstract FSM representing the relationships between independent dialogs.
2. The *intermediate level* is a set of projected FSMS representing internal behaviors for each dialog.
3. The *bottom level* is a complete FSM representing the behaviors of the entire GUI.

Considering the Radio Button Demo application, and its GUI states represented by a length 4 vector \{log, exitWinOpen, created, shape\} as done in Section 2.2.1.1, a tester may specify a subFSM for the main window (dialog $D_{Main}$) to include all states where exitWinOpen is set to 0 and the transitions between them. The other states make up the subFSM for the Exit Confirmation window (dialog $D_{Exit}$). Figure 2.17(c) shows the complete FSM (*bottom level*) for the application. The states are organized into two regions (enclosed by dashed lines) corresponding to two subFSMs. Note that the same full FSM was previous shown in Section 2.2.1.1, except that its layout has changed.
We can infer that that \textit{created} and \textit{shape} are two variables manipulated by \(D_{\text{Main}}\) while \textit{log} is the only variable manipulated by \(D_{\text{Exit}}\). Neither \(D_{\text{Main}}\) nor \(D_{\text{Exit}}\) manipulates \textit{exitWinOpen}. Using this analysis, the \textit{top level} and the \textit{intermediate level} of the HFSM can be constructed as shown in Figure 2.17(a) and Figure 2.17(b).

Two dialogs are \textit{independent} if the set of variables written by one dialog is disjoint from the set of variables manipulated (read or written) by the other. In this case, instead of testing the complete FSM we only need to consider their PFSMs individually. In other words, those dialogs do not need to be tested very time there is a change on variables they do not depend on. To test a dialog \(D\), the variables not manipulated by \(D\) are fixed to a particular value and the test cases are generated using the \textit{PFSM} of \(D\).

Applying this strategy to test the \textbf{Radio Button Demo}'s GUI, we first realize that \(D_{\text{Main}}\) and \(D_{\text{Exit}}\) are two independent dialogs. So we can test \(D_{\text{Main}}\) by fixing \(\textit{log} = 0\) (\textit{exitWinOpen} is already fixed) and generate test case in the \textit{PFSM}_{Main}. Similarly, to test \(D_{\text{Exit}}\) we fix \(\textit{created} = 0\) and \(\textit{shape} = C\). Two transiting actions \textit{exit} and \textit{no} also need to be tested once by fixing \(\textit{created} = 0, \textit{shape} = C\) and \(\textit{log} = 0\). Instead of testing all possible paths of the FSM in Figure 2.17(c), we now only need to examine those in bold.

\subsection{2.2.7.3 UML Diagram-based}

As seen in previous sections, using formal models to represent GUIs makes it possible to systematically generate and analyze test cases. However, these models are often
Figure 2.17: Hierarchical Finite State Machine (self-loops are omitted for readability).

not intuitive, causing difficulties for test designers who are not familiar with formal Computer Science concepts. Paiva et al. [49] builds another visual layer on top of formal models to assist testers. The GUI is modeled using familiar UML notations
and then automatically translated to the underlying formal model by tools. More specifically, the formal model is a set of FSMs which are encoded in a specification language called Spec# (an extension of the C# programming language) [51].

The GUI behaviors are specified by four UML diagrams: *use case diagrams*, *activity diagrams*, *class diagrams* and *state machine diagrams*. These diagrams are enriched with additional stereotypes to enable automatic transformation from the visual forms to Spec# code.

*Use case diagrams* provides an overview of the main functionalities and features of the GUI application. They describe the scenarios in which the GUI is used. The use case diagrams are used to support other UML diagrams. However, there is no formal Spec# code directly generated from these diagrams. Figure 2.18 shows a use case diagram one might design for the **Radio Button Demo** example. The diagram consists of three main use case **Edit shape**, **Reset**, and **Exit** corresponding to three main scenarios the user may interact with the GUI.

*Activity diagrams* describes the business logic of use cases. The conditions and steps in the diagrams are directly encoded in Spec# syntax. Besides the user steps, they may have parameters that correspond to user inputs, pre/post-conditions (describing use case intent) and assertions. *Class diagrams* describes the static structure of the GUI. Each top-level window is modeled as an object. The state variables are represented by class variables, while the interactive controls are *State machine diagrams* describe the dynamic reactive behaviors of the GUI. The diagrams show GUI states at different levels of abstraction, the user actions available at each state, their effects on the GUI states, and the sequences of user actions. Each state
of the state machine can be formalized by a Boolean condition on the state variables. Each transition has a triggering event that is the call of a method representing a user action. The transitions may additionally have pre- and post-conditions on state variables and method parameters. A set of rules are developed to translate the state machine diagrams into the Spec # code. After the formal specifications (e.g., Spec# code) are generated for all UML diagrams, an analyzer tool (e.g., Spec Explorer) is used to analyze the formal models and generate test cases for each diagram accordingly.

2.3 Summary

This chapter presented some of the recent advances in automated model-based GUI testing to motivate the need of the proposed work. Graphical user interfaces are by far the most popular means used to interact with software today. Unfortunately, the
state-of-the-practice in GUI testing has not kept pace with the rapidly evolving GUI technology. In practice, GUI testing is largely manual, often resulting in inadequate testing.

In its very fundamental form, the goal of GUI testing is to determine whether the GUI executes as expected, as documented in the specifications, or as required by the intended user. This definition is very broad and may encompass factors such as testing the GUI’s usability, correctness, and performance. Since GUI testing is a multifaceted problem, no one technique can be used for GUI testing; in fact, in practice, a collection of techniques are almost always used. Model-based testing can be considered a promising approach to handle the complexity of the GUI-based software.

Finally, in all of the proposed model-based testing techniques, the GUI input space is assumed determined. However, with the context-sensitive nature of the modern GUIs, this assumption is no longer true. More comprehensive approaches to explore the GUI’s input space and construct an adequate testing model are needed. The field of model-based GUI testing remains ripe for the application of upcoming areas of research.
Chapter 3

Observe-Model-Exercise* Testing Paradigm

System testing of software applications with a graphical-user interface (GUI) front-end requires that sequences of GUI events—that sample the application’s input space—be generated and executed as test cases on the GUI. However, the context-sensitive behavior of the GUI of most of today’s non-trivial software applications makes it practically impossible to fully determine the software’s input space. Consequently, GUI testers—both automated and manual—working with undetermined input spaces are, in some sense, blindly navigating the GUI, unknowingly missing allowable event sequences, and failing to realize that the GUI implementation may allow the execution of some disallowed sequences.

This chapter presents a new paradigm for GUI testing called Observe-Model-Exercise* (OME*) to tackle the emerging challenges in GUI testing. The key feature of OME* is its opportunistic use of test case execution for model enhancement. More specifically, we now observe the existence of new events either during Ripping or test execution to create or enhance an EFG+ model—an extension of the EFG model—and exercise the newly observed GUI events in test cases using test adequacy criteria. The “*” in OME is due to the iterative nature of the entire approach. As new test cases are generated and executed, their executions are used to observe new events, which are added to the model and used to compute new test requirements,
and subsequently to obtain additional test cases. The iteration ends when no new enhancements can be made to the model.

In next section, we present a step-by-step overview of OME* via an example. Then, we conceptually discuss the new models and algorithms to realize OME*. More detail on the empirical evaluation of OME* will be provided in the following chapters.

3.1 Overview

Because this work leverages several of previously reported techniques [19, 38, 22, 45] we feel that it is appropriate to present an overview, with a running example, to demonstrate the prior work as well as the new OME* paradigm. Figure 3.1(a) presents the GUI of our running example, motivated by the MS Word example that we showed in the previous section. It consists of four events in the New document window. Events $e_1$, $e_2$, and $e_3$ are non-structural events—they do not open/close windows/menus—that manipulate radio buttons and checkbox states. Selecting the Blog post radio button enables $e_3$. Event $e_4$ opens a new modal window\(^1\) entitled either Blog post (with non-structural events $e_5$, $e_6$, and $e_7$) or Blank document (with non-structural events $e_5$ and $e_8$) depending on the states of the radio buttons in the New document window. Checking the Already have a home page check box enables $e_7$.

\(^1\)A modal window, once invoked, restricts the focus of the user to the events within the window, until explicitly closed.
Figure 3.1: Running example.
Our overall goal is to test this running example. We summarize our process using the following steps:

**Step 1: Running the Ripper:** We start by running our Ripper on the application to obtain its EFG. Events $e_1$, $e_2$, $e_3$, and $e_4$ are all available in the main window; their states are as shown in Figure 3.1(a). Because of their availability in the GUI’s start state, these events form the initial nodes set, $I$. The Ripper incorporates these nodes into the EFG; they are shown as shaded ovals in Figure 3.1. The Ripper then starts executing the encountered events one by one: $e_1$ followed by $e_2$, then $e_3$, and $e_4$. After events $e_1$, $e_2$, and $e_3$, the Ripper determines that they are non-structural events because no window is opened or closed; the follows relationships are then computed according to the algorithms presented in earlier work [19] and added to the EFG. Event $e_4$ opens a new window; because of the selected state of the Blog post radio button and checked state of $e_3$, the new window is titled Blog post with three events $e_5$, $e_6$, and $e_7$, all enabled. They are all executed but no new window opens. Their follows relationships are then computed and added to the EFG. The final EFG after the Ripping phase is shown in Figure 3.1(c).

**Step 2: Generating and executing test cases:** In this example, we will assume that we want to cover all EFG edges as our test criterion; we have used this criterion in earlier work (e.g., [18, 38, 22]). There are 24 edges in the EFG of Figure 3.1(c), yielding 24 test cases. The process for test case generation has been explained in earlier reported work [19]. Edges are selected one by one; for each edge $(e_x, e_y)$, a path is computed—using a method called prepend_context()—from one of the initial nodes to $(e_x, e_y)$, yielding a test case.
In previous work, because we lacked specific information about the events, our `prepend_context()` method could only rely on the EFG’s topology to obtain a path from one of the nodes in the initial nodes set to the edge in question. For efficiency reasons, we used the shortest path. For example, if we select the edge \((e_5, e_7)\), the shortest path to its first event is \(\langle e_4 \rangle\), yielding a test case \(\langle e_4, e_5, e_7 \rangle\). However, execution of this test case stops at \(e_5\) because \(e_7\) is disabled. This presents us with Challenge 1 mentioned in Section 1.2, Chapter 1: \textit{it is challenging to generate particular event sequences to replicate context-sensitive behavior of events.}

In our work presented in this paper, we now maintain a context-aware mapping between edges and paths to edges that have previously been seen to be executable. This mapping, together with our previous EFG model forms our new EFG+ model. Using the mapping, partly seen in Figure 3.1(b), the entry for edge \((e_5, e_7)\) is \(\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \rangle\) because this was the executable path seen during \textit{Ripping}. Hence, we will get \(\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_7 \rangle\) as our test case. All 24 test cases are generated in this fashion, guaranteeing that all 24 EFG edges will be covered. These 24 test cases are then executed.

From our knowledge of the GUI, we know that we have yet to test event \(e_8\). However, our \textit{Ripper} does not even know of the existence of \(e_8\). We need ways to drive the GUI into such a state that \(e_8\) is exposed, tested, and added to our EFG model. To do so would, in principle, require that we traverse all possible paths in the GUI. This presents us with Challenge 2: \textit{it is challenging to devise new event sequences that reveal new parts of the input space and help to enhance the model without incurring significant additional cost.}
In our work presented in this paper, our approach to handle this challenge is to simultaneously use test execution for model enhancement. For example, one of our 24 test cases is \( \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle \), whose execution will open the *Blank document* window with events \( e_5 \) and \( e_8 \). If at this time, we can recognize \( e_8 \) as a new yet-to-cover event, we can devise ways to cover it. We have developed mechanisms to add newly discovered events during test execution to our EFG. This presents us with Challenge 3: *it is challenging to identify new events/widgets, i.e., to determine whether an event/widget has already been seen.* For example, we know that \( e_5 \) is the *Insert* button that we have seen earlier. On the other hand, we have never before seen \( e_8 \), the *Page Layout* button. Do we make a determination based solely on the “text labels” of these widgets? This would cause problems as many widgets in the GUI have the same text label (e.g., *OK*, *Cancel*). We have developed mechanisms to assign unique *signatures* to each widget; and heuristics to determine the uniqueness of the signatures.

**Step 3:** *Iteratively enhancing the EFG model, and generating and executing new test cases:* Having developed the ability to identify newly encountered widgets during test execution, we face Challenge 4: *it is challenging to incrementally make changes to the model to add new elements.* To date, we have developed algorithms to create the EFG in one pass. In our work presented in this paper, we develop techniques to incrementally enhance the EFG. The new EFG after the addition of \( e_8 \) is shown in Figure 3.1(d). Because we observed \( e_8 \) after the execution of \( e_4 \), we know that “\( e_8 \) follows \( e_4 \)” which is why we have a new edge from \( e_4 \) to \( e_8 \). Moreover, because we know that \( e_5 \) is not a structural event, i.e., it does not open a new window nor does
it close the current window, $e_8$ could potentially follow $e_5$; hence, we also add the edge $(e_5, e_8)$ to the EFG.

Now that we have two new not-yet-covered edges, $(e_4, e_8)$ and $(e_5, e_8)$, we need to generate test cases to cover them so that we can satisfy our test criteria. This presents us with Challenge 5: it is challenging to incrementally generate new test cases. In our work presented in this paper, we have developed an algorithm to compute new test requirements from changes to the EFG+ model and generate test cases to satisfy the requirements. Using that algorithm, assume that we get test cases $\langle e_1, e_4, e_8 \rangle$ and $\langle e_1, e_4, e_5, e_8 \rangle$, to cover $(e_4, e_8)$ and $(e_5, e_8)$, respectively. These test cases are executed; $e_8$ is determined to be a non-structural event; two new follows relationships are added; these are new EFG edges $(e_8, e_8)$ and $(e_8, e_5)$ (new EFG shown in Figure 3.1(e)). As before, we now need to cover these new edges via new test cases. No changes are made to the EFG model during the execution of these test cases, and so the test process is complete, having satisfied the test criterion of covering all edges.

Even though we used a small example, we were able to show how OME* is used to discover new parts of the input space and exercise them. However, as we will see in our evaluation in Chapter 5, it is possible that we may not be able to automatically exercise all model elements that we observe; in such cases, manual intervention is needed.
3.2 Realizing the OME* Paradigm

We now discuss the new models, algorithms, and techniques that we developed to realize the new OME* paradigm. We structure our discussion around the contributions listed in Chapter 1 (Section 1.2).

3.2.1 Contribution 1: Context-Aware Mapping

In our past work, we relied on the “shortest-path algorithm” to obtain a sequence of events starting with a node in $I$, the initial nodes set, to the model element (e.g., EFG nodes, edges) that we are trying to exercise. As demonstrated by the example of edge $(e_5, e_7)$ in the previous section, this does not always yield an executable event sequence, especially when GUI behavior is extremely context sensitive. To address this problem, we now maintain a new context-aware mapping between model elements and executable event sequences that have previously been successfully used to exercise these elements. Intuitively, during Ripping and test case execution, if we observe a certain model element is available after the execution of a particular event sequence, we create a new mapping to use later to reach the element.

Consider, for example, the execution of event sequence $(e_2, e_3, e_4)$ on the GUI of Figure 3.1(a). Recall that our coverage elements are EFG edges; hence our mapping will be between EFG edges and event sequences used to reach them. We start with the execution of $e_2$, after which the events $e_1$, $e_2$, $e_3$, and $e_4$ are available for execution. We execute $e_3$, which does not change the set of available events. We execute $e_4$, after which events $e_5$, $e_6$, and $e_7$ are available. The same information,
put in terms of the model elements, EFG edges, can be thought of as: "edges \((e_4, e_5), (e_4, e_6), \text{ and } (e_4, e_7)\) are reachable via the event sequence \(\langle e_2, e_3 \rangle\)." If, in the future, we want to cover these edges, we can use this information. This is precisely what we record in our mapping. Hence we see entries for the edges \((e_4, e_5), (e_4, e_6), \text{ and } (e_4, e_7)\) in our partial mapping shown in Table 3.1; there are several more, e.g., \((e_3, e_4)\), which needs \(e_2\). There are also several \textit{NONE} entries, which means that the first element in the edge is in \(I\), and it is enabled, making it trivial to reach this edge from the initial state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edge</th>
<th>Path to edge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((e_4, e_5))</td>
<td>(\langle e_2, e_3 \rangle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_4, e_6))</td>
<td>(\langle e_2, e_3 \rangle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_4, e_7))</td>
<td>(\langle e_2, e_3 \rangle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_2, e_1))</td>
<td>(\text{NONE})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_3, e_4))</td>
<td>(\langle e_2 \rangle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_3, e_1))</td>
<td>(\langle e_2 \rangle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_2, e_2))</td>
<td>(\text{NONE})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e_2, e_4))</td>
<td>(\text{NONE})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\ldots)</td>
<td>(\ldots)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We now describe the mapping formally and present an algorithm for its construction.

\textit{Definition:} A \textbf{Context-aware Mapping} \(CM\) is a table of key-value pairs \(\{me; \langle e_i, \ldots, e_j \rangle\}\); where \(me\) is a model element and \(\langle e_i, \ldots, e_j \rangle\) is an event sequence after which \(me\) was previously observed to be available for execution, where event \(e_i \in I\), the initial event set for the GUI. The entry is \textit{NONE} if the first event in \(me\) is in \(I\), i.e., no sequence is required to reach \(me\).

As alluded to previously, the context-aware mapping is constructed from event
sequence execution. During the execution of each sequence, we maintain an explicit structure to compute the context-aware mapping. Figure 3.2 shows the structure for the example discussed above. At the very top is the executing event sequence \(\langle e_2, e_3, e_4 \rangle\). The set of enabled events after each executed event is enclosed in a dotted oval. The shaded nodes are events in \(I\). Solid arrows show the sequence executed; a dashed arrow from event \(e_x\) to \(e_y\) shows that \(e_y\) was available and enabled after the execution of \(e_x\). To obtain the context-aware mapping, one needs only to trace each edge back to the starting event. For example, the edges \((e_4, e_5)\), \((e_4, e_6)\), and \((e_4, e_7)\) have a path \(\langle e_2, e_3 \rangle\) from the left-most node.

Figure 3.2: Available Events Observed During Execution.

Algorithm 1 shows how this structure, \(T\), is constructed and used to create/update the mapping, \(CM\). The algorithm takes three inputs: (1) a sequence of executed events, each paired with a set of events available and enabled after its execution, (2) the context-aware mapping available thus far (from previously processed event sequences), and (3) the set of events enabled in the initial state \(I\). Lines 1–6 create the structure \(T\). Edges are added from each executed event \(e_i\) to all events \(e_j\) that are available and enabled after \(e_i\). Lines 7–23 use the structure to create the mapping. First, all the model elements \(ME\) are obtained from \(T\) (Line 7); for
our example, this is the set of edges. Then each element \( me \) is processed using one of two cases: (1) if the first event of \( me \) is enabled in the initial state, as is the case for edge \( (e_2, e_2) \), the mapping entry is set to \( NONE \) (Line 10), (2) otherwise a \( searchPath() \) function is used to find a sequence from the left-most element of \( T \) to \( me \) (Line 12). For example, for the edge \( (e_4, e_7) \), the path returned is \( \langle e_2, e_3 \rangle \).

Because event sequences may be long, it is possible that the GUI is driven back to its initial state multiple times during execution. In such cases, the path may become unnecessarily long, which is why we use \( truncate() \) to remove leading events (Line 14). Lines 15–22 update the mapping \( CM \). If an entry for \( me \) does not already exist in \( CM \), the key-value pair \( \{em, contextSeq\} \) is simply added; otherwise, the shorter of existing and new path is retained.

3.2.2 Contribution 2: Simultaneously Extracting New Model Elements During Test Execution

We define a GUI test case as a pair \( (S_0, \langle e_1; e_2; e_3; \ldots; e_n \rangle) \), where \( S_0 \) is a designated start state of the GUI for this test case; and each \( e_i \in E \), the set of events in the GUI. Our test executor (or \( Replayer \)) starts executing the test case by launching the GUI under test in start state \( S_0 \), and executes each event one by one. It determines the correctness of the GUI by using a test oracle [52]. Consider the GUI of our running example shown in Figure 3.1(a). The start state is marked \( S_0 \). All test cases start in this state. During test execution, the GUI transitions through a sequence of states where each state is obtained after the execution of an event. In our work,
Algorithm 1 Construct Mapping

Require: \((e_1, \alpha(S_1)) \ldots (e_n, \alpha(S_n))\): executed sequence

Require: \(CM\): Context-aware mapping

Require: \(\alpha(I)\): Events enabled in initial state

1: \(T = \emptyset\)
2: for \(i = 1 \rightarrow n\) do
3:   for all \(e_j \in \alpha(S_i)\) do
4:     \(T.addEdge(e_i, e_j)\)
5:   end for
6: end for
7: \(ME \leftarrow getModelElements(T)\)
8: for all \(me \in ME\) do
9:   if \(firstEvent(me) \in \alpha(I)\) then
10:     \(contextSeq = NONE\)
11:   else
12:     \(contextSeq = searchPath(me, T)\)
13: end if
14: \(truncate(contextSeq)\)
15: if \(me \notin CM\) then
16: \(CM.addEntry(me, contextSeq)\)
17: else
18: \(contextSeq_{old} \leftarrow lookUp(CM, me)\)
19: if \(|contextSeq_{old}| > |contextSeq|\) then
20: \(CM.updateEntry(me, contextSeq)\)
21: end if
22: end if
23: end for
24: return \(CM\): Updated context-aware mapping

we assume that the outcome of an event in a given state is deterministic. In our running example, once \(e_4\) is executed, the GUI changes to state \(S_1\) or \(S_2\) based on the states of widgets corresponding to events \(e_1\) and \(e_2\).

We define a GUI state as the full set of all triples \((w_i, p_j, v_k)\), where \(w_i\) is a widget currently extant in the GUI, \(p_j\) is a property of \(w_i\), taken from a designated set of properties, and \(v_k\) is a value for \(p_j\), taken from a set of possible values. We see some such triples in Figure 3.1(a) for our running example. The GUI states \(S_0\), \(S_1\), and \(S_2\) would need to contain such triples for all widgets, all their properties,
and values.

We augmented our test executor to collect the state of the GUI after the execution of each event. Using reflection, we obtain the object class for each widget as well as the set of methods associated with the class. If the method name starts with the *get*, (e.g., *getLabel()*, *getX()*), *getY()*), we invoke it to *dynamically* obtain the value of the property. The part of the method name immediately following *get* becomes the name of the property. This approach is useful because it is impossible to predict the list of all properties of all possible widget types. For example, the *label* property is available for a *JButton* but not for a *JTextField*. Similarly, if the method name starts with the *is*, (e.g., *isEnabled()*, *isVisible()*), we assume that it returns a boolean value that is also added to our properties. Figure 3.3 shows part of our Java code used to collect states for GUI widgets.

```java
Method[] methods = widget.getClass().getMethods();
for (Method m : methods) {
    String methodName = m.getName();
    if (methodName.startsWith("get")) {
        property = methodName.substring(3);
        value = m.invoke(widget, new Object[0]);
    }
    if (methodName.startsWith("is")) {
        property = methodName.substring(2);
        value = m.invoke(widget, new Object[0]);
    }
    ...
}
```

Figure 3.3: Code to collect GUI widget states.

Once we have the sequence of states, one state after each event, we developed a post-processing step to pass it for addition to the EFG model, which we discuss
3.2.3 Contribution 3: Unique Widget Signatures

So far, we have conveniently referred to individual widgets by their text labels, e.g., Insert. Although this is fine for informal discussion in this paper’s text so long as the context is clear, use of a text label to identify a widget is insufficient for our tools such as the Ripper or Replayer. One cannot expect to perform an event on a widget, for example, using a method invoke("Insert"), and expect it to work correctly in all contexts; for instance, there might be two widgets, a button and a pull-down menu, in the current window with text label “Insert”; an automated tool does not know which one to execute. In such a situation, one might disambiguate by adding the “widget type” to the call, e.g., invoke("Insert", Button). But this too would not work if both widgets were buttons. One may specify additional widget attributes, e.g., widget coordinates to the invocation to further disambiguate.

The above discussion is moot if each widget in the GUI had a unique identifier, perhaps assigned when programming the GUI, that remains unchanged across application runs. Such identifiers may be used by testers/tools to identify a widget, e.g., during the ripping and test generation phases, and then again later during test execution. Several researchers and practitioners have advocated the need for such identifiers for good testability of GUI software [53, 54]. However, in practice, such identifiers are rarely used [55]. In all fairness, there are situations in which it becomes difficult to use identifiers for widgets. For example, widgets may be dy-
namically generated based on some underlying data, e.g., one widget for each item available in an online store’s database.

Whatever the reasons for not having widget identifiers in practice, the problem of not being able to uniquely identify widgets severely complicates our new work. Consider the Insert button in our running example. Our tools (Ripper and Replayer) may encounter it in two different contexts: first in the modal window entitled Blog post and second in the window entitled Blank document. These tools need to determine whether both these encounters were for the same widget or two different widgets; the determination will result in either one or two nodes in the EFG. Because we created this running example, we know that it is the same Insert in both instances, which is why we gave it the unique identifier $e_5$. In fact, we know that Blog post and Blank document are two instances of the same modal window. However, an automated tool has no way of knowing this information.

Admittedly, it is impossible to devise a general unique widget identification scheme that works for all possible GUIs. Any solution will have to be application-specific. In this section, we describe a general mechanism that must be manually fine-tuned on a per-GUI basis. Our mechanism is based on using a combination of certain parts of the state of the widget and its container (e.g., window). We cannot use the entire state for identification because it will contain some property values that change during the GUI’s execution but do not play any role in identifying that widget. For example, the value of the text property for a JTextField object will change when the text changes; the enabled property changes when the object is enabled/disabled. Such properties cannot be used for our signature because any
change to their values will indicate a new widget, which would be incorrect.

More formally, we define the signature, \( C_{\text{sig}} \), for a container \( C \) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_{\text{state}} & \leftarrow \langle (p_1, v_1), (p_2, v_2), \ldots, (p_n, v_n) \rangle \\
\langle v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle & \leftarrow \text{select}(\text{filter}_p, C_{\text{state}}) \\
C_{\text{sig}} & \leftarrow \Phi(\phi_i(v_i), \ldots, \phi_k(v_k))
\end{align*}
\] (3.1)

where the user defines, per GUI, \( \text{filter}_p \), a specification of a subset of the container’s properties and transformations \( \phi_i \ldots \phi_k \) on the values of the properties. The function \( \text{select} \) returns the values of the properties specified by \( \text{filter}_p \) and function \( \Phi \) is a hash function on the transformed values.

Along similar lines, we define the signature, \( w_{\text{sig}} \), for a widget \( w \) in a container with signature \( C_{\text{sig}} \), as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
w_{\text{state}} & \leftarrow \langle (p_1, v_1), (p_2, v_2), \ldots, (p_n, v_n) \rangle \\
\langle v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle & \leftarrow \text{select}(\text{filter}_p, w_{\text{state}}) \\
w_{\text{sig}} & \leftarrow \Gamma(C_{\text{sig}}, \gamma_i(v_i), \ldots, \gamma_k(v_k))
\end{align*}
\] (3.4)

where \( \text{filter}_p \) and \( \gamma_i \ldots \gamma_k \) are user-defined; and function \( \Gamma \) is a hash function on the transformed values and the container’s signature.

In Section 5.3 (Chapter 5), we give examples of these user-defined functions and transformations, and empirically show, for our subject GUI applications, that they help to uniquely identify widgets.
3.2.4 Contribution 4: Incremental EFG$^+$ Enhancements

Once a new widget/event is identified, it is used to enhance the EFG$^+$ model. We have already discussed, in Section 3.2.1, how to incrementally update the context-aware mapping, which is an important part of the EFG$^+$ model. We now discuss how to incrementally enhance the EFG.

We have already informally discussed EFG enhancement in Section 3.1 and illustrated it in Figures 3.1(d) and 3.1(e). These figures actually show the three important steps for incremental EFG enhancement: (1) add a node to represent the new event; (2) add edges to the new node and (3) add edges from the new node to other nodes.

To explain these steps, we revisit two important terms in GUIs: modal and modeless windows. At any time during GUI interaction, a user is allowed to execute events within a modal window and any modeless window that was opened from the modal window. At no time can the user jump between modal windows without explicitly terminating them. Moreover, the user cannot interleave events that belong to modeless windows associated with different modal windows. Again, the user must explicitly terminate the modal window that is associated with the modeless window, explicitly invoke the other modal window, open the modeless window, and invoke any of its constituent events. A part of MS Word’s window hierarchy is shown in Figure 3.4. Edit Picture and Edit Chart are modal windows whereas Format Picture, Help Picture, Manage Template, and Help Chart are modeless. Consider events $x$, $y$, $z$, $a$, $b$, and $c$. A user may execute $x$, $y$, and $z$ together because they
are all contained in Edit Picture’s window group; similarly, events $a$, $b$, and $c$ may be executed together. However, these two sets of events cannot interleave without their modal windows being explicitly invoked and terminated. The above behavior

![Figure 3.4: A partial window hierarchy of MS Word.](image)

of GUI windows to restrict sets of events leads to the definition of a new term that we call the scope of an event. We define the scope of an event $e$ as the set of events contained in the group of modal and modeless windows to which $e$ belongs. We use scope in an algorithm to incrementally and efficiently enhance the EFG model.

More formally, we use Algorithm 2 to enhance our EFG. The algorithm is invoked after each event, $e$, is executed. It takes two parameters: (1) the EFG, and (2) the executed event. The set of all events available (enabled or disabled) is first obtained (Line 1). For each event, $e_i$, in this set, three steps are performed. First, if $e_i$ has never been seen before (as was the case with $e_8$ in Figure 3.1(d)), then it is added to the set of nodes in the EFG (Line 4). Second, if the edge that was used to get to $e_i$ was never seen before, then it is added as an edge (Line 7). This was the case for the edge $(e_4, e_8)$ in Figure 3.1(d). Third, the set of events in $e_i$’s scope are obtained (Line 9). Those that are not structural, i.e., do not open/close modal
windows, are used to add edges to the newly observed event $e_i$ (Line 13).
This is what we used for edge $(e_5, e_8)$ in Figure 3.1(d).

**Algorithm 2** Enhance EFG Model

**Require:** $(N, E)$: EFG
**Require:** $e$: event executed
1: $AE \leftarrow \text{getAllEventsAfter}(e)$
2: for all $e_i \in AE$ do
3: \quad if $e_i \notin N$ then
4: \quad \hspace{1em} $N$.addNode($e_i$)
5: \quad end if
6: \quad if $(e, e_i) \notin E$ then
7: \quad \hspace{1em} $E$.addEdge($e, e_i$)
8: \quad end if
9: \quad scope$_i \leftarrow \text{getScope}(e_i)$
10: for all $e_{ij} \in \text{scope}_i$ do
11: \quad if not (structural($e_{ij}$)) then
12: \quad \hspace{1em} if $(e_{ij}, e_i) \notin E$ then
13: \quad \hspace{2em} $E$.addEdge($e_{ij}, e_i$)
14: \quad \hspace{1em} end if
15: \quad end if
16: end for
17: end for
18: return $(N, E)$: Updated EFG

The same algorithm is also used to add new edges from newly discovered events, as we saw in Figure 3.1(e) for $e_8$. However, this is done in a separate invocation of Algorithm 2, after the event is executed. Consider the invocation where the second parameter, $e$ is the event $e_8$. The events available after $e_8$, Line 1, are $\{e_5, e_8\}$. Because there are no outgoing edges from $e_8$ in the EFG so far, Line 7 will add two new edges $(e_8, e_5)$ and $(e_8, e_8)$.

3.2.5 Contribution 5: Incremental Test-Case Generation

The new elements added to our model (e.g., EFG) may create new test requirements. For example, if a new edge has been added to the EFG and our test criterion is “cover all edges at least once,” then we need to cover the new edge via a new test case.
Hence, we need new ways to incrementally generate test cases to cover new model elements. Note that not all changes to the model will create a need for new test cases. For example, if the criterion is “cover all nodes,” then newly added edges in the model may not require additional test cases. The need for additional test cases is dictated by the test criteria, not new model elements.

To incrementally generate test cases, we maintain a set of model elements that have already been covered. Another set of model elements (the complete set – covered and not covered) is obtained from the latest EFG. These two sets give us the set of model elements that still need to be covered. For each not-yet-covered model element, we generate a test case to attempt to cover it. We first try to get a path from the initial state to the element using the context-aware mapping; this test case is guaranteed to be executable. If there is no mapping entry, then a path is generated using the shortest-path algorithm.

3.3 Summary

In this chapter, we presented a new testing paradigm that we call Observe-Model-Exercise* (OME*) to address the challenges in model-based GUI testing. We described the key features of OME* and the algorithms used to realize it. In the next chapters, we will discuss more detail on our experimentation infrastructure (Chapter 4) and the empirical studies (Chapter 5) to evaluate OME*.
Chapter 4

GUITAR: A Generic Model-based GUI Testing Framework

In the previous chapters, we have introduced the ideas and models that make up the OME* testing paradigm. To evaluate the abstract concepts we have developed a framework for testing GUI-based application called GUITAR. The GUITAR framework provides tools to automate GUI testing activities including GUI model construction, test case generation, test case execution and test result analysis. It also supports multiple GUI platforms including Java Swing, Java SWT, UNO (Open Office), Android, iPhone and Web. The innovation of GUITAR lies in its architecture, which uses plug-ins to support flexibility and extensibility.

The framework is publicly released as an open-source project and available for download at http://guitar.sourceforge.net. Software developers and testers may use GUITAR to create new toolchains, new workflows based on the toolchains, and plug in a variety of measurement tools to conduct GUI testing. In this work, we will leverage GUITAR to conduct empirical studies to evaluate our OME* testing paradigm (Chapter 5).

4.1 Overall Architecture

We take the component-based approach [56] to design GUITAR. Figure 4.1 shows the UML2 component diagram [57] representing GUITAR’s overall architecture. Each
component has a stereotype describing its role in the system: The ‘core’ components provide global services in the system. The ‘tool’ components provide blocks to build individual tools. The ‘plugin’ components add additional, customized features to the tools.

Tools assemble components in different ways via their common interfaces. Testers can use tools independently or integrate into toolchains to support a specific workflow.

Each GUITAR component includes two separate layers to improve its flexibility and extensibility. The abstract layer defines an API to communicate with other components. This layer makes heavy use of abstract classes and interfaces to provide an abstract view of the component. The implementation layer provides low-level implementations for the component. This layer of separation makes components interchangeable, so that replacing one component does not interfere with other components of the framework. We describe each component in detail.

4.1.1 Model Core

The central component in GUITAR is the Model core. This component defines the conceptual data structures shared amongst other components, including three main structures:

- The GUI Structure represents the hierarchical view of the GUI. It consists of a set of the windows in the application. The windows initially available when the application starts are marked as root windows. All other windows are
invoked from root windows or their descendants. Each window contains GUI components with their properties and associated values. The GUI Structure organizes components in their natural, structural hierarchical layout (e.g., submenu is a child of top-level menu). In GUITAR, a GUI Structure can be used to represent either the static structure of the entire GUI or the dynamic GUI state as observed at a particular time. For example, the GUI Structure is used for both GUI trees output by the Ripper and GUI states output by the Replayer.
• An *Event Model* represents the relationships between events on GUI components, which we refer to as simply “events” for short. The Event Model consists of a directed graph with nodes representing events and edges representing relationships between events, e.g., the *follows* relationships in the EFG. Each event has an *event type* representing the class of action performed (e.g., left click, right click, text entry). Test Case Generators use an *Event Model* to systematically generate replayable test cases.

• The *Test Case* structure represents a sequence of GUI events, which can be performed one after another on the application from its initial state. A test case can optionally contain a sequence of *GUI Structure* objects representing the expected state of the GUI after each event as a form of assertion.

The remaining components interact with one another using the common data structures defined in the Model Core.

4.1.2 Platform-independent Components

As a feature of GUITAR, we want as many of the GUITAR components as possible to work independently of the GUI platform. Indeed, many components in the GUITAR architecture work at the abstract level of the GUI and therefore do not require any platform-specific details to provide important functionality.

The *GUI Structure Converter* converts from a GUI Structure to an Event Model. This tool analyzes the application GUI tree, extract all GUI events and constructs a graphical model representing the relationships between events. The
graph output by the GUI Structure Converter supports automatically generating test cases.

The Event Model Converter is similar to the GUI Structure Converter, except that it transforms from one event model to another. For example, probabilistic values can be added to the edges of an Event Model in support of probabilistic test case generation techniques. Users of GUITAR can extend model converters of both types to work with their own models and support tools based on these models.

The graph structure of the Event Model reduces test case generation to a graph traversal problem. The Test Case Generator takes an event model as input and performs specified graph traversal algorithms on the model to automatically generate test cases. Depending on the model exploration strategies, various test case generators can be built around an event model. The Test Case Generator also generates values for event parameters if necessary (e.g., reading text inputs from a data file to support text input events). Currently, GUITAR supports two types of test case generation strategies: systematic and random sampling on event models. The systematic sampling strategy generates test suites by covering all possible sequences of a given length from the event model. The random sampling strategy, on the other hand, generates test suites performing a random walk traversal on the model.

The Oracle Verifier provides mechanisms to automatically determine whether a GUI executed correctly for a test case. Since a test case for a GUI is a sequence of events, a test designer must decide both what to assert and when or how often to check an assertion, e.g., after each event in a test case or after the entire test
case completes execution. Variations of these two factors significantly impact the
fault-detection ability and cost of a GUI test case. Currently, we have developed
two Oracle Verifier implementations with GUITAR: the CrashVerifier for reporting
crashes and the StateVerifier for matching output GUI states across different test
case executions.

4.1.3 Platform-specific Components

Though we strive for as much platform-independence as possible in GUITAR, the
need for test case execution requires platform-specific be specified in some compo-
nents. These components interact with the GUI components and automate the GUI
evaluations.

To enable the interactions between platform-specific and platform-independent
components, we provide an intermediate component called Executor for GUI au-
tomation. Figure 4.2 shows the design of the Executor at a lower level. The Ex-
ector consists of two sub-components: The Native GUI Automation component
is a platform-specific library such as Java Accessibility for Java JFC or Selenium
WebDriver for Ajax-based web. This component directly interacts with the GUI.
The Executor Bridge component communicates with the Native GUI Automation
component to support the platform-independent Executor API. This API works
as a contract between the platform-specific library and the high-level, platform-
dependent models defined in the Model Core. The Executor API interfaces with
all other GUITAR components, so that once an Executor supports the Executor
API, the platform-specific components of the Executor can communicate with the rest of GUITAR in a platform-independent way.

![Diagram of Executor component]

Figure 4.2: The *Executor* component.

The Executor API consists of four following interfaces:

- **GApplication**: represents a GUI application and methods to initialize applications, such as starting and terminating the GUI and accessing window handlers.

- **GWindow**: represents a GUI window and methods to access window properties

- **GComponent**: represents a GUI component (i.e., a widget) and methods to access component properties

- **GEvent**: represents an event type and associated behavior, such as left-click, right-click, and text entry. A **GEvent** paired with the **GComponent** represents a specific GUI event on a GUI component (e.g., a left-click on the OK button).

\(^1\)The prefix “G” indicates that a component is a GUITAR abstract class
The first three interfaces provide functionality to access the content of the GUI such as the GUI hierarchy and GUI properties. The last interface provides functionality to interact with the GUI. Section 4.3.2 will provide a case study discussing how to implement the Executor API to work with a specific platform.

The Executor plays an important role in GUITAR, replacing the need for manual interaction with GUIs to enable the use of much larger test suites. We currently provide two instances of the Executor: the Ripper and the Replayer. They implement two different automation strategies on the GUI.

4.1.3.1 The Ripper

The Ripper implements an algorithm (referred to as the “ripping algorithm”) to reverse engineer an application’s GUI structure [19]. The ripping algorithm automatically traverses the GUI, extracts all observed GUI components, and constructs a hierarchical structure of the GUI called the GUI tree. The GUI structure is stored in an XML file later for later use with various GUITAR tools.

The default Ripper behaviors can also be dynamically tuned by adding plugins called Ripper Adapters. A Ripper Adapter inserts additional actions at each ripping step to override the default GUI traversal strategy of the algorithm. Developers can implement a specific Ripper Adapter by extending the abstract class GRipperAdapter, which has two important methods:

- **isProcessed**: specifies which components that should be handled by this Ripper Adapter
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• **ripComponent**: specifies how the Ripper should proceed with handling (e.g., interacting with and extracting properties from) the identified components

For example, an adapter called **IgnoreComponentAdapter** implements the capability to ignore undesired components (e.g., the ‘Print’ button leading to the external Printing dialog that we do not want to include in our testing process). This adapter overrides the Ripper’s handling of components specified in the configuration file so that the Ripper skips these components. Section 4.3.1 will provide a more comprehensive example, where we use a Ripper Adapter to incorporate the handling of customized components into the Ripper or Java JFC.

### 4.1.3.2 The Replayer

The **Replayer** automatically executes test cases. It takes a test case as input, starts the application and executes the events of the test case in order, one-by-one. The users can also create plugins called **Test Monitors** to inject additional monitoring activities during execution. More specifically, Test Monitors extend the **GTestMonitor** interface with four main methods which are invoked at particular points during test case execution:

- **init**: invoked before any event is executed.

- **beforeStep**: invoked before an individual event is executed. It takes a **GTestStepEventArgs** object as argument to pass in any step-specific data (e.g., event ID).
• **afterStep**: invoked after an individual event is executed. It also takes a `GTestStepEventArgs` object as an argument.

• **term**: invoked after all events are executed.

An example of `GTestMonitor` is the built-in `StateMonitor` to capture GUI states during test case execution. In this monitor, the `afterStep` method records GUI states after the execution of the entire test case. Those states are exported as GUI Structure XML files that can be examined to determine test results. Another example of using Test Monitors is to inject a code coverage collector between each event to measure code coverage at the GUI event level.

### 4.1.3.3 Using Executors

Importantly, GUITAR itself does not impose any restrictions on the types of applications it can be used to test. However, a specific Executor implementation will usually only work on applications of a certain kind, due to the Executor’s dependence on GUI automation. For this reason, we refer to GUITAR as supporting platforms of applications which can be accessed by a specific Executor implementation.

As we show in the following case study, we can implement an Executor for brand new platforms by providing implementations of all required abstract classes, then implement platform-specific Ripper and Replayer components to provide a toolchain. While we do not explore other extensions within this chapter, we could also use an existing Executor to develop new types of tools which need the automation of GUI interaction, such as a manual capture tool or alternative reverse
engineering tool.

Aside from the testing-related components above, GUITAR also provides Import and Export utilities to convert between its various XML structures and more popular data formats. These components help to incorporate powerful external tools into the GUITAR workflow. For example, the visualizations in Figure 5.2 (Chapter 5) were produced by exporting an EFG to the graph formats used by a visualization tool called Gephi\(^2\). The Gephi visualization can be edited with Gephi’s own external graph editor, then imported back to GUITAR for use with other tools (e.g., test case generation and execution).

4.2 Creating Testing Workflow

Tools in the GUITAR framework can be used independently or stringed together into toolchains. In this section, we will show how testers can create GUITAR toolchain to support different testing workflows via an example.

Figure 4.3 shows a simple testing workflow using GUITAR tools. In this Figure, ovals represent processes and boxes represent testing artifacts or results. The workflow takes an application under test as input and automatically detects possible faults in the application. In particular, the workflow consists of five following steps:

1. GUI Ripping: Use the Ripper to reverse engineer a structural model of the GUI of an application called a GUI tree. The user may need to manually configure the Ripper to obtain a sufficiently valid GUI structure for the application.

\(^2\)https://gephi.org
2. Model Conversion: Use the *Graph Converter* to converting GUI trees produced by the Ripper and other graphical models into an EFG.

3. Test Case Generation: Use a *Test case generator* to automatically and systematically convert the EFG into test cases. Test cases are generated with various graph traversal algorithms.

4. Test Case Execution: Use the *Replayer* to automatically execute test cases on the application. The Replayer can instantiate values for events that require parameters (e.g., text-box, combo-box) by using user-specified or a database of default values. Runtime artifacts such as application logs and GUI state information are collected during test case execution.

5. Test Evaluation: Use the *Test Analyzer* tool analyze test case execution artifacts to determine if the test cases are passed or failed.

![Figure 4.3: A simple GUITAR-based testing workflow.](image)

This workflow, although simple, provides an end-to-end fully automated process to test GUI applications. It is also able to automatically collect a large amount of software artifacts such as test cases and runtime data. These features are very
important in enabling large-scale empirical studies. In Chapter 5, we will leverage GUITAR tools to evaluate a more comprehensive testing workflow - our OME* testing approach.

4.3 Extending GUITAR

With a loose-coupling design, GUITAR can be easily extended to support multiple research scenarios. Next sections will describe several case studies to extend GUITAR. The extensions can either be within a specific GUI platform or cross multiple GUI platforms.

4.3.1 Within-platform Extension

In many cases, the application under test may use custom or otherwise unsupported GUI components. Custom events, custom widget-specific properties, and custom implementation can affect the Ripper’s ability to extract GUI widgets and its properties. To better gather properties and interact with such components, a custom extension of GUITAR is required. In this case study, we consider an extension of GUITAR which improves testing of JabRef\(^3\), an open-source application. JabRef is implemented using Java Swing and has some advanced GUI components which are, by default, inaccessible by GUITAR tools.

\(^3\)http://jabref.sourceforge.net
4.3.1.1 Custom GUI Components

When ripping an application, the Ripper delegates the ripping of custom components to Ripper Adapters (see Section 4.1.3.1). Each adapter directs the extraction of its corresponding components during ripping to make the GUI Structure richer, improving the accuracy of subsequent models and test cases.

JabRef uses a custom-developed GUI component called GeneralTab. This component improves the appearance of the Preferences window (see the left part of the window in Figure 4.4). Because of the implementation of GeneralTab, GUITAR by default does not know how to discover its child components, such as the components revealed on the right-hand part of the window when an item is selected on the left side. By default, when a GeneralTab is selected, the corresponding GUI components revealed on the right-hand side of the window do not show up directly as children of the GeneralTab in the GUITree. This problem occurs because the implementation of GeneralTab creates a separate panel and explicitly moves the affected components to their new location. Without support for this custom component, the Ripper attempts to handle the component as a standard Java Tab, missing all of the components on the right-hand side.

We implemented GeneralTabAdapter, which follows the specific logic of GeneralTab to extract the previously missed components. When the Ripper encounters a GeneralTab object, this adapter automatically searches for the location of the GeneralTab’s children and redirects the ripping of the tab to the new locations, as appropriate.
4.3.1.2 Custom Event Types

The GUITAR architecture manages GUI events separately from GUI components. GUITAR supports the implementation of customized event types for interacting with GUI components in custom ways. All event types in GUITAR extend the abstract GEvent class. There are two main methods in GEvent to implement:

- **isSupportedBy**: defines the class of components that support this event type.
- **performs**: defines what the event type actually performs on the components specified by the isSupportedBy method.

The existing GUITAR toolchain only supports a basic method to enter text at the begin of a JTextArea. GUITAR can also be extended with a custom event to enter text at a specified position in the JTextArea. In this case, a GEvent class should provide an isSupportedBy method which recognizes JTextArea objects and a performs method which invokes the low-level methods of JTextArea to insert the input text at the specified position. This additional event complements the GUITAR
4.3.2 Cross-platform Extension

In this section, we describe GUITAR to how to extend an existing workflow to support multiple GUI platforms. As discussed in Section 4.1, there are two types of components in GUITAR: platform-independent and platform-specific components. To extend an existing workflow, we only need to implement the extensions for platform-specific components.

We use the Java JFC and Web platforms for illustration. We compare the extensions of the two platforms to show how to extend a testing workflow across multiple platforms.

In this case study, the JFC extension leverages the Java Accessibility Framework to monitor and drive interaction with a JFC GUI while the Web extension uses Selenium WebDriver for the same purposes. Supporting a new platform requires extension of the \textit{Executor API} of GUITAR, as described in Section 4.1. More precisely, extending Executor requires three steps:

\textit{Step 1: Mapping platform’s native objects to GUITAR’s abstract objects:} Each native GUI automation library (e.g., Java Accessibility Library, Selenium WebDriver) should have mechanisms for monitoring GUIs on the platform. This step involves identifying native objects in the platform which correspond to the abstract objects $\texttt{GApplication}$, $\texttt{GWindow}$ and $\texttt{GComponent}$ of the Executor API. Table 4.2 shows this mapping for both JFC and Web platforms. For toolchain’s default text interaction of modifying the entire text of the component.
example, in the JFC platform, `GApplication` only needs to know the tested application’s main class. In the Web platform, a `WebDriver` instance and the URL of the site’s root web page provides analogous information.

**Step 2: Accessing GUI properties:** This step requires implementing methods for `GApplication`, `GWindow`, and `GComponent` objects to access GUI functionality. Columns 2 and 3 in Table 4.1 detail the required methods, with reference implementations in Columns 4 and 5 for the corresponding platforms. As we can see, the platform-specific implementation details can be very different, as long as they provide the correct functionality to the Executor API. For example, in the JFC platform, the `connect` method call invokes the `main` method in the main class, which starts the GUI application. In the Web platform, a `WebDriver` object handles the connection by starting the browser, loading the root URL, and setting up the connection between the `Executor` and the web site under test.

**Step 3: Implementing event types:** Finally, the platform needs support for any relevant event types. These extensions are similar to those for the custom event type described in Section 4.3.1.2. The event types extend the `GEvent` interface. For each event type, we need to specify the classes of GUI components supporting the event and how the event is actually performed in the supported components. Table 4.3 shows the summary of the event types implemented for our two example platforms. As we expect, some event types (e.g., submit) are platform-specific.
Table 4.1: Accessing GUI component information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interface</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>JFC platform</th>
<th>Web platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GApplication</td>
<td>connect</td>
<td>Establish a connection with the application under test and start testing</td>
<td>Use reflection to find and invoke the main method in the main class</td>
<td>Use the WebDriver to start the browser and load the root page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terminate</td>
<td>Disconnect with the application under test</td>
<td>Invoke Java System.exit method</td>
<td>Invoke quit method from the WebDriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>getAllWindows</td>
<td>Get all windows currently available</td>
<td>Return the values of Frame.getPages</td>
<td>Return all open pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWindow</td>
<td>isModal</td>
<td>Check if the window is modal or not</td>
<td>Invoke the isModal method in Window</td>
<td>Always returns false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>getContainer</td>
<td>Get the window’s top level component</td>
<td>Return the window’s top JPanel object</td>
<td>Return the top level ‘body’ tags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GComponent</td>
<td>getTitle</td>
<td>Get title of component</td>
<td>return text label or icon name of the Component</td>
<td>return tag (e.g., h1, img) of the WebElement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>getClassVal</td>
<td>Get class of the component</td>
<td>Return class name of the Component</td>
<td>Return tag type of the WebElement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>getGUIProperties</td>
<td>Get all GUI properties and their value</td>
<td>Use Java reflection to find and invoke all bean methods of Component</td>
<td>Use the getAttributes method to get all attributes of WebElement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2: Mapping the internal GUI objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JFC platform</th>
<th>Web platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GApplication</td>
<td>Application's main class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWindow</td>
<td>Java Window object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GComponent</td>
<td>Java Component object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Performing GUI events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEvent</th>
<th>JFC platform</th>
<th>Web platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click</td>
<td>Components implementing the AccessibleAction interface</td>
<td>The ‘a’, ‘href’ tags and the ‘input’ tags having type ‘checkbox’ or ‘radio’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoke the doAccessibleAction method in AccessibleAction</td>
<td>Invoke the click method in WebElement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnterText</td>
<td>Components implementing the AccessibleEditableText interface</td>
<td>The ‘input’ tags having type ‘text’ and the ‘textarea’ tags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoke the setTextContents method in AccessibleEditableText</td>
<td>Invoke the sendKeys method in WebElement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>The ‘input’ tags having type ‘submit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Invoke the submit method in WebElement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUITAR has been extended with Executor implementations for several common GUI platforms. Table 4.4 shows all platforms currently supported by GUITAR and the underlying Native GUI automation library used. The human effort required for these platform specific extensions varied considerably. For example, iOS, UNO, and Web implementations took considerably longer than their Java counterparts (typically one month by 4-member teams of undergraduate software engineering students). We attribute this difference primarily to the extra implementation required to interface between the Java core of GUITAR and the platform’s native implementation.

4.4 GUITAR in Practice

Several researchers have been using GUITAR in their work. In most existing cases, researchers use the GUITAR framework to empirically study software testing in...
Table 4.4: GUI platforms supported by GUITAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUI platform</th>
<th>Native GUI automation library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Java JFC</td>
<td>Java Accessibility Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web</td>
<td>Selenium WebDriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java SWT</td>
<td>Java SWT Accessibility Framework&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android</td>
<td>Robotium Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iOS</td>
<td>iOS Simulator&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO (Open Office)</td>
<td>UNO Accessibility Framework&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>http://wiki.eclipse.org/Accessibility  
<sup>b</sup>http://developer.apple.com  
<sup>c</sup>http://openoffice.org/ui/accessibility

an automated way. For clarity, we divide the work of the primary researchers of GUITAR (i.e., from the University of Maryland) from the work of others who have applied GUITAR to their own scenarios.

We divide work by the GUITAR developers into six broad categories: developing workflows, and conducting large-scale studies of GUI testing, developing testing models from the EFG, designing GUI oracles, and repairing regression test cases.

In 2005, Memon et al. proposed the DART QA process for rapidly evolving software [35]. DART uses GUITAR tools to automate regression testing tasks, including model construction, test case generation, and analysis of test results. In later studies, researchers enhanced the test case generators in DART by incorporating the actual usage of the application [42] and GUI runtime state feedback [58] to provide a better test case quality. These represent two interesting adaptations to workflow which required the development of custom tools to support the new workflow.

GUITAR researchers have implemented several test case generation techniques by developing Model Converters. To date, these tools input the existing EFG as a
base model and augment or filter the EFG before generating test cases. In this modified workflow, existing Test Case Generators (e.g., SequenceLength Generator) can operate on the new model, but test cases must then be reconstructed as necessary to be compatible with the standard EFG-driven Replayer. Existing techniques use the Event Interaction Graph (EIG) [40], Event Semantic Interaction Graph (ESIG) [40], and Probabilistic Event-flow Graph (PEFG) [42].

GUITAR supports the generation, execution and analysis of very large numbers of test cases. With this scalability, GUITAR toolchains provide very good support for the consideration of coverage criteria for GUI testing. In particular, researchers have used GUITAR to analyze three criteria for GUI testing coverage: event-interaction based [59], event-context based [45] and call-stack based [60]. GUITAR can provide candidate test suites for both model-based and non-modeled reduction techniques. In these workflows, we introduce the concept of a test pool being completely generated by GUITAR and the associated reduction techniques then executed and analyzed potential faults by GUITAR.

Strecker et al. [21] also leveraged this scalability to conduct a series of empirical experiments to studying the relationships between testing techniques and the characteristics of faults detected. The authors used GUITAR to automatically generate, execute and collect experimentation artifacts (e.g., logs of error information, code coverage, and GUI state information) supported by GUITAR tools. The experiment consisted of the execution of 100 test suites on 2 fault-seeded open-source applications. The entire process consumed nearly 100 machine-days and was executed on a cluster.
Researchers have also used Test Monitor extensions of GUITAR to perform in-depth analysis of GUI oracles. Xie et al. [38] proposed 6 types of GUI oracles and conducted a series of experiments on four fault-seeded Java applications to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. In these experiments, a Test Monitor collected event-specific GUI states and a customized Oracle Verifier tool matched GUI states to expectations.

Using the information available in the EFG, Memon [61] proposed an approach to repair test cases for regressing testing by developing a Test Case Repairer tool which extended from the Test Case Generator modules of GUITAR. The Repairer automatically transforms all test cases detected by the Replayer as being unable to run due to GUI changes between application versions to executable ones. Later, Huang et al. [62] developed a similar tool but employed genetic algorithms instead.

Other researchers unaffiliated with GUITAR’s development have also used GUITAR in their own studies of GUI testing. Swearngin et al. [63] used GUITAR to construct a model to predict human performance in HCI studies. The model creator starts by manually creating a set of methods (i.e., sequences of events on the GUI) to accomplish a specific task (e.g., changing text font face to bold). These methods are treated as GUITAR test cases and eventually executed automatically on the GUI by the Replayer. The author also added a Test monitor to collect additional widget properties required for their studies. Those states are used to infer implicit, unspecified methods. All of the methods (whether explicitly created or implicitly inferred) are supplied to a tool called CogTool to create a cognitive model of the GUI. This approach has been implemented in a tool call CogTool-Helper, which
uses the Replayer for JFC and UNO platforms as back-ends.

Some authors leverage GUITAR to support their own event models and test case generation algorithms. Huang et al. [64] introduce a weighted EFG model for test case generation. They use GUITAR to obtain a non-weighted version of the EFG, then assign weights to each node in the EFG based on its properties. An empirical study conducted with 3 open source applications showed that the new approach can obtain a better fault detection rate than our standard workflow.

Focusing on the test case generation problem, Huang et al. [65] propose to build an feedback-directed approach on top of the standard GUITAR test case generator. They apply their “ant colony” algorithm to dynamically select the graph traversing path as test cases are executed.

GUITAR has also been used to produce benchmarks to evaluate GUI testing techniques. Mariani et al. [66] study with four open-source applications and compared the GUITAR standard workflow to their technique called AutoBlackTest. In a similar effort, Belli et al. [67] used GUITAR to evaluate a new event model called Event-sequence Graph. A case study with of two large modules of the commercial web portal ISELTA was conducted to compare the new model with the EFG.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter, we discuss GUITAR, a novel automated model-based testing framework for GUI-based applications. GUITAR supports many activities in GUI testing. GUITAR has an extensible architecture and works on multiple GUI platforms. The
framework is open-sourced and publicly available online. Next chapter will present a large-scale empirical study to evaluate OME* using the GUITAR framework.
Chapter 5

Empirical Evaluation

This chapter presents our empirical studies to evaluate the OME* paradigm described in Chapter 3. More specifically, we empirically determine whether the OME* paradigm improves the state-of-the-art, called the baseline (BL), in GUI testing. To this end, we will select several popular open-source software as subject applications to test. We will then generate and execute test cases (for BL and OME*) that attempt to satisfy predetermined adequacy criteria. Finally, we will compare the outcomes of the test runs.

5.1 Research Questions and Metrics

In this study, we are interested in answering the following two research questions:

**RQ1:** How effective is OME* when compared with BL? We will measure the fault detection effectiveness (FDE), event coverage (EC), and code coverage (CC) of the two approaches.

**RQ2:** By how much does the context-aware mapping improve the OME* approach? We will implement OME* in two ways—one with the context-aware mapping and the other without—and compare their FDE, EC, and CC.

**Metrics:** For FDE, we count the number of faults that led to the software crashing (terminating abnormally or throwing an uncaught exception). For EC, we mea-
sure EFG node coverage (E1) and EFG edge coverage (E2). For CC, we measure statement (stmt.), branch, method, and class coverage.

5.2 Selecting & Setting Up Software Subjects

We select eight subject applications from two popular open-source communities Tigris.org\(^1\) and SourceForge\(^2\):

1. **ArgoUML**: A CASE tool for UML diagram design, code generation and reverse engineering;

2. **Buddi**: A financial tool for personal budget management;

3. **CrosswordSage**: A tool for creating and solving crosswords;

4. **DrJava**: An advanced integrated development environment (IDE) for Java programs;

5. **JabRef**: A database management tool for bibliographies management;

6. **OmegaT**: A language tool for automated translation;

7. **PdfSam**: An office utility for advanced pdf files manipulation;

8. **Rachota**: A time management tool for project time tracking;

They are all implemented in Java and rely on the GUI for user input. Table 5.1 summarizes their characteristics. The applications span a variety of domains, ranging from games to office utilities and software development tools. We selected the

\(^1\)http://www.tigris.org
\(^2\)http://sourceforge.net
most recent released versions at the time the study was conducted. All of them are widely used, demonstrated by the high numbers of downloads, and have broad user communities, demonstrated by the multiple numbers of languages available. They are all mature applications, in that they have been around for at least 5 years. They also have non-trivial code sizes in terms of the numbers of non-comment statements (S), branches (B), methods (M), and classes (C). Over the years, a large number of bugs have been reported by their respective communities and fixed by the developers in response.

Having identified the study subjects, we now prepare our tools to use them.
Table 5.1: Subject applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbv.</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Download</th>
<th>Usage Languages</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bug Reports</th>
<th>Size**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArgoUML</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>0.33.1</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddi</td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>3.4.0.8</td>
<td>897,520</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrosswordSage</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.3.5</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DrJava</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>r5004</td>
<td>1,227,393</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JabRef</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>2.7b</td>
<td>1,173,313</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OmegaT</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>254,559</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDFSam</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>2,548,362</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachota</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>74,107</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The all-time statistics for ArgoUML are not publicly available. However, its popularity and maturity are partially demonstrated by the current more than 19,000 registered users and over 150 active developers (http://www.isr.uci.edu/tech-transition.html).

** S = Statements; B = Branches; M = Methods; C = Classes
5.3 Defining Functions for Unique Signatures

Our first preparation step is to ensure that we correctly identify each window and widget in the applications. As described in Section 3.2.3, we develop functions for windows (our containers) and widgets for this purpose. We start with windows, for which we need to develop \( \text{filter}_p \), to select a subset of window properties, and \( \phi() \) and \( \Phi() \) to generate a unique window signature. It turns out that our study subjects only require the use of one window property, namely “window title.” The value of this property is the title of the window, which, for the most part, are already unique. The exceptional cases are handled by mapping a few titles to regular expressions. For example, the title of the window “Save file” in ArgoUML can change dynamically during its execution; it always starts with the string \( \text{Save} \) followed by the full path to the file’s location. The title changes when the user saves the file in another location. Hence, if we rely solely on window title, there is a danger that we consider each instance with a different title as a new window. To ensure that our tools recognize that all instances of this Save file window, with different titles, are in fact the same window, we map the title string, via the \( \phi() \) function, to the regular expression ‘Save \((/.)*)\). We did this for a few windows.

The case for widgets is more complex. The title of widgets in our study subjects is repeated many times in the application. For example, many buttons share the title \( \text{OK} \). For this reason, we use three properties to identify widgets, namely title, icon, and class, representing the main title/label of the widget, the file-name of the icon labeling the widget if it exists, and the object class used to implement
the widget, respectively. The values of these three properties are used in the Java
HashCodeBuilder utility to generate a hash code for each widget.

We verified that our signatures are indeed unique. We manually examined
each application and counted all its widgets and windows; we show the numbers in
Table 5.2 under “Manual Oracle”. We then used our tools to do the same. Our
tools first extracted the Unique Title Strings and used our \( \phi() \) function to map
some of them to regular expressions. Similarly, our tools extracted the Text Titles
for widgets, determined the image used for the Icons, and the Java Classes used to
implement the widgets. These were then mapped to Widget Hash codes. Combined
with their associated window hashes, we obtained unique Mapped Widget Signatures.
As Table 5.2 shows, the resulting numbers matched our manual oracle exactly.

5.3.1 Sandbox and Text Parameters

Our second preparation step for testing the applications included setting up a sandbox.
The key role of this sandbox was to ensure that each run of the application
was independent of all prior runs. We defined a default configuration for each
application. Before a test case is executed, the application is reset to its default
configuration.

Finally, our third preparation step involved setting up data for parameterized
events. A general parameter populating strategy was used. For events requiring
a text input (e.g., text field, text area), a database that contains one instance for
each of the text types in the set \{negative number, real number, zero, long random
Table 5.2: Automated Widget/Window Identification vs. Manual Oracle.

(a) Window Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUT</th>
<th>Manual Oracle</th>
<th>Automated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers of Windows</td>
<td>Unique Title Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Widget Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUT</th>
<th>Manual Oracle</th>
<th>Automated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers of Widgets</td>
<td>Text Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*string, empty string, string with special characters* was used. All instances in the text type set were tried in succession for each test case.

5.4 Running the Experiment

Having prepared the study subjects, we are now ready to run the experiment, first establishing the baseline (BL) and then 2 instances of OME* (with and without the context-aware mapping). For each, we record coverage (*E1, E2, Stmt., Branch, Method, Class*), number of *Nodes* and *Edges* in the EFGs, and number of test cases
that were *Generated*, and those that executed to completion (*Feasible*), and number of faults found.

More specifically, for each study subject, we perform the following steps:

1. Create EFG using the Ripper.

2. Generate tests from EFG, execute them, and record all metrics. This forms our *BL*.

3. As discussed in Section 3.2.2, new model elements are extracted during Step 2 above.

4. As per Section 3.2.4, enhance the EFG model.

5. Generate test suite from new EFG and execute them. Record all metrics for this suite. This forms our first implementation of OME* that does not use the context-aware mapping. We call this *noMap*.

6. As per Section 3.2.1, the context-aware mapping is created. Together with the EFG from Step 4, this forms the EFG+ model.

7. Generate test suite from new EFG+ and execute them. This forms one *iteration* of our *withMap* approach. Record all metrics for this suite and extract new model elements.

8. Enhance both EFG and mapping. Repeat Step 7 until the EFG+ model does not change.
Figure 5.1: Continuous Integration Testing System.

The total number of test cases and their execution times (in hours) are shown in Table 5.3. Note that we executed over 400,000 test cases in almost 1000 machine days. We used 120 2.8 Ghz P4 Linux nodes running in parallel.

The entire experiment process is scripted to provide fully automation. We used a distributed continuous integration tool called Jenkins\(^3\) to control test case execution. Figure 7 shows a screenshot of our continuous integration testing system\(^4\). The left-hand side of the screen shows the list of available slave machines and the right-hand side details existing testing jobs and their current status.

---

\(^3\)http://jenkins-ci.org  
\(^4\)See more detail at http://samwise.cs.umd.edu:8080
Table 5.3: Test Cases Generated and Execution Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>withMap</th>
<th>noMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test cases</td>
<td>Exec time (h)</td>
<td>Test cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>25,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>5,842</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>34,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>39,555</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>170,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64,938</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>299,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Threats to Validity

As is the case with all empirical studies, our experiments suffer from several threats to validity. Threats to external validity are factors that may impact our ability to generalize our results to other situations. We have used eight open-source Java applications. Although carefully selected, they do not reflect the spectrum of all possible GUIs that are available today. Moreover, the applications are extremely GUI-intensive, i.e., most of the code is written for the GUI. We expect that results may be different for applications that (1) have complex underlying business logic and a fairly simple GUI, (2) are developed using other programming paradigms, and (3) are tested in-house for commercial applications. Finally, we initialized various values for text-fields manually and stored them in a database. We may see different results for different values.

Threats to internal validity are possible alternative causes for experimental results. Because we wanted to achieve full automation, we developed functions to identify widgets/windows uniquely. The instruments used for run-time state collec-
tion of GUI widgets were based on Java Swing API. These widgets may have additional properties that are not exposed by the API. Hence the states captured may be incomplete, causing us to map different windows/widgets into the same unique element. Moreover, because GUI execution requires frequent painting/repainting of windows, the captured state will be inaccurate if captured too early in the painting process; we set long artificial delays to allow the GUI to finish repainting.

Threats to construct validity are discrepancies between the concepts intended to be measured and the actual measures used. We used the number of crashes as our fault detection effectiveness metric; event and code as coverage metrics; these might not be useful metrics in all situations.

5.6 Results

We summarize our results in terms of the metrics that we collected for all 3 suites, i.e., BL, noMap, and withMap, in Table 5.4. We also break up the results of withMap by iteration so as to see the effect of OME*. From this raw data, we want to bring several points to the reader’s attention.

Number of Iterations: Technique noMap has a single iteration as opposed to several for withMap. This is because even though new model elements were discovered during test execution in BL and used in Iteration 1 of noMap, very few of them were in fact reachable because of the absence of the mapping. This led to a large number of “infeasible” test cases that did not execute to completion. We revisit this point in more detail later.
Table 5.4: Data for RQ1 and RQ2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>withMap</th>
<th>noMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFG</td>
<td># Nodes</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Edges</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Entries</td>
<td>8,485</td>
<td>11,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Gen.</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>5,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Feas.</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>3,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E1</td>
<td>66.81</td>
<td>79.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E2</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Stmt</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>24.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Brnch</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Mthd</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>28.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Cov.</td>
<td>% Class</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Faults</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Total Faults</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>withMap</th>
<th>noMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFG</td>
<td># Nodes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Edges</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Entries</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Gen.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Feas.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E1</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E2</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>89.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Stmt</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>26.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Brnch</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Mthd</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>28.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Cov.</td>
<td>% Class</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Faults</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Total Faults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JR</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>withMap</th>
<th>noMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFG</td>
<td># Nodes</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Edges</td>
<td>39,555</td>
<td>54,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Entries</td>
<td>45,622</td>
<td>62,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Gen.</td>
<td>39,555</td>
<td>54,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Feas.</td>
<td>30,850</td>
<td>21,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E1</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>50.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E2</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Stmt</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>33.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Brnch</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Mthd</td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>34.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Cov.</td>
<td>% Class</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>57.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Faults</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Total Faults</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OT</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>withMap</th>
<th>noMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFG</td>
<td># Nodes</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Edges</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>5,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Entries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Gen.</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>5,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Feas.</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>4,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E1</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>93.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E2</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>43.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Stmt</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>45.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Brnch</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>29.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Mthd</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td>41.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Cov.</td>
<td>% Class</td>
<td>62.62</td>
<td>65.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Faults</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Total Faults</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RC</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>withMap</th>
<th>noMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFG</td>
<td># Nodes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Edges</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>4,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Entries</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>5,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Gen.</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>3,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Feas.</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>3,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E1</td>
<td>73.51</td>
<td>84.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% E2</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>52.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Stmt</td>
<td>61.19</td>
<td>64.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Brnch</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>37.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Mthd</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>47.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Cov.</td>
<td>% Class</td>
<td>81.88</td>
<td>85.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Faults</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Total Faults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFG: The EFG+ model improves—gets bigger in size— with each iteration of withMap.

In most cases, the number of EFG edges is significantly larger (e.g., 1044% for Buddi) compared to BL, showing that we were able to observe, model, and exercise a larger
number of GUI events, hence test more functionality. The number of entries in the context-aware mapping also grows steadily with each iteration, indicating that we are able to reach and execute new coverage elements. This is all directly reflected in improved fault-detection effectiveness and increased event and code coverage.

We pictorially examine and explain the growth in the EFG model via an example. Figure 5.2 shows a bird’s eye view of the EFGs of our subject application Buddi for BL and 5 iterations of withMap\(^5\). Our goal is not to show details of the EFGs; rather, we want to show very high level pictures of the EFGs so that the reader can visually appreciate the changes from one EFG to the next. The EFGs have been drawn in such a way that the \((x, y)\) location of each node in the EFG is fixed across iterations. For example, the OK event labeled in Figure 5.2(a) is in the same location, relative to all other nodes in Figures 5.2(b) through 5.2(f). We add labels to highlight specific parts that we discuss in the text.

At a high level, there are stark differences between the EFGs of Figure 5.2(a) (BL technique) and Figure 5.2(f) (final iteration of withMap). For example, the Language Items, New Account, Edit Account Types clusters and a large number of edges do not even appear in Figure 5.2(a); all these are observed only during the OME* process. Hence, BL has no way to cover these events/edges.

Buddi has a context sensitive GUI, which changes the set of available events based on the end-user’s current “working perspective,” i.e., at any time during its execution, events related to specific perspective are displayed. For example, during

\(^5\)Additional visualizations of the EFGs, detailed code coverage reports, and actual fault reports are available at http://www.cs.umd.edu/~atif/OME
the execution of the Ripper, the Edit menu is only exercised only once in the Report creation perspective. Hence, only the report related sub-menu items are observed by the Ripper, and hence the BL technique.

In contrast, withMap is able to exercise Edit several times in many other perspectives. As a result, new sub-menu items are observed. As marked in Figure 5.2(b), for example, three new events Edit All Transaction, Edit account types, and Create Account are added to the original EFG when Edit is executed in the Account Management perspective. These events, when performed in subsequent iterations, will in turn, open new windows to extend the EFG even further (marked by the ovals in Figure 5.2(c)).

Our example illustrations also show that changes to the EFGs across iterations may not necessarily be changes in events, i.e., new edges may be added between previously observed events. For example, events in both Edit Account Types and New Account windows have been observed during Iteration 2 (via menu items in the main window). However, the edges linking these two windows are only revealed during Iteration 3, when the New Account event in Edit Account Types is exercised (shown using a “New edges” label at the bottom-left of Figure 5.2(d)). These new edges provide a new way to exercise events in the New Account window.

We also note that even a very small number of newly observed events may lead to a significant change in model size. Because Buddi allows users to work in multiple perspectives simultaneously (e.g., adding a new account when generating a report), the windows are mostly implemented as modeless. For that reason, as soon as a new event is observed and added to the model, it gets connected to all previously
known events, making the graph very dense. As shown in Figure 5.2(d) through Figure 5.2(f), the edge cluster from the All Transactions window’s events back to all the events in the main window (the center of the EFG) grows significantly across iterations.

**Mapping and Test Case Feasibility:** Our context-aware mapping size also grows across iterations of *withMap*. This mapping plays a big role in ensuring that a larger number (compared to *noMap*) of test cases remain feasible. The 4 most important data points to illustrate this are the # Generated and # Feasible entries under Iteration 1 of *withMap*, and under *noMap*. For example, in ArgoUML, only 556 of 5314 test cases were feasible, i.e., executed to completion, with *noMap*. In contrast, 4771 of 5314 test cases were feasible with *withMap*. This shows that by retaining when events were observed to be executable and using this information when exercising these events again proved to be very successful at making test cases executable.

The JabRef data of # Generated and # Feasible entries under Iteration 1 of *withMap* highlights another important aspect of our mapping. Even though we generated 14,961 new test cases during this iteration, a total of 21,164 test cases were feasible and executed. This is because some of the test cases from the previous run (in this case from *BL*) that remained unexecutable earlier, were now executable due to new entries in the mapping.

**Event and Code Coverage:** We see that we gradually increase the amount of code and events that we cover across iterations. However, we never achieve 100% coverage of our criterion, i.e., cover all EFG edges. This means that we observe
edges during some iterations but never get to reach them in subsequent iterations. This is due to the highly context-sensitive nature of our GUIs, where a context-aware mapping entry is no longer valid for a subsequent iteration. Addressing these cases is a subject for future work.

**Faults:** In total, we discovered 34 new faults that have not been detected before. Table 5.5 provides the detail of faults detected only in the iterative phases of OME* (recall that the first phase of OME* is actually BL). These faults were only detected in the later iterations because the new model elements (i.e., EFG edges) were only able to reach by leveraging the information collected in the previous iterations.

We also reported these faults to the developers of the subject applications. In response to our report, they have confirmed and fixed some of these faults in subsequent releases of the applications. There is only a few cases the reported faults were not fixed (e.g., in CrosswordSage). The reason is because at the time we reported the faults, the projects were no longer under an active development. More details of the faults detected can be found online at [http://www.cs.umd.edu/baonn/projects/guitar/bugs](http://www.cs.umd.edu/baonn/projects/guitar/bugs).
Figure 5.2: OME* sees more of the EFG with each iteration.
Table 5.5: Summary of faults detected in the iterative phases of OME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BugID</th>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ProfileException when using <code>/crash/crash</code> as name to save a user profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NullPointerException when changing layout of an empty Activity diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NullPointerException when trying to ‘Revert to Saved’ an unsaved document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>InvalidObjectException when keeping the ‘Open Project’ window open and saving another project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>IllegalArgumentException with an out-of-range Proxy Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>IllegalArgumentException when updating with an non-existing proxy address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>InvalidValueException when creating a transaction with an empty name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>FileNotFoundException when saving with a non-encrypted file with name containing special characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>FileNotFoundException when saving with an encrypted file with name containing special characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ZipException when using a plugin name containing special characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>FileNotFoundException when configuring with a non-existing language file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>FileNotFoundException when providing an invalid file name to save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>NullPointerException when generating Write Clue with an empty crossword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>NullPointerException when generating Suggest Word with an empty crossword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>IOException when saving file with a file name containing special characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>StringIndexOutOfBoundsException when using &quot;!#$&quot; as a ‘Preview text’ in Preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException when allowing to generate keyword for a disabled bibtex entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException when generating keyword for an already closed bibtex file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
Table 5.5 – Summary of faults detected in the iterative phases of OME* (continue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BugID</th>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JR4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pattern Exception when searching with a regular expression containing the special characters ‘ []’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>IOException when setting default owner name containing a ‘{’ character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ClassNotFoundException when providing a non-existing class to setup the ‘Look and Feel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ServerSocketException with an out-of-range Proxy port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException when changing properties of an already closed bibtex file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>StringIndexOutOfBoundsException when import with a non-exist ImportFormat plugin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NullPointerException when checking spell with a blank spell-checking plugin name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>ParseException when providing a non-numeric value for the split after these pages text filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>ParseException when providing a non-numeric value for the split every “n” pages text field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>ParseException when providing a non-numeric value for the split at this size text file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NullPointerException when providing an invalid split by bookmarks level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>FileNotFoundException when saving with an invalid environment file name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NullPointerException when generating report with a non-existing file name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>NullPointerException when adjusting time after switching to a previous day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NumberFormatException when entering a non-numeric value to the Inactivity time text field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>NullPointerException when simultaneously adjusting starting time and correcting the scheduled time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7 Discussion

To better understand the role of dynamic input space exploration on fault detection and adequacy, we analyzed the faults that were detected only by the OME* technique. This section provides details of our analysis and findings.

A total of 7 new faults were detected in Buddi. All 7 were detected by the withMap technique. Of these 7, one fault was also detected by noMap. These faults are also indicated in Figure 5.2. The faulty events (i.e., the last events in the failed test cases) are solid dark nodes with their IDs ($bd_1$–$bd_7$) pointed by an arrow. We now discuss these faults and the test cases that detected them.

Fault $bd_1$ results in an `IllegalArgumentException` when setting an out-of-range proxy port for network configuration. It is detected by a test case consisting of 6 events: \(<e_1$: Expand Edit menu; $e_2$: Open Preferences window; $e_3$: Select Network tab; $e_4$: Enable Use Proxy option; $e_5$: Enter a large number for proxy port; $e_6$: Click OK\)}. This fault did not occur earlier in the BL iteration because, by default, the Proxy Port text box (i.e., $e_5$) is disabled. It is unable to change the proxy port unless the Enable Use Proxy check box is checked (i.e., performing $e_4$). However, this information is not available at BL. During the BL process, event $e_5$ was observed after the execution of event $e_4$. Hence, a new context aware mapping entry was created to reach $e_5$. In the next iteration, test cases were generated to cover $e_5$. One of them led to the failure. Fault $bd_2$ is similar to $bd_1$ except that it throws an `UnknownHostException` when using a non-existing proxy URL (with a valid port).

This is a particularly interesting test case because event $e_6$, i.e., Click OK, the
one that revealed the failure had been executed several times in $BL$. However, the failure was manifested only when $e_6$ executed in the context of $e_5$. Moreover, $e_6$ revealed a different failure, $bd_2$, when executed after setting a non-existing proxy URL. All events in the fault-revealing test cases were available in the initial model (as marked in Figure 5.2(a)). However, the faults were revealed only when the events were tested in specific combinations.

The remaining faults in $Buddi$ were detected due to the discovery of new events. For example, fault $bd_3$ causes an $InvalidValueException$ when saving a transaction with an empty name. In $Buddi$, a transaction can be saved only after a document change. However, during ripping, the events related to the save functionality (e.g., $Save$, $Save All$ buttons) were all executed before any document changing event. Hence, the $Save Transaction$ dialog, which is opened by these events, did not show up. In subsequent iterations, however, it was opened and tested in new executing contexts. As a result, the fault was detected.

Faults $bd_5$, $bd_6$, $bd_7$ were detected during Iteration 2 when new events were observed and exercised. Detecting faults in later iterations is not uncommon, as can be seen in Table 5.4. The reason for this is that exercising fault-revealing events requires going through multiple other events, performed in a sequence. By iteratively identifying the enabling/opening relationships between events, the OME* test case generator is able to compose test cases that reveal faults. Consider, for instance, Fault $rc_7$ in $Rachota$; this was detected in Iteration 3. It is an uncaught $NullPointerException$, thrown when simultaneously adjusting the current date, and setting the starting time of an active task to empty (recall that $Rachota$ is an
application for tracking project time). The event sequence leading to this fault is:
\( \langle e_{11}: \text{Select a task}; e_{12}: \text{Start selected task}; e_{13}: \text{Expand Tool menu}; e_{14}: \text{Open Adjust start time window}; e_{15}: \text{Change to a previous date}; e_{16}: \text{Click OK to confirm the start time adjustment} \rangle \). This sequence brings the GUI through a series of states where events are reached in a chain: first, \( e_{11} \) enables \( e_{12} \) in BL, and then \( e_{12} \) in turn enables \( e_{14} \) in Iteration 1. When performed in Iteration 2, \( e_{14} \) opens a new Adjust starting time window (\( e_{13} \) is known earlier to expand the Tool menu to reach \( e_{14} \)). This window contains the events allowing the user to adjust the starting time of the active task (e.g. \( e_{16} \)). Finally, the pair \( (e_{15}, e_{16}) \) is exercised in Iteration 3, leading to the exception.

We conclude our discussion of these faults by noting that due to the complexity of the GUI, the state-based relationships between events that led to failures are difficult to predict manually. Similarly, because GUI event handlers are often spread across multiple independent modules/classes [68], such faults cannot be detected by code analysis techniques such as static analysis.

Going back to our research questions, we were able to show that OME* is more effective than BL, when using FDE, EC, and CC as our metrics. Further, we implemented OME* in two ways, with and without the mapping, and showed that because noMap does not maintain the context-aware mapping to reach coverage elements, it yields many infeasible test cases. The mapping is key to the success of OME*.
5.8 Benchmark

The data, scripts and tools used in this study require thousands of computation-days and hundreds of person-hours to create. We packaged all of these experimentation artifacts into a benchmark and made it available online for the research community\textsuperscript{6}. The purpose of this benchmark is to provide other researchers with a similar experimentation environment when they want to compare their work with OME*. The benchmark will allow them to objectively experiment with a common set of tools and subjects, using similar models, processes and experimentation assumptions.

We also provide detail documentation for artifacts in the benchmark. Researchers may reuse our data to perform new studies. Similarly, they can extend our experimentation tools and scripts to support their new testing techniques.

5.9 Summary

This chapter empirically studies the OME* testing paradigm. An extensive experiment on 8 open-source applications showed that OME* did much better compared to the current state-of-the-art. In some cases, we observed more than 200% improvement in the set of events that we executed. We also discovered 34 new faults that have not been detected before. This result confirmed our believe on the applicability of the new testing paradigm for modern, event-driven GUI application. To make our study more transparent and replicable for other researchers, we released our tools and experiment data as an online experimentation benchmark.

\textsuperscript{6}http://www.cs.umd.edu/~atif/OME
Chapter 6

Conclusions

As software systems have grown increasingly complex, the testers are tasked with verifying that these systems function correctly. However, often the testers do not have a complete knowledge of the systems’ overall input spaces, i.e., the spaces of all possible input that may be supplied to the systems. This problem is severely compounded in GUIs that have immense or even infinite input spaces. GUI testers routinely miss allowable event sequences, any of which may cause failures once the software is released. The tester may also fail to discover that the software implementation allows the execution of some disallowed sequences. In practice, testing GUI-based applications still remains largely an ad-hoc and labor-intensive activity.

In this dissertation, we show that GUI-based applications can be effectively and efficiently tested by systematically and incrementally leveraging the application runtime execution observations. To demonstrate this thesis we have developed a novel testing paradigm called Observe-Model-Exercise* (OME*). The OME* testing paradigm iteratively observes the GUI runtime behaviors, incrementally models the GUI input space and automatically generates test cases to exercise the newly observed GUI elements. To realize OME*, we have developed a new model to capture the context-sensitive behaviors of GUI applications and algorithms to incrementally
explore the GUI input space and generate context-aware test cases. We have implemented OME* in the open-source GUITAR testing framework. GUITAR was used to conduct a comprehensive empirical study with 8 popular open-source GUI applications and detected 34 previously unknown faults.

In next sections, we further discuss OME* in more detail and provide directions for future work.

6.1 Discussion

We evaluate OME* in terms of its effectiveness and efficiency. Then we discuss some limitations of the approach.

6.1.1 Effectiveness

OME* is an effective testing approach. It improves the fault detection effectiveness and test adequacy in testing GUI-based applications. By leveraging the additional information available at runtime, OME* is able to more precisely and completely capture the GUI input space. As a result, more effective test cases are automatically generated to reach the “deep” parts of the GUI, e.g., those guarded by special event sequences and only available in a particular context. The empirical study in Chapter 5 demonstrated that OME* could improve the test coverage, both at the code level and the GUI level. It detected new faults in GUI elements which were not reachable or even not “seen” by the other state-of-the-art testing techniques. These faults, while missed by the testers, were often considered severe to the applications.
At the management level, OME* can aid in improving the quality of a software testing process. A valuable output of OME* is the formal model representing the overall GUI input space. With this concrete picture of the input space, test managers can define metrics to quantitatively control the software testing process. Such metrics would help the managers in objectively predicting and tracking the testing effectiveness to make multiple sorts of forecasts, judgments and trade-offs during the software life-cycle.

6.1.2 Efficiency

OME* is an efficient testing approach. It is fully automated in all phases of the testing process: from model creation, to test case generation, test case execution, and model enhancement. This approach therefore can be used without any human intervention throughout the software development life-cycle. Potentially, OME* can be implemented with a continuous integration system [69] to provide an end-to-end regression testing workflow [35, 70].

In traditional GUI testing, GUI test cases are often obtained by manually writing automation scripts. With this labor-intensive process, the number of test cases created is often small. In contrast, OME* can automatically generate a large number of test cases; thus, it is able to cheaply cover a broad range of a system’s behaviors. The testing efficiency can even be further improved by adopting a distributed testing workflow [71] to run test cases in parallel, as partially demonstrated in Chapter 5.
6.1.3 Limitations

The current implementation of OME* has certain known limitations. First, as in the case with all automated model-based testing techniques, the test suites obtained by OME* are not optimal. There are often many “redundant” test cases leading to the same faults. Second, the GUI input space models obtained do not perfectly represent the GUI behaviors as they are derived through dynamic analysis. As a result, test cases generated from these models might be infeasible, leading to false positive fault reports. Finally, to avoid any human intervention, the current OME* implementation only relies on runtime analysis to construct the GUI model and completely ignores the application’s specifications. On one hand, this strategy preserves OME* as a fully automated technique. On the other hand, it fails to incorporate application domain knowledge into the testing process. Exploring the trade-off between automated and manual model construction is something we need to consider in the future. Next section will discuss more about our future work.

6.2 Future Work

We discuss our future work in short, medium and long terms.

In the immediate future, we will extend our subject application pool. In particular, we want to use non-Java, non-desktop (e.g., web, mobile) as well as industrial applications to reduce the external threats to validity in our empirical studies. Furthermore, we used natural faults (i.e., crashes) to measure fault detection effectiveness. This approach, on one hand, provides evidence that our technique can
detect actual faults. On the other hand, we are limited in the analysis that we can perform. For example, we cannot examine faults that were missed. For this reason, we will seed artificial faults in future work. Cross empirical studies between seeded faults and natural faults can provide more insight to our approach. In a similar line, we want to use different types of test oracles such as GUI state matching [38] or invariant checking [24] to evaluate the results. Finally, for input supplied to text fields, we intend to use domain specific data instead of our current general purpose database. One possible direction is to leverage some existing static analysis tools to analyze source code and generate application specific text input, similar to what has been done in a recent work for JavaScript testing [6].

In the medium term, we will apply our paradigm to other test case generation techniques (e.g., capture/replay, AI planning) as well as other test adequacy criteria (e.g., event system interaction [40] and event context [45] coverages). Also, as partially shown in Chapter 5, there is a correlation between the model exploration phase and test case generation phase. It would be insightful to study the impacts of test case generation on model creation and vice versa. Finally, in this work, the GUI states collected are only used to explore and expand the input space. In the future, we also plan to leverage those valuable information as feedback for test case selection, similar to the work we have done in the past [22].

Some of the challenges of GUI testing are also relevant to testing of event-driven software [29]. In the long term, we will explore similar techniques for these application domains too. For example, we will apply our techniques to test web applications and object-oriented software as they also share similar input space
characteristics with GUI applications. One way to test these classes of software is to generate test cases that are sequences of events (e.g., web user actions and method calls). Some of the techniques developed in this research may be used to better test these systems. Another direction for future work is studying different GUI input space exploration strategies. For example, the initial model created by GUI ripping may significantly influence the subsequent GUI input space exploration results. If we start the OME* process with different application configurations, we may get different results. To address this bias, we can rip the GUI multiple times, each for a different configuration. The specification documents can also be employed to maximize the spectrum of explored GUI behaviors.

In summary, in this dissertation, we have shown that the combination of dynamic input space exploration and model-based testing can cope well with the challenges in testing GUI applications. To provide focus, we have limited our discussion in the context of GUI testing. However, the general idea of OME* can be broadly extended for testing applications in other domains with similar, hard-to-determine input spaces. Examples of such domains include object-oriented programs [9], component-based systems [28, 72], and distributed systems [73]. In the future, we will empirically explore the applications of our approach on these domains.


