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Abstract. Testing is a process which can be viewed as a complex system. There are techniques for reducing the level of complexity which come from ways of establishing multi-agent systems that have been discovered in the area of artificial intellect. The idea is that testing processes should at least in part be viewed as multi-agent systems. Different paradigms for organising testing processes become possible if many primitive agents are established and if operations and tasks are broken up into primitive units. This makes it possible to use available resources more effectively. The principles which are presented in this paper can gradually develop testing processes into more effective operations. We particularly focus on the organisational aspects of the testing process.
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Introduction

Testing is a fundamental component in the design and maintenance of software. 30-60% of all resources are taken up by testing [1, 2]. These resources include time, money and people and depend on the specifics of the project.

Back in 2000, the European Systems and Software Initiative study found that most software in Europe is produced by organisations whose basic area of operations is not related to IT. The researchers established that software produced by such organisations represented 70% of all produced software [3]. Because of shortages of specialists small and medium companies use their own employees as testers of software. Many of these people had good knowledge about business, but poor knowledge about IT, including skills related to software testing [4]. It must be added that the prestige of the testing profession and the wages that are paid to testers continue to prevent any major inflow of good specialists into the profession.

We believe that the roots of many problems rest in the complex nature of testing processes. This paper offers an untraditional view of how testing processes can be organised. Our aim being to indicate ways in which the complexity of testing can be reduced. We look for solutions in the theory of complex systems or in areas in which such problems are researched.
We describe the complex system of testing as a multi-agent model. These models and the architectures which are based upon them are used to design software which in a simplified way copies or simulates real-world objects and their behaviour [5, 6]. Models from the real world choose only that issues which is of fundamental importance in complex systems, and they represent simplification of those systems. We propose pay more attention on those organizational principles which are of key importance for establishing multi-agent models to improve testing process management. The result is, to a certain extent, a simpler model which describes the testing process. This model may help in noticing many important things which we fail to notice in everyday situations because of the complexity of the relevant system.

Chapter 1 of the paper describes the complexity of testing processes. We show that the testing process is so complex that it can be seen as a complex system. This means that techniques which simplify complex systems can be used to improve the testing process and to manage it in a better way. Chapter 2 offers a brief review of the most important concepts and modeling techniques for multi-agent systems – those which the authors believe can help in improving the testing process. Chapter 3 reviews ways of reducing the complexity of the process with the help of modeling, also looking at the most important principles that can be used in assembling a multi-agent system. Chapter 4 discusses issues concerning the need to establish a model and the opportunities which emerge in that context. The possible benefits are also considered.

1. The Complexity of Testing Processes

There are several dimensions or aspects in testing processes which have an effect on one another [2, 7-12]:

1. **What is to be tested?** What are the size and the complexity of the software that is to be tested? What is its level of testability? At what level will the testing occur? What is the quality of the software when it is submitted for testing? How often are new software versions submitted for testing?

2. **Why is the testing being conducted?** What are its goals? How is the testing to be conducted? What equipment and methods will be used? What types of mistakes the specific method will reveal and what types it will not reveal?

3. **What resources are available?** How much time is there? What’s the budget? What’s the testing environment? How much work needs to be done? What are the specifics? What are the software tools – computer equipment, databases, communications?

4. **What is the software development methodology?** How long will software maintenance take? During that period, is there reason to believe that there will be substantial changes in the software?

5. **Who will conduct the testing?** How many people will be on the team? What do they know about the software that is to be tested? What are their skills and knowledge in the area of testing? What are their motivations?
All of these are issues which affect one another. The goals of testing, the skills of those who are involved, the software that is being tested and the complexity and quality of the process – all of these will determine the testing methods that are to be used. The amount of time that is afforded for the testing and the equipment that is used, in turn, will determine the extent to which these methods will be usable.

Each of these aspects in and of itself can substantially complicate the testing process. For instance, the larger and more complex the software that is to be tested, the more complicated it is to test it.

The complexity of testing is increased even more if there is a combination of these various aspects. In practice, for instance, it often happens that those who have commissioned extensive and complicated software must conduct acceptance testing in just a few days’ time. That usually means that future system users, who are not professionals in the area of testing, are the ones who are expected to do the work. Only luck will help this situation, unless there is an active, creative and professional approach on the part of those who are organising or managing the testing process. There is little time, there is a lot of work, and the responsibilities are very serious. What to do to ensure that the work makes as much sense as possible?

We believe that as the complexity of each dimension of the testing process increases, the complexity of the entire testing process increases many times over. We consider the testing process a complex evolving social system.

2. The Framework of the Multi-Agent Model

2.1. Describing the Real World with the Multi-Agent Model

Multi-agent models as such are based on real world principles. The agent is an analogue to a human being in that it handles tasks which are entrusted to it. Agents work together, react to changes in their surrounding environment, are born, die, educate themselves, try to achieve their own goals, and try to achieve the global goals of the entire system.

Our approach is based on the assumption that lengthy research results in an identification of the most important things and principles in the real world – something which makes it possible to develop a more primitive model. The transformation scheme is from “real world” to “software that is based on the model”. Our hypothesis is that it is also possible to engage in successful transformation or conformity in the opposite direction – from “model” to “real world,” because the model includes the most important principles of the real world. That which is not important or that might even be hindrances in the real world is cast off.

There are many different frameworks under which the architecture and principles of multi-agent systems can be determined. We could use any framework that includes basic concepts and principles. For our proposal, we are using a framework proposed by [13, 14], because it was established on the basis of human organisational principles. Let us now turn to the most important concepts that we are using in our model. We assume that the reader is familiar with multi-agent systems and the most important concepts therein.
2.2. The Agent

Here is one definition of an agent: “An agent is an encapsulated computer system that is situated in some environment and that is capable of flexible, autonomous action in that environment in order to meet its design objectives” [13]. Each agent is limited in its capacities – what it can do, understand and learn, and how effectively can it do that. It is also limited in terms of physical capacities (what are the available resources), time-related capacities (the lifespan of the agent, the deadlines involved in the work that is done), as well as institutional limitations (what is permissible in legal, political and ethical terms).

An agent has precisely defined boundaries (its body) and contiguity (the ability to communicate with other agents). Agents are in specific environments that can be identified with sensors and changed according to the agent’s views and capacities. Agents do the work that is assigned to them, seeking to achieve their own goals and those of the whole system. Agents are autonomous and can determine their own situation and their own behaviour. Agents can analyse situations and deal with problems. They can react to changes in the surrounding environment or even create the necessary environmental changes that will allow other agents to handle the tasks that have been entrusted to them. Agents are divided up into classes in accordance with their purpose.

2.3. The Task

A task represents the work that needs to be done in order to achieve global goals, as well as the goals of individual agents. Higher-level tasks are usually so complicated that even a fine specialist has problems in handling them. Here a specialist can use the divide-and-conquer principle, also known as decomposition. The task is broken up into separate parts up to the point where the different parts are quite primitive, and it is clear that the work can be done. Different links can be established between tasks and subtasks, and that will create a graph or network of dependency. Tasks can also be grouped in accordance with desirable principles so that they are easier to administer.

2.4. The Operation

Operations help to do the work that is needed. The operations are handled by agents, and they are based on the objects that are available. An object can be data, information, knowledge, tools, storage devices such as databases, or material resources. Typical activities with objects include creating, changing, destroying and consuming them.

We recommend the selection of several typical classes of operations, using standardised templates in terms of how these classes are to be put to use. Depending on the behaviour of agents that are involved in the process, operations can be active (the agent initiates the operation, makes sure that there are all necessary entrance data and resources, changes the surrounding environment, and transfers the results to other agents), or passive (the agent waits for other agents to do as much as possible - deliver entrance objects, initiate the operations, and take over the resulting objects). Let us also note that operations
can be described with a precise algorithm, or they can be ones in which the agent must come up with its own innovative solution in each specific situation.

2.5. Co-Ordination and Its Mechanisms

Co-ordination can be vertical, with a leader and a subordinate, or horizontal, in which all agents have equal rights. Co-ordination can be used to achieve the global goals of the entire system or to achieve the private goals of individual agents or groups of agents. These latter goals may be undesirable in the context of the system’s overall goals.

Co-ordination activities are grouped into classes. For instance, in the class called Strategy there are activities aimed at planning the full operations of the system in pursuit of the goal; in Supervise we have activities which control subordinate agents; in Co-operate we have activities aimed at ensuring that agents which are not subordinate to one another work together in operations that are advantageous to both of them or to the system as such.

Typical mechanisms of co-ordination include direct supervision (ensuring vertical co-operation, with the leader managing the operations of the subordinate), standardisation of work (co-operation is described with precise standards or instructions as to how co-operation and joint work are to be pursued), and mutual adjustment (formal or informal communication).

2.6. The Organisational Structure and Relationships Among Its Components

In real life, systems have an organisational structure which defines the groups of elements in the system and the “legal relationship” among these groups. In companies, this involves a classical organisational structure with various jobs for employees. The jobs can be grouped into classes or roles. In AI each agent has a specific job or performs a specific role.

Sometimes it is also useful to describe informal organisational structures with different relationships among the elements and objects. Examples of these relationships include producer/consumer (one agent produces objects, the other consumes them), common limited object (agents need the same object to conduct their operations), report (one agent reports to another), conflict (one agent must report to another that a conflict has emerged), command and instruct (transfer of commands and instructions from one agent to another), and delegation (one agent delegates its rights and responsibilities to another agent).

2.7. The Capabilities of the Agent

An agent requires necessary capabilities if it is to handle the tasks that are assigned to it. For our approach, we selected a model for the description of capabilities - 5C (Five Capabilities) model [13]. There are five groups of capabilities in this model – communication, competence, self, planner and environment. These are the most important considerations if the agents are to be a capable as possible in handling tasks in our system.

Communication ensures co-operation between one agent and others, as well as with the surrounding environment and the maintenance of the necessary knowledge. Competence (knowledge and methods) ensure that the job can be done in technical terms. Self supports
the agent’s “intimate life” – the agent maintains its goals, the work that needs to be done and the opportunities that are at hand, it supervises, maintains and improves itself, and it manages its operations. Planner refers to the ability of the agent to decide on operating strategies, the order in which tasks are to be handled, what techniques are to be used, etc. – in other words, the agent plans its own operations. Finally, the capabilities under the heading of environment enable the agent to gain information about the surrounding environment, other agents, and the processes which are occurring.

3. Establishing a Model for Testing Processes

In establishing models for multi-agent systems, ideas are sought in real life. The motto for this search is this: “How can human organisational principles be used for multi-agent architectures?” We already noted that we have chosen the opposite direction: “How can the architecture of a multi-agent system and the principles whereby that architecture is developed be used in order to organise testing processes in a better way?”

In many books about testing, there is nuanced review not only of testing techniques, but also of the way in which testing processes are organised. Sadly, good books and the knowledge contained therein are not put to sufficient use. One reason is that these are thick textbooks, and people just lack the time to study them carefully. The second problem is that the reader will get confused about many issues, because he will not be able to find the most important things in the book, as it is simply too long and complicated. This is particularly evident in those cases when testing is assigned to employees for whom it is “temporary” or “forced” work and who do not have fundamental knowledge about IT.

It has also been noticed that people are often ineffective when they face complicated situations. Some people do nothing, while others actively do something inappropriate. Few people manage to move toward the stated goal. If, by contrast, the situation is a simple one, and the person understands the order of things, then he feels more comfortable and acts more effectively and with greater purpose. It is also true that people will choose the tool and method that they are familiar with.

The multi-agent model simplifies many things by making use of known techniques in order to reduce the complexity of the system. Complexity of software can be reduced with decomposition, abstraction, organization [15].

**Decomposition.** A large issue is divided up into smaller sub-issues. This process of division continues until such time as the sub-issues are understandable and easier to solve. The level of complexity is reduced, because each phase in the solution is understandable, the solution is more trivial, and it is easier to ensure at the necessary level of quality.

**Abstraction.** Technique to distinguish which issues are the most important and to hide details that are not of importance at the relevant level. The level of complexity is reduced, because the focus can be on the most important aspects of the issue.

**Organisation.** The components can be grouped into more universal and homogeneous components, ones that are at a higher level. There is identification of the techniques that are to be used in organising co-operation among components so as to handle a complex task. It is also possible to reduce duplication of effort in the work that is done.
In order to simplify the testing process, we propose that first the essential be separated from the non-essential. This is a process which we handle gradually. Our first step is to establish an agent-based model. Such models describe only the most important things, because it is impossible to describe everything. The establishment of the model can be an informal process – a mental model in the brain of the organiser of the testing, if there is “laziness” or an “inability” to write it down on paper or model it on a computer. Such models, however, will be too complicated for non-specialists. Moreover, they are more meant for the design of intelligent software. The second step is to look at the agent-based models and to select a few items and principles which are sufficiently simple to be understood and ensure a greater level of freedom in terms of adapting them to real life. Our practical experience shows that when this approach is understood, there can be successful use of just a few principles and that even though the model itself is basically just a vision.

Let us now look at the most important principles that can be adapted from multi-agent systems, as well as at the techniques for establishing these. We will add identifiers to the essential principles, using a different letter for each one – A (Agent), T (Task), O (Operation), C (Co-ordination), S (Structure of organisation), and F (Functioning, which refers to the agent’s capabilities.

**A1**: The agents which will do the work are as primitive as possible. An agent is a person with his or her set of capabilities, or it is software that is needed for a specific task. Examples of such agents include handlers of test cases, evaluators of the results of a test case, the designer of test cases in accordance with criterion C1, documenters of mistakes that are identified, and the receiver of a list of all software screen forms.

**A2**: Agents are grouped into typical classes or groups, and relations among them or within them are defined. The subordination of agents is specified (leader/subordinate), the upper level specialisation of the agent is defined (operator, manager, planner, resource manager), the lower level specialisation is also defined (evaluator of test results, preparer of reports about errors, designer of test cases), and the participants which will handle specific tasks (regressive testing, testing of scenarios, testing of performance) are identified.

**A3**: Agents which exist in a single individual or computer are merged into an agency. According to the A1 principle, a person or computer can contain many primitive agents. Accordingly, the activities of the agents are limited – one agent acts under the framework of the assigned time slot. The parallel activities of several agents, however, can be simulated within the framework of a single agency.

**A4**: The agencies that are available to us and the agents residing therein must regularly be identified. This means that we are aware of the resources that are available to us, and we can plan specific activities – we choose the operations that can be handled with the available resources, we seek opportunities to gain a new agency with a necessary agent, or we establish a new agent in the existing agency.

**A5**: We determine the ability of each agency to create new agents. We must be familiar with the ability of each employee to gain new skills (i.e., create a new agent in himself). We must also be familiar with the computer and its software in terms of opportunities to use or configure these or to create opportunities for automatic adaptation of the software.

**A6**: Planning the effective use of the agency. Each agency has its operating costs. We use employees with a low level of qualifications to handle primitive and standardised tasks.
The computer is what handles operations that are frequently repeated and can be computerised – this makes the testing automatic. Highly qualified employees must be used for non-standard and innovative operations, and they should not be assigned tasks that can actually be handled by employees who are lower on the ladder of qualifications.

**T1:** We divide up the tasks to get primitive sub-tasks. There must be harmony here with the A1 principle. The more primitive the tasks and the agents that handle them, the less complex the system will be. We assume that the system’s “complexity of understanding” declines more rapidly than the “complexity of the quantity of components” increases, because we can make use of resources that are offered by abstraction and grouping. Here we have great opportunities for optimal operations, because major tasks can be handled by more than one.

**T2:** Specification of critical tasks. In evaluating risks and the interests of various stakeholders (the client, the agent doing the work, the user), we can prioritise the tasks that are necessary. We start this evaluation by the highest-level tasks. Evaluation of sub-tasks is conducted only for the critical upper tasks. This helps us to define our testing strategy, to decide whether new tasks must be created, and to come up with conditions for the establishment of a plan to perform the tasks.

**T3:** Defining those groups of tasks which will require a lot of time to perform. Here we determine which tasks are interdependent on the basis of various criteria that will affect the total amount of time that is needed (the tasks have to be handled in sequence, they consume one and the same resource, etc.).

**T4:** Determining those tasks which only a limited number of agents can handle. Usually there will be tasks which require someone with a high level of qualifications to handle them, and that means that there is a deficit of appropriate agents and agencies. Such agencies must be reserved for these critical functions, keeping them from doing other, simpler work.

**O1:** We divide up the operation into primitive sub-operations. As was the case with principle T1, we reduce the complexity of the overall job and make it more possible to manoeuvre with the selection of agencies for each sub-operation. It is also easier to monitor the performance of the work.

**O2:** We define the most important classes of operations and specify their operational algorithm. Typical solutions are identified for those operations that are more important and must be handled more open. Templates help us to describe the way in which the operation is to be conducted. Those operations that can be performed on the computer can later be programmes, and the relevant software agents can be created.

**O3:** Protection against deadlock. Because most agencies will be human beings who have a great deal of freedom in taking decisions, we must make sure that there are controls to ensure that the work is done. In practice, an agency can make some of his agents passive or fail to give them the time that is necessary to do the work. The result is that work on an operation can come to a halt, and that will have an effect on the behaviour of other agencies. When the agent is actually software, the work is easier to adjust and forecast.

**C1:** We specify the best possible co-ordination mechanism for each task. Depending on our strategy for ensuring the testing process and the agencies that are available, we define the best co-ordination mechanisms among agents and among agencies. The testing process...
is very flexible and dynamic. It depends on the project phase and the testing methods that are used. This means that many different versions of co-operation will be used simultaneously in the system.

**C2: Promoting co-operation among agents and agencies.** We set up opportunities for co-operation, show why they should be used, ensure an environment for the pursuit of global goals, and then let agencies themselves decide on co-operation as such. The goal could be to set up a self-organising system, because such a system is far more effective and viable under critical circumstances. Let’s be careful, however, to make sure that the agencies do not get too carried away with private goals and ignore the system’s goals.

**C3: Use of existing co-operation mechanisms.** The cornerstone for the testing process, at the end of the day, will involve living people, and the organisation will have specific co-operation models for specific individuals. There is no ideal co-ordination mechanism among people, because each person prefers his own desired mechanism or a combination of mechanisms. This will depend on the individual’s personal characteristics, the level of the individual’s maturity, and the goals which the individual sets. People don’t like to accept rapid changes in their lives, and that’s why we need to try to use the existing co-operation model, gradually transforming it in the desired direction.

**S1: We select the best organisational structure for each class of tasks.** We have an official organisational structure for our agencies, and that must be taken into account. At the same time, however, there are also informal relations among agencies. We can choose and govern both formal and informal structures. This must be in line with principle C1.

**S2: We use existing organisational structures.** The analogue is with principle C3.

**F1: We determine the most important abilities of agents and agencies.** We must know the resources that are available to us before we can plan our testing strategy and activities.

**F2: We determine the most important abilities of agencies that are needed for the most critical tasks.** This has to be harmonised with the results that we get when applying principles T1, T2 and T3. We can define the missing functions, which will be the difference between those functions found with principle F1 and those found with principle F2.

**F3: Seeking out alternative functions.** We look for ways of replacing those functions that are missing with others, perhaps looking for entirely different solutions to the problem. Testing is a process in which different methods can be used to achieve the same goal, and that also means different functions. This represents dynamic adaptation to the circumstances which prevail.

**F4: Developing new functions.** We look at ways of ensuring those functions which are missing and ensure that they are gradually developed. This means creating new agents by training employees, obtaining new software, or configuring existing software.

The strategy for the simplified use of the listed principles was first described in [16]. The introduction of these principles is a gradual process, making it possible to evolve toward a better operating model.
4. Development and Maintenance of the Model

The models that are described here do not tell us anything fundamentally new. The same can be found in many sources of information about testing, and it can be formulated in different ways. In practice, however, there are problems with organising effective testing processes. Our observation is that testing is often organised on the basis of a simple and understandable principle – each functional component of software is handed over to a tester, and the tester’s job is to test that component. The rest depends on how capable the tester is in doing the work.

This easily understood approach, of course, has the key problem of poorly qualified testers, whose activities are usually limited to the use of simple and typical test cases. The skills of such testers are so poor and so fragmentary that planned and serious testing is simply not possible.

In practice, the key issue is whether the testing team has at least one good tester, as well as whether that tester can organise the resources that are available in pursuit of the goal that is at hand. Good specialists can plan optimal testing strategies on the basis of their own capabilities. Sadly, there is a lack of human resources for this purpose. An unqualified tester cannot be expected to handle a high-level task which he does not understand.

A solution here is to break large tasks up into primitive sub-tasks, and then to plan the handling of those tasks with the assistance of the entire testing team. This represents fundamentally new thinking, because the delegation of tasks no longer involves large functional blocs. Instead there are small and clearly defined tasks – ones which the employee is capable of handling. The multi-agent approach makes it easier to move toward this paradigm in the organisation of testing processes.

Does a multi-agent system model need to be established in a formal sense? Sadly, the current level of development suggests that the answer is probably “no.” Testing teams don’t have the capacity for this – there’s a lack of qualified specialists, and there is a lack of free time, too. In small projects, it is easier to maintain an informal model which is understood by a few senior employees, but is not written down on paper or modeled on a computer. In large projects, by comparison, attempts to establish and maintain a model without specialised tools will demand too much in the way of resources.

At the same time, it has to be said that it is possible to establish a formal or semi-formal model. Testing includes work done by people, but also automated computer processes. Some activities may involve pre-existing standards and procedures as to how the operations can be handled. The use of testing tools can also be described quite easily.

The multi-agent system approach has the advantage that unified principles can be used to describe the co-operation or symbiosis of people and computers in pursuit of the common goal. This makes it easier to replace computerised operations with human activity, as well as to formalise operations by describing them with algorithms which make it possible to create software-based agents.

These principles can define many sub-tasks which represent a duplication of offer. Large functional blocs, for instance, use one and the same sub-functionality, and each tester seeks to test it. Once is enough in this regard. When a test case is run for one purpose, it can
also be used to test another area, but there is no common database of test cases among the testers, and there is no co-operation in the preparation or the handling of the test cases.

This also makes more evident those things that have to be taught to employees. When a large task is divided up into small and understandable sub-tasks and a simple technique for handling them is presented, it becomes far easier to discover the areas in which an employee has weak skills. That makes it clear what the employee must learn before he can be entrusted with a major task all on his own.

Our recommendation is that before delegating a task to an employee, the testing process planner and manager must establish a sub-model for handling the task, at least in their minds. In [16] is offered an example which is focused on the seemingly trivial task of “checking whether all windows in the informational system can be opened and closed”. The fact is that even such a simple task can cause many problems, misunderstandings, poor performance, and inadequate reaction to results. The imagined sub-model can be written down to a certain extent on paper and submitted to the employee as a specification of what needs to be done. Even such minor improvements can substantially enhance the quality of the testing process. If the job specifications are gathered together, that makes it possible to assemble a set of fragments from the large model, and that is a good base for the development of knowledge.

Conclusions

Our aim in this paper was not to review a specific model for organising a testing process, and we have not done so. Techniques for establishing models can be found in the literature which describes the establishment of multi-agent systems. The thing that must be remembered, however, is that the literature mostly deals with computerised systems, while testing mostly depends on people. It’s not worth rewriting the many things which multi-agent systems have adapted from the real world and which can be adapted successfully during testing processes, because those who are interested in these can find them themselves and put them to use as needed.

In this paper we have mentioned only those concepts and principles of multi-agent systems which are important for us and are based on our own experience. Other authors may have different priorities and different sets of principles. Also, we have only mentioned those principles which help to improve the management of testing processes, because we see that this makes it possible to improve testing to a substantial degree and with less effort. We are not talking about principles that can be used to ensure adequacy in testing – a minimal set of test cases that can be handled with minimal effort, one which offers precise evaluation of results and the conclusion that preventing the consequences of any potential mistakes which have not been discovered might be cheaper than the consumption of additional resources that are needed for testing.

Although we have argued in this paper that it is not really realistic to establish formal models at this time, the fact is that it is worth considering the possibility of establishing special tools and methodologies to make it easier to observe the principles of multi-agent systems in testing processes.
In conclusion, we wish to stress once again that the use of the ideas which are presented here will largely depend on the presence in a testing team of at least one specialist who truly understands multi-agent systems and has good knowledge in the area of software testing. We have seen nothing to indicate that without this, it is possible to improve testing processes in any substantial way. The key figure here is the specialist who can imagine the testing process as a set of many primitive agents which handle small tasks and all move toward the common goal, and who can establish and constantly update the specific model for the project, at least in an informal and mental manner.
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