

Beautiful Tests

by Bruce A. Tate

icanmakeitbetter

It's good to be here... I almost wasn't.

```
Test
  all of your code
  with
    beautiful,
    dry,
    fast
    tests
```

Test

your code

Many of us come from a testing culture... that's good.

Testing tools are in their infancy... that's bad.

This talk is about a set of band aids we added to existing tools until ExUnit can come around.

Test

all of your code

if it is **worth writing**

```
if it is worth writing  
    it is worth testing
```

don't let your **customers**
test your **code**

we use **excoveralls**

<https://github.com/parroty/excoveralls>

setup

```
defmodule Chat.Mixfile do
  defp deps do
    [ {:excoveralls, only: :test} ]
  end

  defp test(args) do
    Mix.Task.run("test", [])

    Mix.shell.info("")
    Mix.shell.info("$ mix coveralls
                    - coverage overview")
    Mix.shell.info("$ mix coveralls.detail FILENAME
                    - line-by-line coverage of file")
  end

  defp cli_env do
    [ coveralls: :test,
      "coveralls.detail": :test ]
  end
end
```

<https://gist.github.com/batate/fd9e7569b3861a80a0b3>

report

```
[imbe] (develop=) → mix coveralls
Compiled lib/chat/room_supervisor.ex
Compiled lib/chat.ex
Compiled lib/chat/attachment_cache.ex
Compiled lib/chat/socket/handler.ex
Compiled lib/chat/room.ex
Generated chat.app
.....
.....

Finished in 8.1 seconds (2.4s on load, 5.6s on tests)
101 tests, 0 failures

Randomized with seed 167783
-----
COV    FILE                                LINES RELEVANT  MISSED
100.0% lib/chat.ex                    98             18      0
100.0% lib/chat/attachment_cache.ex   221            81      0
100.0% lib/chat/crypto.ex             47             17      0
100.0% lib/chat/http/process.ex       34             13      0
100.0% lib/chat/models.ex             16              4      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/company.ex     89              1      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/multi_attachment.ex 45             13      0
  0.0% lib/chat/models/page.ex        11              0      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/survey.ex      83              4      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/survey_question.ex 80             12      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/survey_response.ex 66              8      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/token.ex       51              8      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/user.ex        88              7      0
```

This is hard to read unless you have zeros on the right hand side!

```
100.0% lib/chat/models/company.ex          89      1      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/multi_attachment.ex  45     13      0
   0.0% lib/chat/models/page.ex           11      0      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/survey.ex          83      4      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/survey_question.ex 80     12      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/survey_response.ex 66      8      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/token.ex           51      8      0
100.0% lib/chat/models/user.ex            80      7      0
100.0% lib/chat/mongo.ex                  118     37      0
100.0% lib/chat/mongo/cursor.ex           92     20      0
100.0% lib/chat/mongo/model.ex           105     39      0
100.0% lib/chat/mongo/process.ex          176     65      0
100.0% lib/chat/mongo/query.ex            54     16      0
100.0% lib/chat/mongo/worker.ex           75     14      0
   0.0% lib/chat/repo.ex                   14      0      0
100.0% lib/chat/room.ex                   786    329      0
100.0% lib/chat/room_supervisor.ex         29      7      0
100.0% lib/chat/router.ex                  15      2      0
100.0% lib/chat/socket.ex                  20      2      0
100.0% lib/chat/socket/handler.ex          363    169      0
100.0% lib/chat/socket/process.ex          87     25      0
100.0% lib/chat/socket/sockjs.ex          62     20      0
100.0% lib/chat/topic.ex                   167     41      0
100.0% lib/chat/topic/gc.ex                46     13      0
[TOTAL] 100.0%
-----

$ mix coveralls - coverage overview
$ mix coveralls.detail FILENAME - line-by-line coverage of file
```

The bottom line makes it easier for our devs to do the right thing.

detailed report

```
...
defp receive_nonmember(false, conn, s, chat) do
  room = Room.join(s.room, chat, s.user, s.token)

  if s.role != "admin" do
    # Filter unpublished questions
    questions = Enum.filter(room.questions, & &1.published)

    # Filter hidden messages
    questions =
      Enum.map(questions, fn question ->
        answers = Enum.reject(question.answers, & &1.hidden)
        %{question | answers: answers}
      end)

    # Filter blocked members
  end
end
...

```

```
Test  
  all of your code  
    with ???
```

```
tests
```

When we decided to code Elixir for our production servers, we had a decision to make.
want a good elixir... compressed schedules

Think **Philosophy,**
not the **Tool Box**

We want to show you real code so that means context. But the tool set doesn't matter.
That said...

We use...

- ExUnit
- ShouldI (batate/shouldi)
- Blacksmith (batate/blacksmith)

We hope to push as much of this into shouldi as possible

We use...

- ExUnit (**our goal: 100%**)
- ShouldI (batate/shouldi)
- Blacksmith (batate/blacksmith)

Oh... About Exunit

- + Fast
- + Pretty Assertions
- + Templates

Oh... About Exunit

- + Fast
- + Pretty Assertions
- + Templates

- Not Dry
- Chaotic
- Language / Syntax

Oh... About Exunit

- + Fast
- + Pretty Assertions
- + Templates

- Not Dry
- Chatty
- Language / Syntax

Not Yet!

Our goal is to work directly with the core team to improve tests where we can help.

```
setup do
  # universal setup
end

test "a get" do
  ...
end

test "logged in get" do
  login_user
  ...
end

test "logged in post" do
  login_user
  ...
end
```

```
setup do
  # universal setup
end
```

```
test "a get" do
  ...
end
```

```
test "logged in get" do
  login_user
  ...
end
```

```
test "logged in post" do
  login_user
  ...
end
```



```
setup do
  # universal setup
end
```

```
test "a get" do
  ...
end
```

```
test "logged in get" do
  login_user
  ...
end
```

```
test "logged in post" do
  login_user
  ...
end
```

```
setup do
  # universal setup
end

test "a get" do
  ...
end

test "logged in get" do
  login_user
  ...
end

test "logged in post" do
  login_user
  ...
end
```

Not DRY

This becomes a big problem as overarching tests get nested.
in models: persistent vs not; error vs happy path; etc.
So setup code can be a big pain

a **horror** story

```
test "gets and updates many levels deep dependencies" do

  Mix.Project.push DepsOnGitApp

  in_fixture "no_mixfile", fn ->

    Mix.Tasks.Deps.Get.run []

    message = "* Getting git_repo (#{fixture_path("git_repo")})"
    assert_received {:mix_shell, :info, [^message]}

    message = "* Getting deps_on_git_repo (#{fixture_path("deps_on_git_repo")})"
    assert_received {:mix_shell, :info, [^message]}

    assert File.exists?("deps/deps_on_git_repo/mix.exs")
    assert File.rm("deps/deps_on_git_repo/.fetch") == :ok
    assert File.exists?("deps/git_repo/mix.exs")
```

Testing is good, but it's not enough to test.

This test is from the Elixir framework. This test is more insufficient tooling.

```
# Compile git repo but unload it so...
Mix.Tasks.Deps.Compile.run ["git_repo"]

assert File.exists?("_build/dev/lib/git_repo/ebin")
Code.delete_path("_build/dev/lib/git_repo/ebin")

# Deps on git repo loads it automatically on compile
Mix.Task.reenable "deps.loadpaths"

Mix.Tasks.Deps.Compile.run ["deps_on_git_repo"]

assert File.exists?("_build/dev/lib/deps_on_git_repo/ebin")

end

after

  purge [GitRepo, GitRepo.Mix]

end
```

You can see that the test creator wants to do the right thing, but can't.

```
# Compile git repo but unload it so...
Mix.Tasks.Deps.Compile.run ["git_repo"]

assert File.exists?("_build/dev/lib/git_repo/ebin")
Code.delete_path("_build/dev/lib/git_repo/ebin")

# Deps on git repo loads it automatically on compile
Mix.Task.reenable "deps.loadpaths"

Mix.Tasks.Deps.Compile.run ["deps_on_git_repo"]

assert File.exists?("_build/dev/lib/deps_on_git_repo/ebin")

end

after

  purge [GitRepo, GitRepo.Mix]

end
```

But the framework is fighting against him.

```
# Compile git repo but unload it so...
Mix.Tasks.Deps.Compile.run ["git_repo"]

assert File.exists?("_build/dev/lib/git_repo/ebin")
Code.delete_path("_build/dev/lib/git_repo/ebin")

# Deps on git repo loads it automatically on compile
Mix.Task.reenable "dep_loadpaths"
Mix.Task.Deps.Compile.run ["deps_on_git_repo"]
assert File.exists?("_build/dev/lib/deps_on_git_repo/ebin")
end
after
  purge [GitRepo, GitRepo.Mix]
end
```

Chaotic!

We are going to stamp this chaotic.
It violates principles of coupling and single purpose.
Also, the reporting can't help us out as much as it should

Shouldi

+ **Fast**

+ Pretty Assertions

+ Templates-Code

- ~~Not~~ **Dry**

- ~~Chaotic~~ **Beautiful**

± **Language** / Syntax

Blacksmith

- + **Fast**
- + Pretty Assertions
- + Templates-Code and **Data**

- ~~Not~~ **Dry Data**
- ~~Chaotic~~ **Beautiful Data**
- ± **Language** / Syntax

Test
all of your code
with
beautiful,
tests

Beautiful is important.

Tests are
first class citizens

You see,

Language Matters

Said another way, language shapes thought. Syntax shapes language.

```
test "chat" do
  chat = Chat.create(...)

  assert something_about_chat
end
```

Why do we get names like this over and over?
Because the language of “test” isn’t strong enough.

The language is for the designers of the framework, not the test.

```
test "chat" do
  chat = Chat.create(...)

  assert something_about_chat
end
```

The word we use here

```
test "chat" do
  chat = Chat.create(...)

  assert something_about_chat
end
```

The word we use here

```
test "should create chat" do
  chat = Chat.create(...)

  assert something_about_chat
end
```

should language improves the thought process: single purpose experiment.


```
should "create chat" do
  chat = Chat.create(...)

  assert something_about_chat
end
```

Push this language into the framework
and we'll be reminded to give all tests better names
and a single purpose.

One **Experiment,**
Multiple **Measurements**

Our overarching philosophy: one experiment, multiple measurements.

```
test "chat" do
  bucket = create_bucket
  assert %#__struct__: "Bucket"} = bucket
  assert Bucket.empty?(bucket)

  Bucket.add(bucket, 1)
  assert bucket.contents == [1]
end
```

Multiple experiments, Multiple measurements

Tightly coupled, encourages abuse.

```
setup context do
  assign bucket: create_bucket
end

should "create struct bucket", context do
  assert %[__struct__: "Bucket"] = context.bucket
end

should "be empty", context do
  assert Bucket.empty?(bucket)
end

should "add to bucket", context do
  Bucket.add(bucket, 1)
  assert bucket.contents == 1
end

should "remove from bucket", context ...
```

```
setup context do
  assign bucket: create_bucket
end
```

Our Experiment

:) / :(

```
should "create struct bucket", context do
  assert %[_struct_: "Bucket"] = context.bucket
end
```

```
should "be empty", context do
  assert Bucket.empty?(bucket)
end
```

```
should "add to bucket", context do
  Bucket.add(bucket, 1)
  assert bucket.contents == 1
end
```

```
should "remove from bucket", context ...
```

This is a compromise. It will allow us to tailor some concepts in advance of changes in exunit

```
setup context do
  assign bucket: create_bucket
end

should "create struct bucket", context do
  assert %{@__struct__: "Bucket"} = context.bucket
end

should "be empty", context do
  assert Bucket.empty?(bucket)
end

should "add to bucket", context do
  Bucket.add(bucket, 1)
  assert bucket.contents == 1
end

should "remove from bucket", context ...
```

We can improve...
these should blocks are sometimes patterns that can be expanded through macros

```
setup context do
  assign bucket: create_bucket
end

should_match_key :bucket, %{ __struct__: "Bucket" }
should_match_key :bucket, %{ contents: [] }

should "add to bucket", context do
  Bucket.add(bucket, 1)
  assert bucket.contents == 1
end

should "remove from bucket", context ...
```

In both forms, we have one experiment and multiple measurements.

Tests the context.

should_have_key
should_match_key

Or tests for Plug connection.

should_respond_with :success
should_render_template :index

Or any framework specific matchers...

In both forms, we have one experiment and multiple measurements.

We are selling our soul here... macros instead of functions.

Continues on **Fail**
Halts on **Error**

```
should_respond_with :success  
should_render_template :index
```

In both forms, we have one experiment and multiple measurements.

We are selling our soul here... macros instead of functions.

Business apps need
Test Data

Business apps need
Beautiful Test Data

Remember, tests are first class citizens

Elixir makes

Beautiful Test Data

Elixir makes
Beautiful Test Data
until things get real

Persistence
Different formats JSON, structs, maps
of attributes



Persistence
Data issues can swallow tests

Blacksmith

Mostly just a functional library with a few key macros

Create structured data for tests

Blacksmith **Templates**


```
defmodule Forge do
  use Blacksmith
  register :user,
    name: Faker.Name.first_name,

    description: Faker.Lorem.sentence

end
```

Faker is a library that creates fake data

```
defmodule Forge do
  use Blacksmith
  register :user,
    name: Faker.Name.first_name,

    description: Faker.Lorem.sentence,

    always_the_same: "string"

end
```

```
defmodule Forge do
  use Blacksmith
  register :user,
    name: Faker.Name.first_name,
    email: Sequence.
      next(:email, &"test#{&1}@example.com"),
    description: Faker.Lorem.sentence,

    always_the_same: "string"

end
```

Maybe you have a database backed test that should be isolated

In that test, email must be unique

```
defmodule Forge do
  use Blacksmith
  register :user,
    name: Faker.Name.first_name,
    email: Sequence.
      next(:email, &"test#{&1}@example.com"),
    description: Faker.Lorem.sentence,
    roles: [],
    always_the_same: "string"

  register :admin,
    [prototype: :user],
    roles: ["admin"]
end
```

Maybe some data should be based on other data
Second form of the register function has options (in the second position)

Blacksmith **Config**

```
defmodule Blacksmith.Config do
  def save(repo, map) do
    repo.insert(map)
  end

  def save_all(repo, list) do
    Enum.map(list, &repo.insert/1)
  end
end
```

Blacksmith **Usage**

```
user = Forge.user
```

```
user = Forge.saved_user Models.User,  
      name: "Will Override"
```

```
admin = Forge.admin
```

```
admin = Forge.admin_list 5
```


Test
all of your code
with
beautiful,
dry,
tests

To have **dry tests**,
you need **specialized setups**
with **nested context**

Controller test

index
show
create
configure

Controller test

logged in

index

show

create

configure

logged out

index

show

create

Controller test

logged in

index

show

create

configure

admin users

configure

show

logged out

index

show

create

Controller test

logged in

index

show

create

configure

admin users

configure

show

logged out

index

show

create

```
test "Logged in admin user gets configure" do
  part = Forge.saved_part(...)
  conn = setup_connection
  admin = Forge.saved_admin( ... )
  sign_in admin
  conn = get conn, :configure
  assert conn.status == 200
end
```

```
test "Logged in user user gets configure" do
  part = Forge.saved_part(...)
  conn = setup_connection
  user = Forge.saved_user( ... )
  sign_in user
  conn = get conn, :configure,
  assert conn.status == 301
end
```

```
test "Logged in admin user gets configure" do
  part = Forge.saved_part(...)
  conn = setup_connection
  admin = Forge.saved_admin( ... )
  sign_in admin
  conn = get conn, :configure
  assert conn.status == 200
end

test "Logged in user user gets configure" do
  part = Forge.saved_part(...)
  conn = setup_connection
  user = Forge.saved_user( ... )
  sign_in user
  conn = get conn, :configure,
  assert conn.status == 301
end
```

Too much duplication

with "a part and a connection" do
...setup for a connection and a part

with "a logged in user" do
...setup for logged in user

tests for logged in user

with "a logged in admin" do
...make the user an admin

tests for logged in admin

Too much duplication

```
with "a get to configure" do
  setup do
    assign conn: get( :configure, context.part.id)
  end

  should_respond_with :success
  should_render_template :configure
end
```

now the test is easy

Test
all of your code
with
beautiful,
dry,
fast
tests

1. **Integration** matters

Jose, you crack me up.

We were batting some test code back and forth over skype and emails. here's Jose's example

```
setup do
```

```
  ...
```

```
end
```

```
test "make breakfast" do
```

```
  breakfast = make_the_toast breakfast
```

```
  assert breakfast.taste == :good
```

```
  breakfast = spread_the_cream breakfast
```

```
  assert breakfast.taste == good
```

```
  breakfast = be_sexy breakfast
```

```
  ...
```

```
end
```

No. This will deteriorate with time.

But maybe it takes a long time to make toast. So...

```
setup do
```

```
  ...
```

```
end
```

```
test "make breakfast" do
```

```
  breakfast = make_the_toast breakfast
```

```
  assert breakfast.taste == :good
```

```
  breakfast = spread_the_cream breakfast
```

```
  assert breakfast.taste == :good
```

```
  breakfast = be_sexy breakfast
```

```
  ...
```

```
end
```

MULTI-PURPOSE

We have all written this test. But we can also see this test deteriorate with time.

But maybe it takes a long time to make toast. So... we live with the consequences.

```
setup do
  ...
  %{ breakfast: create_breakfast ...}
end

...
end
```

No. This will deteriorate with time.
But maybe it takes a long time to make toast. So...

```
setup...
```

```
def make_toast ...
```

```
def spread_cream breakfast do  
  breakfast = spread_the_cream breakfast  
  assert breakfast.taste == good  
  breakfast  
end
```

```
def be_so_sexy ...
```

```
...
```

```
should...
```

No. This will deteriorate with time.

But maybe it takes a long time to make toast. So...


```
def setup
```

```
  def make_toast ...
```

```
  def spread_cream ...
```

```
  def be_so_sexy ...
```

```
  ...
```

```
test "make breakfast", context do
```

```
  context.breakfast
```

```
    |> make_toast
```

```
    |> spread_cream
```

```
    |> be_so_sexy
```

```
end
```

Much better. Single purpose...

The tooling can't help as much as we would like

Want failures reported from make_toast

Integration tests
will be

```
...
step "make the toast", breakfast do
  breakfast = make_the_toast breakfast
  assert breakfast.taste == :good
  breakfast
end

step "spread the cream", breakfast do
  ...
end

step "be sexy", breakfast do
  ...
end
end
```

2. **Concurrency** matters

Functional programming helps.

Database backed tests: Allow data templates which guarantee unique attributes.

3. Isolate the **Database**

Blacksmith list as a
Repository

Directions

In ShouldI

- Push experiments out of setup blocks, back into tests
- Matchers are macros

Into ExUnit

- Nested Context
- Continue on Fail
- Assertion Customization
- Integration Tests into ExUnit

Test

all of your code
with
beautiful,
dry,
fast
tests

Test

all of your code

with

beautiful,

dry,

fast

tests

```
Test
  all of your code
  with
    beautiful,
    dry,
    fast
    tests
```

Test
all of your code
with
beautiful,
dry,
fast
tests

```
Test
  all of your code
  with
  beautiful,
  dry,
  fast
  tests
```

```
should respond_with questions
```

Functional programming helps.

Database backed tests: Allow data templates which guarantee unique attributes.