Screwtape’s Guide to
How to Fake a Test Project
(without getting caught)

As told to
James Bach
james@satisfice.com
The Challenge

So, you want to release bad software, but you have to make it look as if you *really tried* to test it well...

*Here's how I would fake it!*
You could just lie, of course, 

**testing is hard to supervise**

- Your boss probably doesn’t watch you closely.
- Say you tested it, but spend most of your time playing Spider Solitaire, instead.
- Report a few minor bugs to keep the heat off. (A tester did this to me in 1987)
- *But what if you were going to be audited?*
My Basic Strategy

- Behave Conventionally
  (don’t worry: conventional testing wisdom is empty)
- Squander Energy
  (so that you can’t test)
- Focus Narrowly
  (don’t make eye contact with bugs)
- Deflect Scrutiny
  (don’t avoid it; co-opt it)
- Minimize Humanity
  (humans are too good at testing)
- Blame Complexity, Ambiguity, and Volatility
  (argue that no one can cope with these things)
Important Ingredient: Find Some Bugs

- This is not difficult. Anyone can find a few bugs.
- Small bugs, mostly.
- A few big ones.
- Report them just badly enough so that they will be ignored, but not too badly.
My Self-Presentation

- I would call myself an “Engineer” and talk a lot about “engineering discipline”
- Or call myself “Quality Assurance” and talk a lot about “best practices” and “process maturity”
- Of course, I would also call myself an expert. It’s easy!
- Process maturity lets me to defend a slow and expensive process by featuring as a virtue its very slowness and expensiveness!
- I would get ISTQB certification!

**DANGER**: someone may realize that maturity is a moral concept that begs the question of what practices and skills are actually needed on the project.

**SOLUTION**: I accuse those people of being philosophers instead of practical like me. That way, I maintain hegemony over the “regular guy” mytheme within the axiological dialectic.
Minimize Humanity

It increases cost without raising suspicion

The lesser the skill of the tester, the more prescribed procedure, supervision, or favorable environment is required.
Thick Official Documents!

- Thickness discourages scrutiny.
- Templates give appearance of analysis.
- IEEE 829 is a faker’s best friend!
- Contrast your handsome docs to the crude ones you receive.
- Make a big show of keeping them up to date.
- The time you spend on these documents will prevent you from testing.
- Consider computer generated docs! Cool!!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓ Behave Conventionally</th>
<th>✓ Deflect Scrutiny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Squander Energy</td>
<td>✓ Minimize Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Focus Narrowly</td>
<td>✓ Blame Complexity, Ambiguity, and Volatility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thick Official Documents!

- I will be sure to include in every document:
  - Title page
  - Approvals page
  - Version history
  - Table of contents
  - Introduction to the project
  - Purpose of the document
  - Document reference list
  - Acronyms and definitions
  - Chatty tutorial text to discourage review
  - LOTS OF FORMATTING

Little useful content, but plenty of excuses for including it!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓ Behave Conventionally</th>
<th>✓ Deflect Scrutiny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Squander Energy</td>
<td>Minimize Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Narrowly</td>
<td>✓ Blame Complexity, Ambiguity, and Volatility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Scripted Test Procedures with Specific Expected Results Executed After Each Build by Unskilled Testers!

- This is the gold standard of testing fraud.
- Real expected results are impossible to document fully, so it’s hard for people to accuse you of doing too little.
- Most managers think any intellectual process can and should be written down, so you are going with the flow.
- Make them simple function tests so that they are unlikely to find problems even the first time through.
- It helps to relocate the test team thousands of miles from the programmers.

DANGER: Testers may accidentally find bugs because they don’t follow the scripts precisely.

SOLUTION: Accuse them of lacking discipline and maturity.

| ✓ Behave Conventionally | ✓ Deflect Scrutiny |
| ✓ Squander Energy       | ✓ Minimize Humanity |
| ✓ Focus Narrowly        | ✓ Blame Complexity, Ambiguity, and Volatility |
Test Case and Pass Rate Metrics!

- Test cases are just containers, easily manipulated.
- Make your tests easy to pass, and all similar.
- It should not be difficult to produce thousands of them, just by using copy and paste.
- You need more than 1000 tests. Make the pass rate climb slowly.
- If necessary, restrict the oracles so that more pass.
- Golden Rule: *Make the graphs fit expectations.*

DANGER: They may realize this depends on easily manipulated assumptions.

SOLUTION: Remind them that EVERY commercial test management tool offers on test case metrics and ask “How could they all be wrong?”

| ✓ Behave Conventionally | ✓ Deflect Scrutiny |
| ✓ Squander Energy       | ✓ Minimize Humanity |
| ✓ Focus Narrowly        | Blame Complexity, Ambiguity, and Volatility |
Expensive GUI Test Automation!

1. Purchase an expensive GUI test execution tool. (see Rational, Mercury, Compuware, etc.)
2. Define a lot of paper test procedures.
3. Hire an automation team to automate each one.
4. Build a comprehensive test library and framework.
5. Keep fixing it.
6. BONUS: *Test Management Software*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓ Behave Conventionally</th>
<th>✓ Deflect Scrutiny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Squander Energy</td>
<td>✓ Minimize Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Focus Narrowly</td>
<td>✓ Blame Complexity, Ambiguity, and Volatility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>