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ABSTRACT
Automated testing (hereafter referred to as just ‘testing’) has become an essential process for improving the quality of software systems. In fact, testing can help to point out defects and to ensure that production code is robust under many usage conditions. However, writing and maintaining high-quality test code is challenging and frequently considered of secondary importance. Managers, as well as developers, do not treat test code as equally important as production code, and this behaviour could lead to poor test code quality, and in the future to defect-prone production code. The goal of my research is to bring awareness to developers on the effect of poor testing, as well as helping them in writing better test code. To this aim, I am working on 2 different perspectives: (1) studying best practices on software testing, identifying problems and challenges of current approaches, and (2) building new tools that better support the writing of test code, that tackle the issues we discovered with previous studies.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Software testing has a fundamental role in any successful software development process [4, 14]. Test cases form the first line of defense against the introduction of software faults and ensure that production code is robust under many usage conditions [4, 6, 20]. Despite this, developers do not test as they should and tend to overestimate their testing effort [2, 15].

In the last decade, a lot of research has been done to understand the negative impact of poor testing on the overall quality of the system. First, van Deursen et al. [23] described how the quality of test code was “not as high as the production code [because] test code was not refactored as mercilessly as our production code” [23]. This is in line with the recent studies reporting that developers perceive and treat production code as more important than test code, thus generating quality problems in the tests [2, 3, 25].

In the same work, van Deursen et al. introduced the concept of test smells, inspired by Fowler et al.’s code smells [8]. These smells were recurrent problems that van Deursen et al. found when refactoring their troublesome tests [13]. Similarly, Palomba et al. [16] investigated the relationship between flaky tests and test smells, showing that more than half of flaky tests also contained smells. Even though research showed that testing is a fundamental process to improve the quality of the project, developers still consider testing less important than “writing features.” In my previous work [20], interviewees admitted that developers and managers prioritize production code to tests, because that “is the code running on clients’ machines,” tests, on the other hand, are only useful for developers: clients can not know if the new feature they are trying is tested or not. Another discovery of my previous work is that current tools do not fully support developers in writing test code: for example, code review tools are built mainly to support the review of production code [20].

With my work, I want to (1) raise practitioners awareness of the effect of writing poor tests on the overall software code quality and (2) support developers in writing better test code, by means of new techniques and tools.

To this aim, I will help developers under two different perspectives: first, in better understanding current practices in software testing, and second, building better tools to support them in writing/ reviewing test code. Regarding the first point, current practices can help novice developers in understanding how experts handle specific problems when writing and testing software, and they also help expert developers in understanding if their practices are in line with others. On the other hand, when interviewing practitioners I noticed that current software development tools do not have features that may help developers in writing good test code: to fill this gap, I will build new tools that better support the writing/reviewing of tests.
2 TEST QUALITY AND SOFTWARE QUALITY

With the aim of bringing awareness to developers on the effect of poor testing, with these studies I want to investigate the relation between test and production code quality. Since developers consider tests less important than production [20], if we are able to demonstrate that the tests quality has an impact on the production quality, developers may re-consider both as equally important.

2.1 Test Smells to Software Code Quality [22]

In this work we wanted to bring empirical knowledge on the effect of poor testing on the software quality. Van Deursen et al. [23] introduced the concept of test smells: These smells were recurrent problems that authors found when refactoring their troublesome tests [13]. Given the definition of test smells, we wanted to investigate what is their impact on the overall quality of the system, calculated as change- and defect-proneness of both test methods and the production code they intend to test. To this aim, we conducted a large observational study [5], collecting data from 221 releases pertaining to ten open source software systems, analyze more than a million test cases, and investigate the association between six test smell types and change- and defect-proneness of the code.

Our results show that tests with smells are more change- and defect-prone than tests without smells and production code is more defect-prone when tested by smelly tests. Among the studied test smells, Indirect testing, Eager Test and Assertion Roulette are those associated with highest change-proneness; moreover, the first two are also related to a higher defect-proneness of the exercised production code.

Overall, our results provide empirical evidence that detecting test smells is important to signal underlying software issues. Furthermore, we showed that the presence of design flaws in test code is associated with the defect-proneness of the exercised production code; indeed the production code is 71% more likely to contain defects when tested by smelly tests. This is a call to arms for practitioners, since we finally demonstrated that poor test code is related to poor production code, hence they should be treated as equally important.

2.2 Test coupling: Free your code and tests (in submission at ICSE 2019)

The problem of coupling between test and production code is a well-known problem for practitioners [7, 9, 11]. This problem happens when, due to a refactor or a semantic change in the production code, developers apply mock objects in their test suites. To this aim, we analyzed more than 2,000 test dependencies from three OSS projects and one industrial system. We then interviewed developers from these systems to understand why some dependencies were mocked and others were not. We challenged and supported our findings by surveying 105 developers from software testing communities. Finally, we discussed our findings with a main developer from the most used Java mocking framework.

We found that developers tend to mock dependencies that make testing difficult, i.e., classes that are hard to set up or that depend on external resources. In contrast, developers do not often mock classes that they can fully control. Interestingly, a class being slow is not an important factor for developers when mocking. As for challenges, developers affirm that challenges when mocking are mostly technical, such as dealing with unstable dependencies, the coupling between the mock and the production code, legacy systems, and hard-to-test classes are the most important ones.

This paper has been invited for an extension to the Empirical Software Engineering (EMSE) journal. In the extension, we focused on the evolution of mocks and on the coupling between the mock object and the production code.

3 CURRENT PRACTICES IN TESTING

To help developers in writing better test code, we first need to understand how they are currently writing it. To this aim, the works presented in this section are focused on different practices of software testing, with the intention of uncover problem and challenges of current approaches.

3.1 To Mock or Not To Mock? [21]

A widespread practice in software testing is mocking [21]. When testing a unit (e.g., a class in object-oriented programming), developers often need to decide whether to test the unit and all its dependencies together (similar to integration testing) or to simulate these dependencies and test that unit in isolation (by means of mocking).

By testing all dependencies together, developers gain realism: The test will more likely reflect the behavior in production [24]; however, some dependencies, such as databases and web services, may slow the execution of the test [12], or be costly to properly setup for testing [19]. By simulating its dependencies, developers gain focus: The test will cover only the specific unit and the expected interactions with its dependencies; moreover, inefficiencies of testing dependencies are mitigated.

We performed a study to empirically understand how and why developers apply mock objects in their test suites. To this aim, we analyzed more than 2,000 test dependencies from three OSS projects and one industrial system. We then interviewed developers from these systems to understand why some dependencies were mocked and others were not. We challenged and supported our findings by surveying 105 developers from software testing communities. Finally, we discussed our findings with a main developer from the most used Java mocking framework.

We found that developers tend to mock dependencies that make testing difficult, i.e., classes that are hard to set up or that depend on external resources. In contrast, developers do not often mock classes that they can fully control. Interestingly, a class being slow is not an important factor for developers when mocking. As for challenges, developers affirm that challenges when mocking are mostly technical, such as dealing with unstable dependencies, the coupling between the mock and the production code, legacy systems, and hard-to-test classes are the most important ones.

This paper has been invited for an extension to the Empirical Software Engineering (EMSE) journal. In the extension, we focused on the evolution of mocks and on the coupling between the mock object and the production code.

3.2 When Testing Meets Code Review [20]

Modern Code Review (MCR) is now a widespread practice in many development projects, since it has been shown that it can improve the quality of the source code [1, 18]. However, past research mainly focused on the review of production code, while there is still a gap...
of knowledge on how and why developers review test code. To
fill this gap, we conducted a two-phase study to understand how
test code is reviewed, to identify current practices and reveal the
challenges faced during reviews, and to uncover needs for tools
and features that can support the review of test code.

In the first phase, we analyzed more than 300,000 code reviews
related to three open source projects (Eclipse, OpenStack and Qt)
that employ extensive code review and automated testing. In the
second phase, we interviewed developers from these projects and
from a variety of other projects (from both open source and industry)
to understand how they review test files and the challenges
they face.

We found evidence that developers tend to discuss test files
significantly less than production files. The main reported cause is
that reviewers see testing as a secondary task and they are not aware
of the risk of poor testing or bad reviewing. We discovered that
when reviewing test files, reviewers often discuss better testing
practices, tested and untested paths, and assertions. Regarding
defects, often reviewers discuss severe, high-level testing issues, as
opposed to results reported in previous work [1], where most of
the comments on production code regarded low level concerns.

Among the various review practices on tests, we found two ap-
proaches when a review involves test and production code together:
some developers prefer to start from tests, others from production.
In the first case, developers use tests to determine what the pro-
duction code should do and whether it does only that, on the other
hand when starting from production they want to understand the
logic before validating whether its tests cover every path. As for
challenges, developers' main problems are: understanding whether
the test covers all the paths of the production code, ensuring main-
tainability and readability of the test code, gaining context for the
test under review, and difficulty reviewing large code additions
involving test code.

3.3 Test-Driven Review (in submission to ICSE 2019)

My work on how developers review test code [20] has provided
initial evidence that some reviewers use the tests to guide their
understanding of the code to review. Similarly to how tests can
be used to document the corresponding production code, some
reviewers have reported to take advantage of tests at review time.

This practice, which we name Test-Driven Review (TDR), could
be an attractive take on improving the code review process. In fact,
tests often have to accompany a change in production code [10, 25],
thus adopting this practice would not require more contribution
effort, but only a change in how a reviewer would proceed to under-
stand the code under review. The similarities of TDR with scenario-
driven inspection, which was effective in the context of code in-
spections [17], give an additional interesting rationale on why TDR
could bring benefits to MCR.

In this paper, we aim at empirically understanding this practice in
order to have a more comprehensive view of (i) when and how TDR
is applied and (ii) what are its main advantages and disadvantages
from the developers point of view. To address these questions and
find insights about TDR, we first performed an experiment with 93
developers, analyzing data from more than 150 reviews, and second,
we interviewed 9 developers that employ extensive code review
and automated testing.

Key findings of our study report that having tests together with
production code makes the reviewing of the production faster. Fur-
thermore, we discovered that developers tend to spend more time
on the first file it is presented to them, independently whether it
is a test or production file, with the consequence of finding more
defects on that file.

As for the main implications of this work, we showed that there
is a statistically significant difference in the time required to review
the production code: Indeed, when it is together with the test code,
reviewers take less time to review it compared to when the produc-
tion code is alone, even though reviewers find the same amount
of issues. Hence, reviewers find the same amount of issues in less
time. Furthermore, as developers tend to more carefully review
the first code change they inspect, we believe there is the need for
prioritization mechanisms that can effectively rank code changes
to be inspected first.

4 BUILDING BETTER TOOLS

While studying best practices in software testing, I identified some
weak points of current tools that do not fully support the writing/reviewing of test code. In this section I will explain how I aim
to improve software development tools to better handle tests.

4.1 GitHub enhancement

The first tool I want to discuss is the one regarding code review.
My previous studies on how developers review test code uncover
problems of current MCR tools that do not fully support the review
process of test code. I identified 4 main features that may ease the
review:

(1) Linking test and production code: when reviewing, the
files are presented in alphabetical order. This has the disad-
vantange that all the production files will be presented at the
beginning, and all the test files at the end. However, after
reviewing a production file, developers would like to imme-
diately see the test file: This results in scrolling the page
from the top to the bottom many times. In our tool we aim
at adding a link to every production file that will link its test.

(2) Provide Test-Driven Review (and Production-Drive re-
view): similarly, current MCR tools do not provide the pos-
sibility to apply TDR. We aim at adding this feature: with
the press of a button, all the files will be re-ordered and pre-
sented following his/her best practice, namely first the test
class and then its production class, or viceversa.

(3) Detailed code coverage information within the code
review: many IDEs currently provide this information, but
it is more difficult to have it within the code review tool. We
aim at adding this feature in which it will be possible to see
whether the added lines are covered by tests and what is the
overall test code coverage.

(4) Code navigation: all the interviewees complained about
the lack of navigation support in GitHub. For example, it is
currently not possible to navigate through the dependencies
or go to the definition of a variable/method. This is instead
possible in (almost all) IDEs, resulting in reviewers having
to checkout the change and opening it in their IDE. We aim at adding this feature, enabling the reviewer to click on the name of a variable/method and pointing to the definition.

The tool is finished and I am currently testing it with practitioners, collecting inputs and feedback in order to improve it.

4.2 Coupling between test and production code

As discussed in Section 2.2, the coupling between test and production code is a well-known problem for practitioners[7, 9, 11]. However, understanding where the problem is and how to fix it is challenging and requires the developers to perform difficult code refactoring.

With our study (Section 2.2) we aim at understanding how spread the problem is and how developers current solve it: the aim is to identify a set of rules that prevent the code to be too coupled. Once completed, we will be able to build a tool that automatically detects classes that are too coupled with the tests, to prevent a cascade of failing tests when refactoring the source code. We aim at doing this within the IDE through static analysis of the code.

Once a pattern is detected, a number of suggestions will appear in the IDE to solve the problem: these suggestions will be a refactoring of the code, for example the creation of a new class, or the refactoring of the test.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Software testing has a fundamental role in any successful software development process [4, 14]. However, many developers underestimate the effect of poor testing on the overall system code quality, and managers prioritize "new features" to test code. However, in my studies I discovered that test code quality is well related to production code quality, hence they should be treated as equally important.

For this reason, I am working closely with practitioners to understand their best practices when it comes to writing tests, for example studying mocking [21], how they review test code [20], TDR, and test coupling. When investigating best practices in software testing, I uncovered many problems of current tools that do not ease the process of testing. To this aim, I am writing and building new tools that better support developers.

After I finish to build the tools presented in Section 4, my future agenda includes deploying them in a real setting with developers and testers. I plan to do this in SIG 1, the company partner of my PhD. I will be able to collect information on how people use the tools, problems of them and how to improve it. After some iteration, I will have collected enough information to write a research/tool paper and, after that, the tools will be mature enough to be deployed outside SIG.
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