

ENGLISH FOR WORK / ENGLISH FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND SOFTWARE TESTING

Software Quality & Testing English

Clear findings. Useful next checks.



Phil Stilwell

© 2026 Phil Stilwell. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the author, except as permitted by law.

Eight practical lessons. Eleven extended conversations.

Vocabulary, phrase banks, guided speaking, and explained answers.

Revised 2026 edition / Upper-intermediate to advanced

Your route through the book

[01 Agreeing the expected result, page 4](#)

Expose contradictory examples and obtain a clear equality rule without inventing a missing requirement.

[02 Making a failure reproducible, page 14](#)

Give a reproducible defect report and explain why a successful attempt with different input does not disprove it.

[03 Choosing cases at boundaries and across rules, page 26](#)

Explain missing boundary and rejection coverage while keeping unspecified decimal behavior separate from the whole-number rule.

[04 Explaining coverage and change risk, page 36](#)

Explain limited smoke-test evidence and justify focused follow-up on both consumers of a changed formatter.

[05 Investigating inconsistent automated results, page 48](#)

Describe an order-dependent automated failure and request isolated test data instead of treating reruns as a fix.

[06 Separating impact from scheduling in triage, page 58](#)

Compare functional impact, reach, and timing without equating demonstration urgency with defect severity or release approval.

[07 Reporting exploratory findings, page 71](#)

Report a timeboxed exploratory observation while separating behavior, an unresolved warning requirement, and untested mobile scope.

[08 Giving a release-evidence handover, page 81](#)

Report pass, failure, and blocked counts while identifying the unmet critical-path criterion and preserving release ownership.

[Professional communication notes, page 3](#)

[Three additional workplace cases, page 94](#)

[Answers and explanations, page 108](#)

[Phrase finder, page 166](#)

[Vocabulary index, page 168](#)

[References and publication notes, page 173](#)

Suggested study range: B2-C1. This is an editorial study range, not a certified proficiency assessment.

A result is only as clear as its boundary.

A passing test does not cover an untested path. A blocked check is not a pass. An unexpected behavior may expose a missing requirement rather than a confirmed violation. Good testing English keeps those distinctions visible.

Agree what correct means

Conflicting examples cannot both define the same expected result. Name the exact equality case and ask the requirement owner to resolve it. Do not allow a test script to silently become the product rule.

"One example accepts exactly twenty-four hours and another rejects it. Which result is intended?"

Report the conditions with the result

Include the build, saved input, action, actual output, and observed frequency. A successful attempt using different input does not refute a failure under the reported conditions. Keep the scope of the evidence explicit.

"On Q12, this three-item selection omitted the last item in both attempts."

Keep impact and timing separate

A visible error may deserve urgent attention before a demonstration, while a less frequent data defect has a different functional impact. Explain both dimensions without inventing a severity rating, priority decision, or release approval.

"The typo affects every account page; the export defect loses a row in the monthly workflow."

Distinguish untested from successful

A release summary should show passes, failures, blocked checks, unresolved criteria, and decision ownership. Percentages can conceal an unexecuted critical path. A report supports the release decision; it does not replace the authorized decision maker.

"Seven passed, one failed, and two are blocked; one blocked check is critical."

Professional boundaries

All products, builds, requirements, observations, and decisions are fictional. This book teaches workplace English, not certification content or a complete testing method. Actual requirements, test policies, evidence standards, privacy safeguards, and release authority take precedence. The exercises authorize no live-system changes. A proposed check has no result until executed, and an observed result applies only to its stated conditions.

A Read the situation

LESSON 01 / AGREEING THE EXPECTED RESULT

Expose contradictory examples and obtain a clear equality rule without inventing a missing requirement.

Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?

A fictional booking requirement says cancellation is allowed within 24 hours. One example permits cancellation exactly 24 hours before the event; another rejects it. Tester Maya and requirement owner Dev review the conflict. The equality case has not been settled. Time-zone handling is outside this discussion. Maya needs an agreed expected result before using a test to declare this exact boundary behavior correct or defective.

People: Maya, Tester; Dev, Requirement owner.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. Which case is contradictory?

- A.** Cancellation exactly 24 hours before the event
- B.** Every cancellation more than a week ahead
- C.** Only time-zone conversion
- D.** Every completed booking

2. Who can clarify the intended rule?

- A.** An unrelated customer
- B.** The test framework
- C.** The requirement owner
- D.** The test result alone

3. What is outside this discussion?

- A.** The equality case
- B.** The contradictory examples
- C.** The expected cancellation result
- D.** Time-zone handling

[Answers and explanations, page 108](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

requirement

Statement of behavior or capability the product should provide.

clarify the requirement

actual result

Outcome observed when the test is executed.

record the actual result

ambiguity

Wording that permits more than one interpretation.

resolve an ambiguity

boundary

Point where an applicable rule or outcome changes.

test the boundary

inclusive limit

Limit that includes the endpoint itself.

specify an inclusive limit

threshold

Value at which a rule changes or applies.

name the threshold

expected result

Outcome a test should produce under the agreed rule.

agree the expected result

acceptance criterion

Condition used to judge whether a requirement is met.

refine the acceptance criterion

contradiction

Two statements that cannot both hold for the same case.

identify a contradiction

equality case

Input exactly equal to the specified threshold.

clarify the equality case

exclusive limit

Limit that excludes the endpoint itself.

distinguish an exclusive limit

test oracle

Reference used to decide the expected outcome.

establish the test oracle

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

requirement **REQUIREMENT**

clarify the requirement

Keep the meaning precise: Statement of behavior or capability the product should provide.

contradiction **CONTRADICTION**

identify a contradiction

Keep the meaning precise: Two statements that cannot both hold for the same case.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

test basis

Information from which tests and expectations are derived.

review the test basis

business rule

Product behavior specified for a business purpose.

confirm the business rule

decision record

Traceable statement of an agreed decision.

preserve the decision record

precondition

State required before a test action is performed.

state the precondition

traceability

Ability to link a test or result to its supporting requirement.

maintain traceability

pass/fail judgment

Conclusion comparing observed behavior with an agreed expectation.

defer the pass/fail judgment

Boolean condition

Condition with a true or false value.

combine Boolean conditions

requirement owner

Person responsible for clarifying the relevant requirement.

consult the requirement owner

assumption

Belief used without current confirmation.

label an assumption

postcondition

State expected after the relevant action.

define the postcondition

scope boundary

Limit on topics or behavior covered by the work.

respect the scope boundary

clarification request

Specific question seeking missing or inconsistent information.

raise a clarification request

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

test oracle **TEST ORACLE**

establish the test oracle

Keep the meaning precise: Reference used to decide the expected outcome.

decision record **DECISION RECORD**

preserve the decision record

Keep the meaning precise: Traceable statement of an agreed decision.

Phrases that move the work forward

Locate the ambiguity

The two examples disagree at exactly twenty-four hours.

Name the second outcome

The other rejects the same case.

Separate preference

My interpretation is not yet an agreed rule.

Avoid an implementation shortcut

Current behavior does not settle intended behavior.

Name the boundary

I am asking about the endpoint itself.

Request alignment

Please update the conflicting example after the decision.

Defer judgment

I cannot make a justified pass/fail judgment on this case yet.

Confirm the decision status

This is a clarification request, not a chosen outcome.

Name the first outcome

One example allows the cancellation.

Ask the precise question

Should equality be accepted or rejected?

Request authority

Can the requirement owner clarify this point?

Request a usable expectation

We need one expected result for this input.

Keep scope focused

Time-zone handling is outside this discussion.

Preserve traceability

Link the test to the clarified requirement.

Avoid premature agreement

The equality rule remains unresolved.

Close with the next step

Record the intended result before finalizing the test expectation.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: Ask the precise question

Useful wording: Should equality be accepted or rejected?

Purpose: Separate preference

Useful wording: My interpretation is not yet an agreed rule.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which question isolates the unresolved rule?

- A.** Did cancellation work at 23 hours?
- B.** Does the current build reject at 24 hours?
- C.** Which time zone does the event use?
- D.** At exactly 24 hours before the event, should cancellation be accepted or rejected?

2. What should serve as the test expectation?

- A.** Whatever the code currently does
- B.** A different product's behavior
- C.** The explicitly clarified requirement
- D.** The tester's unrecorded preference

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Condition used to judge whether a requirement is met. Which term fits?

- A.** traceability
- B.** inclusive limit
- C.** acceptance criterion
- D.** business rule

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?". Maya: "My first reading included the endpoint, but I haven't treated that as an approved product rule. I need the owner's decision." Dev: [missing response] Maya: "The precise question is accept or reject at exactly twenty-four hours. I want to leave time-zone conversion outside this particular clarification." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Good. Label it an assumption until the requirement decision is explicit. Your reading may be reasonable, but it is not enough to declare the product correct or defective.
- B.** Show me the equality case you are comparing. I want to separate that exact endpoint from any other timing question before we decide what the rule should mean.
- C.** That is a real contradiction, not merely a difference in wording. We need to resolve the intended outcome rather than ask you to choose whichever example matches the implementation.
- D.** That is accurate. Defer the pass/fail judgment for this case until the intended outcome is recorded. The next step is a requirement decision, not an invented test result.

[Answers and explanations, page 108](#)

One useful distinction

The exact twenty-four-hour case has two conflicting expected outcomes. Neither the word within nor the current implementation resolves that conflict by itself. Request an explicit accept-or-reject decision for equality.

Conversation

Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?

Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

equality case / test oracle / pass/fail judgment / decision record / traceability /
contradiction / inclusive limit / scope boundary / assumption / clarification request

- 01 **Maya:** Before I finalize the cancellation test, can we resolve the two examples for exactly twenty-four hours before the event? One accepts it; one rejects it.
- 02 **Dev:** Show me the ¹ _____ you are comparing. I want to separate that exact endpoint from any other timing question before we decide what the rule should mean.
- 03 **Maya:** They describe the same endpoint, not nearby times. I can't give the test two incompatible expected outcomes for the same condition.
- 04 **Dev:** That is a real ² _____, not merely a difference in wording. We need to resolve the intended outcome rather than ask you to choose whichever example matches the implementation.
- 05 **Maya:** My first reading included the endpoint, but I haven't treated that as an approved product rule. I need the owner's decision.
- 06 **Dev:** Good. Label it an ³ _____ until the requirement decision is explicit. Your reading may be reasonable, but it is not enough to declare the product correct or defective.
- 07 **Maya:** The precise question is accept or reject at exactly twenty-four hours. I want to leave time-zone conversion outside this particular clarification.
- 08 **Dev:** That keeps the ⁴ _____ clear. We should not introduce a separate timing policy into this discussion and then mistake that for resolving the original conflict.
- 09 **Maya:** Could I copy what the application currently does into the expected result? It would finish the script, but wouldn't show whether the behavior is intended.
- 10 **Dev:** That would not establish the ⁵ _____. We need the intended rule first, otherwise the test can repeat an existing mistake and still appear to pass.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Maya:** Once the outcome is agreed, I'll record it and correct the conflicting example. A note saying clarified without the actual rule won't be enough.
- 12 **Dev:** Yes. The ⁶ _____ should state the endpoint behavior explicitly. A vague note saying clarified would leave the same interpretation problem for the next tester.
- 13 **Maya:** I'll hold off calling the boundary inclusive. That describes one possible decision, and the other example currently says the opposite.
- 14 **Dev:** Exactly. An ⁷ _____ is one possible decision, not a fact we have already agreed. Keep the options separate from the final rule.
- 15 **Maya:** I can attach the two examples and the one equality question. That should give the owner a focused decision instead of a vague requirement complaint.
- 16 **Dev:** That is a useful ⁸ _____. It gives the requirement owner a concrete choice and shows why testing cannot make a justified judgment yet.
- 17 **Maya:** I'll link the updated expectation to that decision. Silently changing an example would hide why we chose the new outcome.
- 18 **Dev:** Preserve that ⁹ _____. Anyone reviewing the result should be able to see which rule was applied and why it replaced the conflicting interpretation.
- 19 **Maya:** For now: equality unresolved, expected result pending, time zones outside this discussion. I haven't selected accept or reject.
- 20 **Dev:** That is accurate. Defer the ¹⁰ _____ for this case until the intended outcome is recorded. The next step is a requirement decision, not an invented test result.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. equality case / 2. contradiction / 3. assumption / 4. scope boundary / 5. test oracle / 6. decision record / 7. inclusive limit / 8. clarification request / 9. traceability / 10. pass/fail judgment

[Why these answers fit, page 109](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?

Return to the case

A fictional booking requirement says cancellation is allowed within 24 hours. One example permits cancellation exactly 24 hours before the event; another rejects it. Tester Maya and requirement owner Dev review the conflict. The equality case has not been settled. Time-zone handling is outside this discussion. Maya needs an agreed expected result before using a test to declare this exact boundary behavior correct or defective.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which status is accurate now?

- A. Equality remains unresolved
- B. Equality is confirmed accepted
- C. Equality is confirmed rejected
- D. Time zones have been fully tested

2. What should follow clarification?

- A. Align the examples and link the test to the decision
- B. Keep contradictory examples as equal authorities
- C. Erase all requirement history
- D. Claim every cancellation case passed

[Answers and explanations, page 111](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 9-16, stressing intended rule rather than current application behavior.

A precise question is not obstruction

When a phrase supports different readings, identify the exact case rather than asking whether the entire requirement is clear. Two contradictory examples provide a concrete reason to seek a decision. Keep your own preferred interpretation separate from the agreed rule.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Ask one answerable requirement question

Complete the clarification exchange without choosing the unresolved cancellation outcome.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

result / 24 / unresolved / discussion

- 01 **Tester:** The examples conflict at exactly ¹ _____ hours.
- 02 **Owner:** The equality case remains ² _____.
- 03 **Tester:** The test needs an agreed expected ³ _____.
- 04 **Owner:** Time-zone handling is outside this ⁴ _____.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. 24 / 2. unresolved / 3. result / 4. discussion

[Why these answers fit, page 111](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?". Maya: "I'll hold off calling the boundary inclusive. That describes one possible decision, and the other example currently says the opposite." Dev: [missing response] Maya: "I can attach the two examples and the one equality question. That should give the owner a focused decision instead of a vague requirement complaint." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Yes. The decision record should state the endpoint behavior explicitly. A vague note saying clarified would leave the same interpretation problem for the next tester.
- B.** That is a useful clarification request. It gives the requirement owner a concrete choice and shows why testing cannot make a justified judgment yet.
- C.** Exactly. An inclusive limit is one possible decision, not a fact we have already agreed. Keep the options separate from the final rule.
- D.** Preserve that traceability. Anyone reviewing the result should be able to see which rule was applied and why it replaced the conflicting interpretation.

[Answers and explanations, page 112](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 02 / MAKING A FAILURE REPRODUCIBLE

Give a reproducible defect report and explain why a successful attempt with different input does not disprove it.

Three selected, two exported, twice

On fictional build Q12, tester Hana exports a saved selection of three items. The output omits the last selected item. She observes the omission in two attempts out of two. Developer Joel exports one item successfully. No other build or selection size has been checked. They compare conditions and prepare a handoff using the saved three-item selection, the export action, and the observed output without claiming every export fails.

People: Hana, Tester reporting the omission; Joel, Developer investigating the report.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. Which build did Hana test?

- A. Q20
- B. Every release
- C. An unspecified previous build
- D. Q12

2. What did Joel successfully export?

- A. Every selection size
- B. The omitted item in every build
- C. One item
- D. The same saved three-item selection

3. What frequency is established?

- A. Two omissions in two attempts with the saved selection
- B. Every export always fails
- C. One failure in ten attempts
- D. No repeatable omission

[Answers and explanations, page 113](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

defect report

Record describing a suspected or confirmed product problem.

submit a defect report

reproduction steps

Ordered actions used to observe a reported problem.

follow the reproduction steps

test fixture

Prepared data or state for a test.

share the test fixture

expected output

Data or behavior required for the test to pass.

state the expected output

selection size

Number of items included in the chosen input.

compare selection size

denominator

Total count against which a proportion is measured.

state the denominator

build identifier

Label identifying the software version under test.

include the build identifier

saved selection

Retained set of items used as input.

reuse the saved selection

actual output

Data or behavior produced by the executed operation.

attach the actual output

omission

Absence of something that should be included.

report the final-item omission

reproduction frequency

Observed failures relative to stated attempts and conditions.

report reproduction frequency

environment detail

Relevant setting or configuration for an observation.

preserve environment details

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

defect report DEFECT REPORT

submit a defect report

Keep the meaning precise: Record describing a suspected or confirmed product problem.

actual output ACTUAL OUTPUT

attach the actual output

Keep the meaning precise: Data or behavior produced by the executed operation.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

mutation testing

Checking test sensitivity using deliberately modified program variants.

interpret mutation testing results

equivalent mutant

Modified variant with the same observable behavior for the relevant domain.

investigate an equivalent mutant

minimal reproduction

Smallest useful example retaining the observed problem.

seek a minimal reproduction

scope of evidence

Range of conditions actually supported by observations.

limit the scope of evidence

reproduction run

Repeat intended to check the reported behavior.

perform a reproduction run

cannot reproduce

Status indicating failure to observe the report under stated attempts.

qualify cannot reproduce

evidence bundle

Group of supporting records for an investigation.

prepare an evidence bundle

log excerpt

Relevant portion of recorded system events.

include a log excerpt

counterexample

Example contradicting a universal claim under its relevant terms.

assess a counterexample

unverified condition

Condition whose behavior has not been checked.

identify an unverified condition

input parity

Use of matching input in a comparison.

establish input parity

handoff note

Concise record transferring evidence and next steps.

prepare the handoff note

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

environment detail ENVIRONMENT DETAIL

preserve environment details

Keep the meaning precise: Relevant setting or configuration for an observation.

minimal reproduction MINIMAL REPRODUCTION

seek a minimal reproduction

Keep the meaning precise: Smallest useful example retaining the observed problem.

Phrases that move the work forward

Identify the build

I observed this on Q12.

State the action

I exported that selection.

Report frequency

It occurred in two attempts out of two.

Acknowledge the comparison

Your one-item attempt succeeded.

Request matching input

Please use the same saved selection.

Request evidence

I will attach the selection and actual output.

Name an unknown

Other selection sizes remain unchecked.

Request confirmation

Report the result with the same input and build.

Identify the input

I used the saved selection of three items.

State the omission

The last selected item is missing from the output.

Limit the claim

I have not tested other builds.

Explain the difference

That uses a different selection size.

Avoid dismissal

The one-item result does not disprove this report.

Keep steps repeatable

Follow the recorded action sequence.

Avoid overgeneralizing

I am not claiming that every export fails.

Close the handoff

The report includes the conditions, omission, and observed frequency.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: State the omission

Useful wording: The last selected item is missing from the output.

Purpose: Report frequency

Useful wording: It occurred in two attempts out of two.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which title best preserves the evidence?

- A.** Q12 export omits last item from saved three-item selection, observed twice
- B.** All exports always lose data
- C.** Export fails on every build
- D.** One-item exports are broken

2. Why does Joel's result not refute Hana's?

- A.** Successful tests never matter
- B.** Q12 cannot export anything
- C.** Hana tested every possible input
- D.** The selection size differs

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Retained set of items used as input. Which term fits?

- A.** selection size
- B.** reproduction run
- C.** saved selection
- D.** equivalent mutant

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "I'll attach the output alongside it. The export isn't empty; comparing selected and exported items shows which one disappeared." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "For frequency, I'm writing two out of two attempts. Always would make it sound as though I'd tested a much larger set." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** My one-item export worked, so I marked it cannot reproduce. I should qualify that: I didn't use your three-item selection.
- B.** That's the evidence bundle I need. I'll return the result under those conditions, not another unqualified cannot-reproduce label.
- C.** Agreed. Keep the scope of evidence bounded: one-item success, this three-item failure, other sizes unknown. Those facts can coexist.
- D.** That distinguishes the actual output from a total failure. We need the precise omission, not just export broken.

[Answers and explanations, page 113](#)

One useful distinction

Two out of two describes Hana's observed attempts with the saved three-item selection on Q12. It is not a universal failure rate for every input, every session, or every build.

Conversation

Three selected, two exported, twice

Three selected, two exported, twice

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

build identifier / cannot reproduce / actual output / defect report / reproduction run / denominator / scope of evidence / minimal reproduction / input parity / evidence bundle

- 01 **Hana:** Q12 exported only two of my three selected items. The last selected item is missing, and I got the same omission in both attempts.
- 02 **Joel:** My one-item export worked, so I marked it ¹ _____. I should qualify that: I didn't use your three-item selection.
- 03 **Hana:** Exactly. I'm reporting this saved selection on Q12, not claiming that every export fails. Other builds and sizes haven't been checked.
- 04 **Joel:** Let's establish ² _____. Send the saved selection so I can repeat your input, not just pick three different items.
- 05 **Hana:** I'll attach the output alongside it. The export isn't empty; comparing selected and exported items shows which one disappeared.
- 06 **Joel:** That distinguishes the ³ _____ from a total failure. We need the precise omission, not just export broken.
- 07 **Hana:** For frequency, I'm writing two out of two attempts. Always would make it sound as though I'd tested a much larger set.
- 08 **Joel:** Include the ⁴ _____ with the conditions. Two repeats support your report, but not a failure rate across every possible export.
- 09 **Hana:** The second attempt used the same build and selection and lost the same final item. I haven't changed any code or checked a fix.
- 10 **Joel:** Call that a ⁵ _____ of the failure. It is not confirmation testing of a repaired version, because no repair has been tested.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Three selected, two exported, twice

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Hana:** I suspect a loop boundary, but I don't have internal evidence. Should I leave that theory out of the title?
- 12 **Joel:** Yes. A useful ⁶ _____ doesn't require guessing the cause. Keep the observed behavior in the title and any hypothesis explicitly provisional.
- 13 **Hana:** I'll put Q12 first, then the saved input, export action, and item comparison. That should make the starting conditions clear.
- 14 **Joel:** Good. The ⁷ _____ matters. A result from another version belongs in the record with that difference, not as an identical repeat.
- 15 **Hana:** Your one-item pass should stay too. It doesn't erase my failure, but neither should we erase a genuine successful case.
- 16 **Joel:** Agreed. Keep the ⁸ _____ bounded: one-item success, this three-item failure, other sizes unknown. Those facts can coexist.
- 17 **Hana:** If you reduce the input and the same omission remains, record that smaller case. We don't yet know the smallest failing selection.
- 18 **Joel:** That would establish a ⁹ _____. I'll start with the known saved selection before trying to remove anything from it.
- 19 **Hana:** My handoff will include both observations and the exact reproducer, with two attempts out of two and untested conditions listed.
- 20 **Joel:** That's the ¹⁰ _____ I need. I'll return the result under those conditions, not another unqualified cannot-reproduce label.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. cannot reproduce / 2. input parity / 3. actual output / 4. denominator / 5. reproduction run / 6. defect report / 7. build identifier / 8. scope of evidence / 9. minimal reproduction / 10. evidence bundle

[Why these answers fit, page 114](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

Three selected, two exported, twice

Return to the case

On fictional build Q12, tester Hana exports a saved selection of three items. The output omits the last selected item. She observes the omission in two attempts out of two. Developer Joel exports one item successfully. No other build or selection size has been checked. They compare conditions and prepare a handoff using the saved three-item selection, the export action, and the observed output without claiming every export fails.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which next attempt is most directly relevant?

- A. Use an unrelated build and ten new items
- B. Change all settings at once
- C. Repeat only the one-item test
- D. Use Q12 and the same saved three-item selection

2. Which claim is unsupported?

- A. Other builds are unchecked
- B. Every selection size is affected
- C. The last item was omitted twice
- D. Joel's one-item attempt succeeded

[Answers and explanations, page 116](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 3-10. Keep different input separate from a reproduction of the reported failure.

Different results may come from different conditions

Cannot reproduce can sound like dismissal if the input is not compared. State the successful attempt accurately, then ask for the reported fixture. A bounded reproduction frequency is more useful than always or sometimes without a denominator.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Report a bounded reproduction

Complete the report using only the observed build, input, output, and frequency.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

Q12 / last / two / three

- 01 **Tester:** The tested build is ¹ _____.
- 02 **Developer:** The saved selection contains ² _____ items.
- 03 **Tester:** The ³ _____ selected item is omitted.
- 04 **Developer:** The omission occurred in ⁴ _____ attempts out of two.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. Q12 / 2. three / 3. last / 4. two

[Why these answers fit, page 116](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "I'll put Q12 first, then the saved input, export action, and item comparison. That should make the starting conditions clear." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "Your one-item pass should stay too. It doesn't erase my failure, but neither should we erase a genuine successful case." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** My one-item export worked, so I marked it cannot reproduce. I should qualify that: I didn't use your three-item selection.
- B.** Good. The build identifier matters. A result from another version belongs in the record with that difference, not as an identical repeat.
- C.** Yes. A useful defect report doesn't require guessing the cause. Keep the observed behavior in the title and any hypothesis explicitly provisional.
- D.** Call that a reproduction run of the failure. It is not confirmation testing of a repaired version, because no repair has been tested.

[Answers and explanations, page 117](#)

Review 1 / Meaning and context

Use language from the lessons you have completed. Choose one answer per question.

Case file

Revisit "Agreeing the expected result" and "Making a failure reproducible". Choose precise terminology, then reconstruct the missing responses using both neighboring turns. The final two questions also revisit earlier conversations.

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Outcome observed when the test is executed. Which term fits?

- A. Boolean condition
- B. actual result
- C. equality case
- D. postcondition

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Absence of something that should be included. Which term fits?

- A. scope of evidence
- B. mutation testing
- C. omission
- D. defect report

3. Rebuild the exchange from "Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?". Maya: "Could I copy what the application currently does into the expected result? It would finish the script, but wouldn't show whether the behavior is intended." Dev: [missing response] Maya: "Once the outcome is agreed, I'll record it and correct the conflicting example. A note saying clarified without the actual rule won't be enough." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A. Show me the equality case you are comparing. I want to separate that exact endpoint from any other timing question before we decide what the rule should mean.
- B. That would not establish the test oracle. We need the intended rule first, otherwise the test can repeat an existing mistake and still appear to pass.
- C. That keeps the scope boundary clear. We should not introduce a separate timing policy into this discussion and then mistake that for resolving the original conflict.
- D. Yes. The decision record should state the endpoint behavior explicitly. A vague note saying clarified would leave the same interpretation problem for the next tester.

Review 1 / Meaning and context / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "If you reduce the input and the same omission remains, record that smaller case. We don't yet know the smallest failing selection." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "My handoff will include both observations and the exact reproducer, with two attempts out of two and untested conditions listed." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Let's establish input parity. Send the saved selection so I can repeat your input, not just pick three different items.
- B.** My one-item export worked, so I marked it cannot reproduce. I should qualify that: I didn't use your three-item selection.
- C.** Include the denominator with the conditions. Two repeats support your report, but not a failure rate across every possible export.
- D.** That would establish a minimal reproduction. I'll start with the known saved selection before trying to remove anything from it.

[Answers and explanations, page 148](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 03 / CHOOSING CASES AT BOUNDARIES AND ACROSS RULES

Explain missing boundary and rejection coverage while keeping unspecified decimal behavior separate from the whole-number rule.

Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits

A fictional quantity form accepts whole numbers from 1 through 20 inclusive and rejects whole-number values outside that range. The proposed tests use only 5, 10, and 15. Tester Rosa and developer Amir review the gap. They propose boundary-focused values 0, 1, 2, 19, 20, and 21. Decimal handling is unspecified and outside the stated whole-number rule. The new tests are proposed, not executed results.

People: Rosa, Tester reviewing case selection; Amir, Developer discussing the rule.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. Which whole-number values are accepted by the rule?

- A. 0 through 20 inclusive
- B. 1 through 19 only
- C. Every positive number
- D. 1 through 20 inclusive

2. What is missing from 5, 10, and 15?

- A. A confirmed decimal policy
- B. Endpoint and outside-range checks
- C. All accepted values
- D. The existence of a quantity field

3. What is known about decimals?

- A. They are rounded automatically
- B. Handling is unspecified
- C. They are all accepted
- D. They are all rejected under an explicit rule

[Answers and explanations, page 118](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

boundary value

Input at an edge where a rule changes.

select a boundary value

equivalence partition

Group of inputs expected to follow the same relevant rule.

identify an equivalence partition

invalid partition

Input group rejected under the specified rule.

cover an invalid partition

upper bound

Largest value within a defined range.

check the upper bound

whole number

Number without a fractional part in the stated quantity context.

enter a whole number

interior value

Input strictly between the relevant endpoints.

distinguish an interior value

boundary value analysis

Test design concentrating on rule edges and nearby values.

apply boundary value analysis

valid partition

Input group accepted under the specified rule.

sample the valid partition

lower bound

Smallest value within a defined range.

check the lower bound

inclusive range

Range containing both stated endpoints.

specify an inclusive range

adjacent value

Nearest relevant value beside a boundary.

test the adjacent value

off-by-one error

Mistake that shifts a count or boundary by one unit.

detect an off-by-one error

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

boundary value BOUNDARY VALUE

select a boundary value

Keep the meaning precise: Input at an edge where a rule changes.

lower bound LOWER BOUND

check the lower bound

Keep the meaning precise: Smallest value within a defined range.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

acceptance region

Set of inputs the stated rule accepts.
define the acceptance region

input domain

Set of inputs relevant to the defined problem.
state the input domain

validation message

User-facing message explaining an input condition.
check the validation message

case selection

Choice of checks to cover relevant behavior.
explain case selection

decision rule

Condition-to-outcome relationship.
map the decision rule

out-of-range value

Input below or above the accepted range.
reject an out-of-range value

rejection region

Set of inputs the stated rule rejects.
cover the rejection region

decimal input

Input containing a fractional numeric value.
clarify decimal input

test case

Defined input, action, and expected outcome for a check.
specify the test case

coverage item

Rule, value, or condition counted in a coverage assessment.
identify the coverage item

decision table

Organized mapping of condition combinations to outcomes.
build a decision table

unspecified behavior

Behavior for which no governing rule is supplied.
flag unspecified behavior

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

off-by-one error OFF-BY-ONE ERROR

detect an off-by-one error

Keep the meaning precise: Mistake that shifts a count or boundary by one unit.

validation message VALIDATION MESSAGE

check the validation message

Keep the meaning precise: User-facing message explaining an input condition.

Phrases that move the work forward

State the domain

The rule concerns whole-number quantities.

Describe existing cases

Five, ten, and fifteen are interior values.

Name the value below

Zero should be rejected.

Name the value above

Twenty-one should be rejected.

Explain the gap

The current set never reaches either boundary.

Avoid a result claim

These are expected outcomes, not completed test results.

Avoid inventing rounding

We have no agreed rounding rule.

Keep coverage honest

Boundary cases improve coverage but do not prove the form defect-free.

State the range

One through twenty are accepted, including both endpoints.

Name the lower endpoint

One should be accepted.

Name the upper endpoint

Twenty should be accepted.

Add inside neighbors

Two and nineteen check just inside the limits.

Connect case and rule

Each added value tests a specific edge condition.

Separate decimals

Decimal handling is not specified.

Request clarification

Ask for the decimal policy separately.

Close the proposal

Add the six boundary-focused cases and retain their expected outcomes.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: Name the lower endpoint

Useful wording: One should be accepted.

Purpose: Name the value below

Useful wording: Zero should be rejected.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which six-value set checks both endpoints and their immediate neighbors?

- A.** 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15
- B.** 1, 5, 10, 15, 18, 19
- C.** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- D.** 0, 1, 2, 19, 20, 21

2. Which expected result is correct?

- A.** Accept both 0 and 21
- B.** Reject every interior value
- C.** Accept 20 and reject 21
- D.** Reject 20 and accept 21

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Input group accepted under the specified rule. Which term fits?

- A.** valid partition
- B.** decision rule
- C.** input domain
- D.** whole number

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits". Rosa: "I propose zero, one, two, nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one. That includes each endpoint and the nearest relevant value on either side." Amir: [missing response] Rosa: "Two and nineteen are accepted, but they test just inside the edges. I'll explain that role rather than describe the extra values as more coverage without details." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** The adjacent value matters because a comparison can be wrong by one. Checking only five would not expose an error that rejects one but accepts the rest.
- B.** That gives us an invalid partition on either side. The existing tests only sample the accepted middle and tell us nothing about either rejection region.
- C.** Yes. A decision table can organize those outcomes. Mark decimal behavior as unspecified rather than folding it into a rejection rule that was never agreed.
- D.** You mean the boundary value cases at one and twenty. The requirement says both endpoints are included, so those exact values should be accepted.

[Answers and explanations, page 118](#)

One useful distinction

One and twenty are accepted endpoints. Zero and twenty-one are adjacent rejected whole-number values. Two and nineteen check just inside the range. The existing five, ten, and fifteen do not test these edges.

E Conversation

Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits

Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

boundary value / inclusive range / coverage / boundary value analysis / invalid partition
/ Case selection / decision table / expected result / decimal input / adjacent value

- 01 **Rosa:** The quantity tests use five, ten, and fifteen. All sit inside the accepted range, so none reaches the point where the rule changes.
- 02 **Amir:** You mean the ¹ _____ cases at one and twenty. The requirement says both endpoints are included, so those exact values should be accepted.
- 03 **Rosa:** The nearest rejected whole-number values are zero and twenty-one. They check both sides of the accepted one-through-twenty range.
- 04 **Amir:** That gives us an ² _____ on either side. The existing tests only sample the accepted middle and tell us nothing about either rejection region.
- 05 **Rosa:** I propose zero, one, two, nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one. That includes each endpoint and the nearest relevant value on either side.
- 06 **Amir:** The ³ _____ matters because a comparison can be wrong by one. Checking only five would not expose an error that rejects one but accepts the rest.
- 07 **Rosa:** Two and nineteen are accepted, but they test just inside the edges. I'll explain that role rather than describe the extra values as more coverage without details.
- 08 **Amir:** That is a clear use of ⁴ _____. Connect each proposed input to its expected result and the edge condition it helps examine.
- 09 **Rosa:** At the lower edge, zero should reject and one and two should accept. Those are expectations; the new cases haven't run.
- 10 **Amir:** Keep that ⁵ _____ language. Saying should be accepted follows the requirement; saying passed would falsely imply an observation we do not have.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Rosa:** At the upper edge, nineteen and twenty should accept, twenty-one should reject. Inclusive means we must not reject twenty itself.
- 12 **Amir:** Exactly. An ⁶ _____ includes the endpoints themselves. We should not quietly turn twenty into the first rejected value.
- 13 **Rosa:** What about one point five? The stated rule covers whole-number quantities, and we haven't been given a fractional-input policy.
- 14 **Amir:** Then ⁷ _____ needs a separate clarification. We should not invent rounding, truncation, acceptance, or rejection and present it as an existing requirement.
- 15 **Rosa:** I'll map below one, one through twenty, and above twenty to their outcomes, with decimal handling visibly unresolved rather than silently added to reject.
- 16 **Amir:** Yes. A ⁸ _____ can organize those outcomes. Mark decimal behavior as unspecified rather than folding it into a rejection rule that was never agreed.
- 17 **Rosa:** We can retain useful interior cases, but their count won't establish edge coverage. Three central examples still miss both endpoints.
- 18 **Amir:** Correct. ⁹ _____ is about the conditions exercised, not simply having several numbers in a list. The current values all occupy the interior.
- 19 **Rosa:** I'll submit the six cases and expected outcomes as a proposal, not a pass report. The separate decimal question remains open.
- 20 **Amir:** That is accurate ¹⁰ _____ language. It improves the design while keeping both execution status and the missing decimal rule visible to the team.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. boundary value / 2. invalid partition / 3. adjacent value / 4. boundary value analysis / 5. expected result / 6. inclusive range / 7. decimal input / 8. decision table / 9. Case selection / 10. coverage

[Why these answers fit, page 119](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits

Return to the case

A fictional quantity form accepts whole numbers from 1 through 20 inclusive and rejects whole-number values outside that range. The proposed tests use only 5, 10, and 15. Tester Rosa and developer Amir review the gap. They propose boundary-focused values 0, 1, 2, 19, 20, and 21. Decimal handling is unspecified and outside the stated whole-number rule. The new tests are proposed, not executed results.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which decimal statement is justified?

- A. Decimals are already tested
- B. The rule requires clarification for decimals
- C. All decimals round down
- D. Every decimal is explicitly rejected

2. Which coverage claim is appropriate?

- A. The proposed set addresses the missing edges but has not been executed
- B. All possible defects are eliminated
- C. Three interior checks prove both bounds
- D. The new cases have already passed

[Answers and explanations, page 121](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 9-16. Stress should accept rather than passed, and keep decimal handling unresolved.

Explain why a case matters

Adding more inputs is less persuasive than connecting each input to a rule. Name the accepted endpoint, its nearby accepted neighbor, and the adjacent rejected value. Keep a missing decimal rule visible without silently expanding the product specification.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Read the limits literally

Complete the expected-result exchange. These expectations come from the stated rule, not from completed test runs.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

unspecified / 21 / 1 / 20

- 01 **Tester:** The accepted lower endpoint is ¹ _____.
- 02 **Developer:** The accepted upper endpoint is ² _____.
- 03 **Tester:** The whole number immediately above the range is ³ _____.
- 04 **Developer:** Decimal handling remains ⁴ _____.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. 1 / 2. 20 / 3. 21 / 4. unspecified

[Why these answers fit, page 121](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits". Rosa: "What about one point five? The stated rule covers whole-number quantities, and we haven't been given a fractional-input policy." Amir: [missing response] Rosa: "I'll map below one, one through twenty, and above twenty to their outcomes, with decimal handling visibly unresolved rather than silently added to reject." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** That is accurate coverage language. It improves the design while keeping both execution status and the missing decimal rule visible to the team.
- B.** Then decimal input needs a separate clarification. We should not invent rounding, truncation, acceptance, or rejection and present it as an existing requirement.
- C.** Correct. Case selection is about the conditions exercised, not simply having several numbers in a list. The current values all occupy the interior.
- D.** Keep that expected result language. Saying should be accepted follows the requirement; saying passed would falsely imply an observation we do not have.

[Answers and explanations, page 122](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 04 / EXPLAINING COVERAGE AND CHANGE RISK

Explain limited smoke-test evidence and justify focused follow-up on both consumers of a changed formatter.

The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked

A fictional account update passes a smoke test that signs in and opens the account page. The update changes a formatter used by account-save and by the existing export path. Neither of those paths has been tested. Tester Elena and team lead Sam have one hour for further checking. They need to prioritize evidence around the shared change without claiming full coverage or assuming the existing export path is unaffected.

People: Elena, Tester; Sam, Team lead.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. What did the smoke test cover?

- A. All regression checks
- B. Sign-in and opening the account page
- C. Account-save and export
- D. Every formatter consumer

2. Which paths use the changed formatter?

- A. Account-save and existing export
- B. Sign-in only
- C. Export only
- D. No existing behavior

3. How much time remains?

- A. Two completed test cycles
- B. One hour
- C. A full week
- D. No time limit

[Answers and explanations, page 123](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

smoke test

Small check set used to detect major basic failures.

pass the smoke test

change impact

Potential effect of a modification on related behavior.

assess change impact

formatter

Component converting values into a required representation.

trace formatter usage

account-save path

Route that persists an account update.

exercise the account-save path

coverage gap

Relevant behavior not yet checked.

report the coverage gap

test priority

Relative order or urgency assigned to checks.

set test priority

regression testing

Checking existing behavior for problems introduced by change.

prioritize regression testing

shared component

Component used by more than one path or feature.

identify the shared component

consumer path

Execution route using a shared component.

test the consumer path

export path

Route producing output for external use.

check the export path

risk-based testing

Selection of tests according to relevant likelihood and impact concerns.

propose risk-based testing

timebox

Fixed amount of time allocated to work.

use a one-hour timebox

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

smoke test SMOKE TEST

pass the smoke test

Keep the meaning precise: Small check set used to detect major basic failures.

consumer path CONSUMER PATH

test the consumer path

Keep the meaning precise: Execution route using a shared component.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

residual risk

Risk remaining after the checks or controls performed.

disclose residual risk

execution evidence

Record of checks actually run and their results.

distinguish execution evidence

dependency mapping

Identification of relationships between components and consumers.

use dependency mapping

test objective

Purpose a particular check is meant to serve.

define the test objective

coverage claim

Statement about what the tests have exercised.

limit the coverage claim

branch coverage

Proportion of defined control-flow branches exercised by tests.

report branch coverage

test scope

Behavior and conditions included in the checking effort.

state the test scope

untested path

Execution route with no relevant test result yet.

identify an untested path

functional impact

Effect on what users or systems can do.

assess functional impact

selection rationale

Reason for choosing particular checks.

explain the selection rationale

test summary

Concise account of scope, results, and limits.

write the test summary

release recommendation

Evidence-based advice about proceeding with a release.

qualify a release recommendation

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

timebox TIMEBOX

use a one-hour timebox

Keep the meaning precise: Fixed amount of time allocated to work.

dependency mapping DEPENDENCY MAPPING

use dependency mapping

Keep the meaning precise: Identification of relationships between components and consumers.

Phrases that move the work forward

State the narrow success

Sign-in and opening the account page passed.

Identify both consumers

Account-save and export use that formatter.

Challenge the label

An account update can still affect export.

Name the time limit

We have one hour for further checking.

Request a clear objective

Check the formatted result in each consumer path.

Preserve the unknown

Export behavior after this change remains unverified.

Report unfinished work

Keep any untested path visible.

Name remaining exposure

There will still be residual risk.

Name the change

The shared formatter changed.

Expose the gap

Neither consumer path has been tested.

Explain the priority

I would focus the next checks on the changed component's consumers.

Keep a proposal provisional

Those checks are planned, not completed.

Avoid claiming total coverage

A smoke pass is not full regression coverage.

Report actual execution

List which checks ran and their results.

Separate evidence and advice

The summary can support a recommendation without proving every risk absent.

Close with a bounded plan

Prioritize both affected paths and report the limits of the hour's work.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: Expose the gap

Useful wording: Neither consumer path has been tested.

Purpose: Challenge the label

Useful wording: An account update can still affect export.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which summary is accurate?

- A.** The formatter is fully verified
- B.** Smoke passed for sign-in and page opening; save and export remain untested
- C.** All account behavior passed
- D.** Export is unaffected because it is old

2. Why include export in follow-up?

- A.** Every old feature must be rewritten
- B.** The smoke test already failed export
- C.** Export is the only account feature
- D.** It uses the changed formatter

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Component used by more than one path or feature. Which term fits?

- A.** execution evidence
- B.** coverage gap
- C.** coverage claim
- D.** shared component

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "Opening the page doesn't compare the formatted saved value. It also doesn't generate an export whose contents we can check." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "We have one hour. I'd focus on each consumer's output, with an explicit expected representation, before spending time on unrelated screens." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Agreed. What changed that makes those the next checks? The smoke test itself tells us only about those basic actions.
- B.** Keep execution evidence separate from intention. A planned check doesn't become passed because we expect it to be straightforward.
- C.** That's the coverage gap. We have basic access evidence, not results for the two consumers of the changed formatter.
- D.** That is a defensible selection rationale. Explain which changed behavior the checks target rather than just promising more test cases.

[Answers and explanations, page 123](#)

One useful distinction

Opening the account page does not establish correct account-save formatting, and it does not exercise export. Both use the changed formatter. Existing behavior can need regression checking even when the visible update is described as an account change.

Conversation

The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked

The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

selection rationale / residual risk / execution evidence / coverage gap / test summary /
change impact / shared component / test objective / timebox / smoke test

- 01 **Elena:** Sign-in and opening the account page passed. I don't want that smoke result reported as account-save or export tested; neither path ran.
- 02 **Sam:** Agreed. What changed that makes those the next checks? The ¹ _____ itself tells us only about those basic actions.
- 03 **Elena:** The update changes a formatter used by both save and export. The account label on the change doesn't remove export from its impact.
- 04 **Sam:** Then the ² _____ gives us a concrete reason to include both. Existing export behavior can regress when its dependency changes.
- 05 **Elena:** Opening the page doesn't compare the formatted saved value. It also doesn't generate an export whose contents we can check.
- 06 **Sam:** That's the ³ _____. We have basic access evidence, not results for the two consumers of the changed formatter.
- 07 **Elena:** We have one hour. I'd focus on each consumer's output, with an explicit expected representation, before spending time on unrelated screens.
- 08 **Sam:** That is a defensible ⁴ _____. Explain which changed behavior the checks target rather than just promising more test cases.
- 09 **Elena:** I can't promise full regression coverage in that hour. I'll keep the uncompleted checks visible if the time runs out.
- 10 **Sam:** Right. The ⁵ _____ constrains the work; it doesn't redefine a short check set as full coverage.

Conversation continues on the next page.

The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Elena:** For export, the rationale is the shared formatter, not evidence that it already fails. I don't have a failure probability to attach.
- 12 **Sam:** State the ⁶ _____ relationship without inventing one. A relevant dependency is enough to justify investigating that path.
- 13 **Elena:** Both proposed checks are still planned. I'll update their statuses only after execution gives us actual results.
- 14 **Sam:** Keep ⁷ _____ separate from intention. A planned check doesn't become passed because we expect it to be straightforward.
- 15 **Elena:** If only one consumer finishes, I'll identify which one and its result. I won't combine it with the other under formatter verified.
- 16 **Sam:** That preserves the ⁸ _____. Readers need to know what remains unchecked as well as what the completed case showed.
- 17 **Elena:** I'll also check the content, not merely that Save or Export can be clicked. Otherwise we'd repeat the smoke-test limitation.
- 18 **Sam:** Exactly. The ⁹ _____ is the changed formatting behavior in each path. Make the assertion answer that question.
- 19 **Elena:** Current update: narrow smoke pass, save and export untested, shared formatter changed, one hour available, focused follow-up proposed.
- 20 **Sam:** That's an accurate ¹⁰ _____. The subsequent evidence can inform a recommendation without implying that every risk or release question is settled.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. smoke test / 2. shared component / 3. coverage gap / 4. selection rationale / 5. timebox / 6. change impact / 7. execution evidence / 8. residual risk / 9. test objective / 10. test summary

[Why these answers fit, page 124](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked

Return to the case

A fictional account update passes a smoke test that signs in and opens the account page. The update changes a formatter used by account-save and by the existing export path. Neither of those paths has been tested. Tester Elena and team lead Sam have one hour for further checking. They need to prioritize evidence around the shared change without claiming full coverage or assuming the existing export path is unaffected.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. What does one hour justify?

- A. Ignoring all shared consumers
- B. Prioritized checks with disclosed gaps
- C. A full-coverage claim without execution
- D. Automatic release approval

2. Which statement confuses plan and evidence?

- A. Both paths passed because we intend to check them
- B. Both paths need checking
- C. The current smoke scope is narrow
- D. One hour remains for further work

[Answers and explanations, page 126](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 7-14. Keep the one-hour plan separate from completed execution evidence.

Replace tested with named paths

A short status such as smoke passed can be useful if everyone knows its limits. Name what ran, then connect the changed component to its consumers. A time limit calls for explicit priorities and residual risk, not a larger claim about the same narrow evidence.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Keep scope, change, and time together

Complete the testing update before the proposed follow-up checks have run.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

tested / formatter / hour / smoke

- 01 **Tester:** The ¹ _____ test covered sign-in and opening the page.
- 02 **Lead:** Both paths use the changed ² _____.
- 03 **Tester:** Neither account-save nor export has been ³ _____.
- 04 **Lead:** We have one ⁴ _____ for further checking.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. smoke / 2. formatter / 3. tested / 4. hour

[Why these answers fit, page 126](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "Both proposed checks are still planned. I'll update their statuses only after execution gives us actual results." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "If only one consumer finishes, I'll identify which one and its result. I won't combine it with the other under formatter verified." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A. That's the coverage gap. We have basic access evidence, not results for the two consumers of the changed formatter.
- B. That is a defensible selection rationale. Explain which changed behavior the checks target rather than just promising more test cases.
- C. Agreed. What changed that makes those the next checks? The smoke test itself tells us only about those basic actions.
- D. Keep execution evidence separate from intention. A planned check doesn't become passed because we expect it to be straightforward.

[Answers and explanations, page 127](#)

Review 2 / Meaning and context

Use language from the lessons you have completed. Choose one answer per question.

Case file

Revisit "Choosing cases at boundaries and across rules" and "Explaining coverage and change risk". Choose precise terminology, then reconstruct the missing responses using both neighboring turns. The final two questions also revisit earlier conversations.

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Group of inputs expected to follow the same relevant rule. Which term fits?

- A. coverage item
- B. equivalence partition
- C. rejection region
- D. inclusive range

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Route producing output for external use. Which term fits?

- A. residual risk
- B. smoke test
- C. test objective
- D. export path

3. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "The second attempt used the same build and selection and lost the same final item. I haven't changed any code or checked a fix." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "I suspect a loop boundary, but I don't have internal evidence. Should I leave that theory out of the title?" Which response belongs in the gap?

- A. Call that a reproduction run of the failure. It is not confirmation testing of a repaired version, because no repair has been tested.
- B. Good. The build identifier matters. A result from another version belongs in the record with that difference, not as an identical repeat.
- C. Yes. A useful defect report doesn't require guessing the cause. Keep the observed behavior in the title and any hypothesis explicitly provisional.
- D. My one-item export worked, so I marked it cannot reproduce. I should qualify that: I didn't use your three-item selection.

Review 2 / Meaning and context / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "I'll also check the content, not merely that Save or Export can be clicked. Otherwise we'd repeat the smoke-test limitation." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "Current update: narrow smoke pass, save and export untested, shared formatter changed, one hour available, focused follow-up proposed." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** State the change impact relationship without inventing one. A relevant dependency is enough to justify investigating that path.
- B.** Exactly. The test objective is the changed formatting behavior in each path. Make the assertion answer that question.
- C.** Keep execution evidence separate from intention. A planned check doesn't become passed because we expect it to be straightforward.
- D.** That's the coverage gap. We have basic access evidence, not results for the two consumers of the changed formatter.

[Answers and explanations, page 151](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 05 / INVESTIGATING INCONSISTENT AUTOMATED RESULTS

Describe an order-dependent automated failure and request isolated test data instead of treating reruns as a fix.

Cleanup deletes what search expects

On fictional build T8, an automated search check fails when it follows a cleanup check but passes when run alone. The cleanup removes a shared sample record that search expects. No code change occurs between these observations. Automation engineer Noah and tester Aisha compare the starting state and execution order. They need to remove the shared-data interference and verify the revised arrangement rather than simply rerun until the suite appears green.

People: Noah, Automation engineer; Aisha, Tester.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. When does the search check fail?

- A. On every build
- B. After the cleanup check
- C. Whenever run alone
- D. Only after a code change

2. What does cleanup remove?

- A. The T8 build
- B. A confirmed unrelated log only
- C. The shared sample record search expects
- D. All test source code

3. What changes between the observations?

- A. Every environment setting
- B. Order and relevant starting state, not code
- C. The code is confirmed rewritten
- D. The search requirement disappears

[Answers and explanations, page 128](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

flaky test

Test showing inconsistent outcomes under apparently similar conditions.

investigate a flaky test

shared fixture

Prepared data or state used by multiple checks.

isolate a shared fixture

teardown

Work restoring or removing state after a test.

review teardown

test isolation

Independence of a test from other tests' state changes.

restore test isolation

sample record

Prepared data item used for testing.

preserve the sample record

execution order

Sequence in which checks run.

record execution order

order dependency

Dependence of a result on the sequence of test execution.

expose an order dependency

setup

Preparation establishing a test's starting conditions.

verify setup

cleanup

Removal of data or resources no longer needed by a check.

limit cleanup scope

state leakage

Unintended influence of one test's state on another.

detect state leakage

precondition

Required state before a check starts.

establish the precondition

standalone run

Execution of a check without the surrounding suite.

compare a standalone run

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

flaky test FLAKY TEST

investigate a flaky test

Keep the meaning precise: Test showing inconsistent outcomes under apparently similar conditions.

cleanup CLEANUP

limit cleanup scope

Keep the meaning precise: Removal of data or resources no longer needed by a check.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

suite run

Execution of a group of related checks.

inspect the suite run

false alarm

Failure signal not caused by the claimed product defect.

investigate a false alarm

test data ownership

Responsibility for creating and removing test records.

define test data ownership

deterministic setup

Preparation that establishes predictable required conditions.

create deterministic setup

interference

Effect of one check on another's operation.

remove test interference

continuous integration

Frequent integration with automated checking; abbreviated CI.

investigate the CI result

rerun

Another execution of an existing check.

qualify a rerun result

failure evidence

Records supporting an observed unsuccessful result.

retain failure evidence

unique test data

Data assigned specifically to one test or execution.

use unique test data

environment state

Relevant current conditions in the test setting.

compare environment state

quarantine

Temporary separation of an unreliable check under a defined policy.

review quarantine status

verification run

Execution used to check whether a proposed correction works.

perform a verification run

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

standalone run STANDALONE RUN

compare a standalone run

Keep the meaning precise: Execution of a check without the surrounding suite.

test data ownership TEST DATA OWNERSHIP

define test data ownership

Keep the meaning precise: Responsibility for creating and removing test records.

Phrases that move the work forward

Identify the build

Both observations are on T8.

Report the comparison

Search passes when run alone.

Name the shared dependency

Both checks depend on the sample record's state.

Avoid calling it random

The observed pattern is order-dependent.

Separate rerun and repair

A passing rerun does not fix isolation.

Propose isolation

Give the checks independent data or a defined setup.

Avoid suppressing the symptom

Do not remove the assertion merely to get green.

Limit the conclusion

The standalone pass does not prove the suite is reliable.

Report the failing order

Search fails after cleanup.

Preserve the code fact

No code changed between those observations.

Explain cleanup's effect

Cleanup removes the record search expects.

Request the starting state

Was the required record present when search began?

Request ownership

Which check creates and removes this record?

Preserve the evidence

Keep the failed sequence and logs.

Request verification

Check the revised arrangement in the relevant sequence.

Close with the cause of interference

Resolve shared-data ownership and verify the resulting behavior.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: Preserve the code fact

Useful wording: No code changed between those observations.

Purpose: Name the shared dependency

Useful wording: Both checks depend on the sample record's state.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which explanation matches the evidence?

- A.** The code changes between every run
- B.** Search never passes
- C.** Every failure is random
- D.** Cleanup removes data needed by the later search check

2. What comparison most directly tests the reported interference?

- A.** Pass percentages with execution order omitted
- B.** Record presence before search alone and after cleanup on T8
- C.** Only search duration in two unrelated runs
- D.** Q12 export output versus T8 search output

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Preparation establishing a test's starting conditions. Which term fits?

- A.** sample record
- B.** false alarm
- C.** setup
- D.** interference

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Cleanup deletes what search expects". Noah: "A standalone rerun could turn the report green without fixing the sequence that lost the record. It would hide what we need to investigate." Aisha: [missing response] Noah: "We need to decide who creates and removes the sample. Right now cleanup assumes ownership of something search treats as available." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Exactly. A rerun is another observation, not a repair. Keep its changed context visible instead of replacing the failure with it.
- B.** That names the environment state precisely. We can investigate the actual dependency instead of calling the result random and moving on.
- C.** Good. That failure evidence shows why the shared state matters. Deleting it would remove the most useful reproduction conditions.
- D.** Those address test isolation. Choose and review the arrangement, then verify it; proposing separation isn't evidence that the suite is repaired.

[Answers and explanations, page 128](#)

One useful distinction

The search result differs with test order because cleanup removes its expected sample record. No code change is needed for this interference to matter. Compare the starting state, not just the build identifier.

E Conversation

Cleanup deletes what search expects

Cleanup deletes what search expects

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

execution order / test isolation / verification run / rerun / test data ownership /
order dependency / failure evidence / precondition / environment state / interference

- 01 **Noah:** Search fails after cleanup on T8 but passes alone. I was about to enable reruns, though no code changed between these results.
- 02 **Aisha:** Before doing that, compare the ¹ _____. What does cleanup remove that the isolated search run still has?
- 03 **Noah:** The shared sample record. Search expects it, and cleanup deletes it. The build matches, but the data at the start doesn't.
- 04 **Aisha:** That explains an ² _____. An identical build doesn't make the starting conditions identical.
- 05 **Noah:** A standalone rerun could turn the report green without fixing the sequence that lost the record. It would hide what we need to investigate.
- 06 **Aisha:** Exactly. A ³ _____ is another observation, not a repair. Keep its changed context visible instead of replacing the failure with it.
- 07 **Noah:** We need to decide who creates and removes the sample. Right now cleanup assumes ownership of something search treats as available.
- 08 **Aisha:** Make ⁴ _____ explicit. Otherwise a different execution order can expose the same problem again.
- 09 **Noah:** We could give each check its own records, or establish the required state explicitly without depending on another check's leftovers.
- 10 **Aisha:** Those address ⁵ _____. Choose and review the arrangement, then verify it; proposing separation isn't evidence that the suite is repaired.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Cleanup deletes what search expects

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Noah:** I'll retain the failing order and logs. The successful isolated run belongs beside them as a comparison, not as a replacement.
- 12 **Aisha:** Good. That ⁶ _____ shows why the shared state matters. Deleting it would remove the most useful reproduction conditions.
- 13 **Noah:** The record's presence is required before the search assertion can mean anything. We shouldn't leave that hidden in the environment.
- 14 **Aisha:** Establish the ⁷ _____ in setup. A missing fixture and an application search defect are different problems to report.
- 15 **Noah:** Cleanup also needs narrower ownership checks. A broad delete based on a shared label could still remove another test's record.
- 16 **Aisha:** That's the ⁸ _____ to remove. Keep the useful search assertion rather than weakening it until the suite looks green.
- 17 **Noah:** After the revision, I'll run cleanup then search, as well as search alone, and capture the starting data and actual results.
- 18 **Aisha:** The ⁹ _____ needs that original sequence. A standalone pass alone would leave the reported interaction unverified.
- 19 **Noah:** My handoff will show T8, unchanged code, deletion of the expected record, and the two observed outcomes. The revised arrangement is not yet verified.
- 20 **Aisha:** That names the ¹⁰ _____ precisely. We can investigate the actual dependency instead of calling the result random and moving on.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. execution order / 2. order dependency / 3. rerun / 4. test data ownership / 5. test isolation / 6. failure evidence / 7. precondition / 8. interference / 9. verification run / 10. environment state

[Why these answers fit, page 129](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

Cleanup deletes what search expects

Return to the case

On fictional build T8, an automated search check fails when it follows a cleanup check but passes when run alone. The cleanup removes a shared sample record that search expects. No code change occurs between these observations. Automation engineer Noah and tester Aisha compare the starting state and execution order. They need to remove the shared-data interference and verify the revised arrangement rather than simply rerun until the suite appears green.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which action is not a demonstrated fix?

- A. Verify required setup
- B. Rerun alone until the check passes
- C. Define independent test data
- D. Review cleanup scope

2. What should verification include?

- A. The relevant sequence after the data arrangement is corrected
- B. Only deleting the failing assertion
- C. A claim that no tests need data
- D. An unchanged summary saying always passes

[Answers and explanations, page 131](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 7-16. Stress ownership of the sample record and preserving the search assertion.

Inconsistent does not mean meaningless

Different outcomes can become understandable when hidden conditions are named. Record order and data state before calling a test random. A passing rerun can be evidence about changed conditions, but it does not erase the earlier failure or repair isolation.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Name the hidden difference

Complete the automation report using the observed order and shared-record facts.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

T8 / record / cleanup / isolation

- 01 **Engineer:** Both observations use build ¹ _____.
- 02 **Tester:** Search fails after ² _____.
- 03 **Engineer:** The shared sample ³ _____ is removed.
- 04 **Tester:** A standalone pass does not prove test ⁴ _____.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. T8 / 2. cleanup / 3. record / 4. isolation

[Why these answers fit, page 131](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Cleanup deletes what search expects". Noah: "The record's presence is required before the search assertion can mean anything. We shouldn't leave that hidden in the environment." Aisha: [missing response] Noah: "Cleanup also needs narrower ownership checks. A broad delete based on a shared label could still remove another test's record." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Establish the precondition in setup. A missing fixture and an application search defect are different problems to report.
- B.** Good. That failure evidence shows why the shared state matters. Deleting it would remove the most useful reproduction conditions.
- C.** That's the interference to remove. Keep the useful search assertion rather than weakening it until the suite looks green.
- D.** Before doing that, compare the execution order. What does cleanup remove that the isolated search run still has?

[Answers and explanations, page 132](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 06 / SEPARATING IMPACT FROM SCHEDULING IN TRIAGE

Compare functional impact, reach, and timing without equating demonstration urgency with defect severity or release approval.

The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo

An export defect omits the final row in one monthly workflow. A heading typo appears on every account page. Tomorrow's customer demonstration uses the account page, with no export planned. Tester Lina and product lead Marcus discuss triage. The export has a data-completeness impact; the typo has broad visibility and immediate demonstration relevance. No severity scale, final repair order, or approval to release either issue is supplied.

People: Lina, Tester; Marcus, Product lead.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. What does the export defect do?

- A. Prevents all sign-ins
- B. Deletes every database record
- C. Omits the final row in one monthly workflow
- D. Misspells every account heading

2. What will tomorrow's demonstration use?

- A. The account page, with no export planned
- B. Only the monthly export
- C. Every workflow
- D. Neither affected area

3. What decision has already been made?

- A. No final repair order or release approval is supplied
- B. The typo must always be first
- C. The export is approved for release
- D. Both defects are waived

[Answers and explanations, page 133](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

triage

Structured review to classify issues and decide next handling.

bring a defect to triage

priority

Relative urgency or order assigned to work.

set priority

visibility

Extent to which users encounter or notice an issue.

describe visibility

frequency

How often the relevant event or workflow occurs.

state workflow frequency

cosmetic defect

Presentation issue without an established functional failure here.

classify a cosmetic defect carefully

business timing

Importance arising from an event or deadline.

explain business timing

severity

Degree of impact caused by a defect under the relevant scale.

assess severity

functional impact

Effect on the ability to perform the intended task.

explain functional impact

reach

Range of users or surfaces affected.

distinguish reach from harm

data completeness

Presence of all required data items.

verify data completeness

customer demonstration

Planned presentation of product behavior to a customer.

prepare for the customer demonstration

repair order

Sequence in which issues are scheduled for correction.

agree the repair order

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

triage TRIAGE

bring a defect to triage

Keep the meaning precise: Structured review to classify issues and decide next handling.

reach REACH

distinguish reach from harm

Keep the meaning precise: Range of users or surfaces affected.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

release blocker

Issue preventing release under the applicable criteria.

identify a release blocker

risk acceptance

Authorized decision to proceed with identified exposure.

distinguish risk acceptance

affected workflow

Process in which the reported issue occurs.

name the affected workflow

defect classification

Assignment of an issue to a defined category.

explain defect classification

decision owner

Person responsible for a specified decision.

identify the decision owner

defer

Postpone work without claiming the issue is resolved.

document a decision to defer

waiver

Explicit authorized acceptance of an exception.

record a waiver

workaround

Alternative way to complete a task despite a defect.

verify a workaround

stakeholder impact

Consequence for people who rely on the product.

assess stakeholder impact

scheduling constraint

Limit affecting when work can be performed.

state the scheduling constraint

evidence-based comparison

Comparison grounded in observed effects and stated context.

make an evidence-based comparison

disposition

Recorded decision about how an issue will be handled.

record the disposition

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

repair order **REPAIR ORDER**

agree the repair order

Keep the meaning precise: Sequence in which issues are scheduled for correction.

affected workflow **AFFECTED WORKFLOW**

name the affected workflow

Keep the meaning precise: Process in which the reported issue occurs.

Phrases that move the work forward

Name the export effect

The export omits its final row.

Name the typo's reach

The heading typo appears on every account page.

Preserve the exclusion

No export is planned for the demonstration.

Avoid minimizing

Monthly use does not make missing data harmless.

Explain timing

The demonstration makes the typo immediately relevant.

Keep the decision open

We have not agreed the repair order.

Request a recorded decision

Please record the disposition for each issue.

Preserve both concerns

Keep data completeness and presentation visibility in the comparison.

Limit the affected workflow

The observed issue affects the monthly workflow.

State tomorrow's scope

The demonstration uses the account page.

Separate dimensions

Impact and scheduling urgency are different questions.

Avoid inflating

Broad visibility does not automatically mean greater functional harm.

Request the scale

Which severity definitions apply here?

Avoid implying permission

Triage discussion is not release approval.

Avoid inventing a workaround

We have not established an alternative export method.

Close with the distinction

Discuss impact, timing, and authorization separately.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: State tomorrow's scope

Useful wording: The demonstration uses the account page.

Purpose: Preserve the exclusion

Useful wording: No export is planned for the demonstration.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which comparison is accurate?

- A.** Export loses a row; the typo is widely visible and relevant to tomorrow's demo
- B.** The monthly defect is harmless
- C.** The typo destroys all account data
- D.** Neither issue has any user effect

2. What does the demonstration establish?

- A.** Proof export is correct
- B.** A timing reason to discuss the typo urgently
- C.** Automatic permission to release both defects
- D.** A universal severity ranking

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Effect on the ability to perform the intended task. Which term fits?

- A.** cosmetic defect
- B.** decision owner
- C.** functional impact
- D.** risk acceptance

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo".
Lina: "The typo appears on every account page, including the one used in tomorrow's demonstration. No export is planned for that event." **Marcus:** [missing response] **Lina:** "So its visibility is broad, while the export has a different functional consequence. I don't want account-wide to become a substitute for an impact analysis." **Which response belongs in the gap?**

- A.** No. Priority concerns what receives attention and when. It is not permission to ship a known issue, and we have not finalized the repair order either.
- B.** That gives the typo immediate business timing. We should discuss it urgently for that reason, while keeping its presentation effect distinct from the export's missing data.
- C.** Use the applicable defect classification process when those labels are assigned. For this discussion, the concrete effects and timing are enough to explain the competing concerns.
- D.** Start with the functional impact of the export. A missing row affects the completeness of that workflow's output, even though the workflow runs monthly.

[Answers and explanations, page 133](#)

One useful distinction

Monthly describes when the export workflow occurs; it does not make a missing row trivial. Every account page describes the typo's reach; it does not make its functional impact identical to missing export data.

E Conversation

The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo

The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

business timing / risk acceptance / Reach / disposition / evidence-based comparison /
workaround / defect classification / Frequency / Priority / functional impact

- 01 **Lina:** Before we rank these issues, can we separate missing export data from the heading typo? Tomorrow's demonstration affects urgency, but not the underlying consequences.
- 02 **Marcus:** Start with the ¹ _____ of the export. A missing row affects the completeness of that workflow's output, even though the workflow runs monthly.
- 03 **Lina:** Monthly is the workflow frequency, not proof that the missing row is harmless. We should retain the actual completeness problem in the description.
- 04 **Marcus:** Agreed. ² _____ is one part of the context, not a substitute for describing the effect. What is established about the typo?
- 05 **Lina:** The typo appears on every account page, including the one used in tomorrow's demonstration. No export is planned for that event.
- 06 **Marcus:** That gives the typo immediate ³ _____. We should discuss it urgently for that reason, while keeping its presentation effect distinct from the export's missing data.

E Conversation / continued

- 07 **Lina:** So its visibility is broad, while the export has a different functional consequence. I don't want account-wide to become a substitute for an impact analysis.
- 08 **Marcus:** Yes. ⁴ _____ and severity are not synonyms. A widespread heading error and an incomplete export have different consequences that need separate descriptions.
- 09 **Lina:** We haven't been supplied a severity scale. I'll describe the observed consequences before assigning labels such as critical or minor.
- 10 **Marcus:** Use the applicable ⁵ _____ process when those labels are assigned. For this discussion, the concrete effects and timing are enough to explain the competing concerns.

Conversation continues on the next page.

The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Lina:** Does discussing the typo urgently imply the export is cleared to ship? I'd like the meeting note to avoid linking those decisions.
- 12 **Marcus:** No. ⁶ _____ concerns what receives attention and when. It is not permission to ship a known issue, and we have not finalized the repair order either.
- 13 **Lina:** Then each issue needs a recorded outcome once decided: corrected, deferred, or still pending. Handled wouldn't tell the next person which one applies.
- 14 **Marcus:** Exactly. Record the ⁷ _____ once the authorized decision is made. Do not write deferred as though it meant corrected.
- 15 **Lina:** We also don't have a verified alternative export method. I won't soften the risk statement by inventing a workaround.
- 16 **Marcus:** Correct. A ⁸ _____ is another factual claim requiring evidence. It cannot be added just to make the risk summary sound more reassuring.
- 17 **Lina:** My comparison will show the missing row, the typo's reach, and the demonstration's actual scope. It won't invent consequences we haven't observed.
- 18 **Marcus:** That is an ⁹ _____. It gives the team a clear basis for scheduling discussion without pretending a decision has already been reached.
- 19 **Lina:** I'll leave the repair order and release disposition pending. Strongly arguing for urgency doesn't mean I can announce an authorization.
- 20 **Marcus:** Good. Keep any ¹⁰ _____ separate and explicit. We can discuss urgency strongly without silently approving either defect for release.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. functional impact / 2. Frequency / 3. business timing / 4. Reach / 5. defect classification / 6. Priority / 7. disposition / 8. workaround / 9. evidence-based comparison / 10. risk acceptance

[Why these answers fit, page 134](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo

Return to the case

An export defect omits the final row in one monthly workflow. A heading typo appears on every account page. Tomorrow's customer demonstration uses the account page, with no export planned. Tester Lina and product lead Marcus discuss triage. The export has a data-completeness impact; the typo has broad visibility and immediate demonstration relevance. No severity scale, final repair order, or approval to release either issue is supplied.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which claim needs more evidence?

- A. No export is planned for the demo
- B. A workaround exists for the export
- C. The export omits its final row
- D. The typo appears on every account page

2. Which statement avoids a false decision?

- A. The typo is automatically first under every policy
- B. The export has been waived
- C. Both issues are approved for release
- D. The repair order and release disposition still need agreement

[Answers and explanations, page 136](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 9-16. Keep classification, work order, and permission to release separate.

Keep two dimensions on the table

Teams can disagree because one person is discussing harm and another is discussing timing. Name each dimension before comparing issues. A visible typo may be urgent for an event without making lost export data harmless, and discussing either issue does not authorize release.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Impact is not the same as tomorrow's priority

Complete the triage summary without assigning an unsupported rating or release decision.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

row / tomorrow / undecided / page

- 01 **Tester:** The export omits the final ¹ _____.
- 02 **Lead:** The typo appears on every account ² _____.
- 03 **Tester:** The demonstration is ³ _____.
- 04 **Lead:** The final repair order is still ⁴ _____.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. row / 2. page / 3. tomorrow / 4. undecided

[Why these answers fit, page 136](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo".

Lina: "Then each issue needs a recorded outcome once decided: corrected, deferred, or still pending. Handled wouldn't tell the next person which one applies." Marcus: [missing response] Lina: "We also don't have a verified alternative export method. I won't soften the risk statement by inventing a workaround." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Good. Keep any risk acceptance separate and explicit. We can discuss urgency strongly without silently approving either defect for release.
- B.** Exactly. Record the disposition once the authorized decision is made. Do not write deferred as though it meant corrected.
- C.** Yes. Reach and severity are not synonyms. A widespread heading error and an incomplete export have different consequences that need separate descriptions.
- D.** Agreed. Frequency is one part of the context, not a substitute for describing the effect. What is established about the typo?

[Answers and explanations, page 137](#)

Review 3 / Meaning and context

Use language from the lessons you have completed. Choose one answer per question.

Case file

Revisit "Investigating inconsistent automated results" and "Separating impact from scheduling in triage". Choose precise terminology, then reconstruct the missing responses using both neighboring turns. The final two questions also revisit earlier conversations.

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Prepared data or state used by multiple checks. Which term fits?

- A. state leakage
- B. rerun
- C. shared fixture
- D. environment state

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Presence of all required data items. Which term fits?

- A. release blocker
- B. triage
- C. data completeness
- D. defect classification

3. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "I can't promise full regression coverage in that hour. I'll keep the uncompleted checks visible if the time runs out." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "For export, the rationale is the shared formatter, not evidence that it already fails. I don't have a failure probability to attach." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A. State the change impact relationship without inventing one. A relevant dependency is enough to justify investigating that path.
- B. That's the coverage gap. We have basic access evidence, not results for the two consumers of the changed formatter.
- C. Right. The timebox constrains the work; it doesn't redefine a short check set as full coverage.
- D. Exactly. The test objective is the changed formatting behavior in each path. Make the assertion answer that question.

Review 3 / Meaning and context / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo".
Lina: "My comparison will show the missing row, the typo's reach, and the demonstration's actual scope. It won't invent consequences we haven't observed."
Marcus: [missing response] Lina: "I'll leave the repair order and release disposition pending. Strongly arguing for urgency doesn't mean I can announce an authorization." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Yes. Reach and severity are not synonyms. A widespread heading error and an incomplete export have different consequences that need separate descriptions.
- B.** Start with the functional impact of the export. A missing row affects the completeness of that workflow's output, even though the workflow runs monthly.
- C.** Correct. A workaround is another factual claim requiring evidence. It cannot be added just to make the risk summary sound more reassuring.
- D.** That is an evidence-based comparison. It gives the team a clear basis for scheduling discussion without pretending a decision has already been reached.

[Answers and explanations, page 154](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 07 / REPORTING EXPLORATORY FINDINGS

Report a timeboxed exploratory observation while separating behavior, an unresolved warning requirement, and untested mobile scope.

Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently

Tester Isha completes a twenty-minute exploratory session with the charter Investigate interrupted profile edits. Navigating away after a saved edit preserves the value.

Navigating away during an unsaved edit loses it without warning. Whether a warning is required is unspecified. Mobile behavior was not explored. Isha debriefs with product analyst Owen, who needs a factual record and a clarification request rather than a claim that every profile edit is broken.

People: Isha, Exploratory tester; Owen, Product analyst.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. What was the session's charter?

- A.** Investigate interrupted profile edits
- B.** Verify every mobile workflow
- C.** Approve the release
- D.** Measure all search latency

2. What happens after a saved edit?

- A.** The application crashes
- B.** Navigating away preserves the value
- C.** Every value is lost
- D.** A warning always appears

3. What is unresolved?

- A.** Whether mobile was fully tested
- B.** Whether the session lasted twenty minutes
- C.** Whether the saved value persisted
- D.** Whether a warning is required for unsaved edits

[Answers and explanations, page 138](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

exploratory testing

Investigation that adapts checks as the tester learns.

conduct exploratory testing

focus containment

Keeping keyboard tab navigation within an open modal dialog.

verify focus containment

debrief

Discussion reviewing observations, limits, and follow-up.

hold a debrief

observation

Behavior directly seen during the investigation.

separate observation from interpretation

saved state

Data retained after a completed save under the observed behavior.

verify saved state

navigation away

Leaving the current view or page.

describe navigation away

test charter

Statement guiding the purpose of an exploratory session.

define the test charter

timebox

Fixed time allocated to an investigation.

respect the timebox

session notes

Record of actions, observations, and questions from testing.

preserve session notes

finding

Recorded result or question arising from investigation.

report a finding

unsaved change

Edit not yet committed by the relevant save action.

identify an unsaved change

persistence

Continued retention of data across the relevant transition.

check persistence

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

exploratory testing **EXPLORATORY TESTING**

conduct exploratory testing

Keep the meaning precise: Investigation that adapts checks as the tester learns.

session notes **SESSION NOTES**

preserve session notes

Keep the meaning precise: Record of actions, observations, and questions from testing.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

warning prompt

Message alerting a user before a consequential action.

clarify the warning prompt

user journey

Sequence of actions a user takes toward an objective.

describe the user journey

requirement gap

Missing specification needed to judge intended behavior.

raise the requirement gap

confirmed defect

Established departure from an applicable expectation.

distinguish a confirmed defect

scope exclusion

Area explicitly not covered by the investigation.

list a scope exclusion

evidence trail

Records linking a finding to actions and observations.

retain the evidence trail

state transition

Change from one defined condition to another.

record the state transition

focus restoration

Returning keyboard focus to the required target after an interface closes.

check focus restoration

usability concern

Potential difficulty in understanding or using the product.

record a usability concern

follow-up question

Specific unresolved point for further investigation or clarification.

record a follow-up question

mobile coverage

Evidence from checking behavior on mobile devices or conditions.

avoid assuming mobile coverage

session outcome

Bounded summary of findings and remaining questions.

summarize the session outcome

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

persistence PERSISTENCE

check persistence

Keep the meaning precise: Continued retention of data across the relevant transition.

requirement gap REQUIREMENT GAP

raise the requirement gap

Keep the meaning precise: Missing specification needed to judge intended behavior.

C Phrases that move the work forward

Name the charter

The session investigated interrupted profile edits.

Separate the saved path

After saving, navigation preserved the value.

Describe the interface

No warning appeared in that sequence.

Expose the requirement gap

The warning requirement is unspecified.

Keep the observation

The no-warning behavior remains a useful finding.

State the excluded scope

I did not explore mobile behavior.

Separate classification

The observation is not yet a confirmed requirement violation.

Limit the conclusion

These findings apply to the paths explored.

State the timebox

I explored for twenty minutes.

Separate the unsaved path

Navigating away during an unsaved edit lost the change.

Avoid a broad defect claim

I did not observe all profile edits failing.

Request the intended behavior

Should leaving an unsaved edit trigger a warning?

Avoid inventing policy

I have not assumed that every unsaved edit must persist.

Request traceable follow-up

Link the warning decision to the session notes.

Preserve the sequence

Record whether save occurred before navigation.

Close the debrief

Saved value persists; unsaved change is lost without warning; requirement and mobile questions remain.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: Separate the unsaved path

Useful wording: Navigating away during an unsaved edit lost the change.

Purpose: Describe the interface

Useful wording: No warning appeared in that sequence.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. Which report matches the observations?

- A.** Every saved edit is lost
- B.** Unsaved edits always persist
- C.** Mobile behavior is confirmed identical
- D.** Saved edits persist; unsaved edits are lost without warning

2. What should be requested?

- A.** A declaration that all edits are broken
- B.** Removal of the saved-path observation
- C.** Clarification of whether an unsaved-edit warning is required
- D.** Automatic release approval

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Fixed time allocated to an investigation. Which term fits?

- A.** user journey
- B.** scope exclusion
- C.** timebox
- D.** saved state

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently". Isha: "When I left during an unsaved edit, the change disappeared without a warning. I didn't observe saved values disappearing in that sequence." Owen: [missing response] Isha: "The requirement doesn't say whether a warning is required. I can raise that question without choosing the policy myself." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** That is a specific observation. We can record both the lost change and the absence of a warning without yet deciding whether either violates a requirement.
- B.** Raise that requirement gap explicitly. Ask whether leaving an unsaved edit should trigger a warning, rather than treating your preferred behavior as already agreed.
- C.** Correct. A usability concern can be worth discussing while its status remains clear. We do not need to exaggerate the evidence to make the question relevant.
- D.** Exactly. The timebox explains the session boundary. Report the actual paths and questions rather than using elapsed time as a proxy for exhaustive checking.

[Answers and explanations, page 138](#)

One useful distinction

The saved and unsaved paths have different observations. Saved edits persist after navigation; unsaved edits are lost without warning. Do not merge them into all edits are lost or assume that loss of an unsaved change violates an unstated rule.

E Conversation

Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently

Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

usability concern / scope exclusion / requirement gap / evidence trail / session outcome
/ observation / confirmed defect / timebox / test charter / saved state

- 01 **Isha:** My twenty-minute session found different results before and after saving a profile edit. I'd like to report those separately and ask about the warning rule.
- 02 **Owen:** Start with the ¹ _____. That will help me understand which paths you explored and what the session was not intended to settle.
- 03 **Isha:** The charter was interrupted profile edits. In the saved path, I saved first and then navigated away; the value remained.
- 04 **Owen:** So the ² _____ persisted in that sequence. Keep it separate from what happened when navigation occurred before the edit was saved.
- 05 **Isha:** When I left during an unsaved edit, the change disappeared without a warning. I didn't observe saved values disappearing in that sequence.
- 06 **Owen:** That is a specific ³ _____. We can record both the lost change and the absence of a warning without yet deciding whether either violates a requirement.
- 07 **Isha:** The requirement doesn't say whether a warning is required. I can raise that question without choosing the policy myself.
- 08 **Owen:** Raise that ⁴ _____ explicitly. Ask whether leaving an unsaved edit should trigger a warning, rather than treating your preferred behavior as already agreed.
- 09 **Isha:** I'll record edit, no save, navigate away, change absent, no warning. Saying profile loses data would omit the condition that makes this finding meaningful.
- 10 **Owen:** The ⁵ _____ matters. A note saying profile loses data would omit the saved-versus-unsaved distinction and could misrepresent the finding.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Isha:** The lack of warning may confuse users, but I haven't established that it violates an agreed rule. Both points can stay in the report.
- 12 **Owen:** Correct. A ⁶ _____ can be worth discussing while its status remains clear. We do not need to exaggerate the evidence to make the question relevant.
- 13 **Isha:** Mobile wasn't explored. That needs to remain visible if someone forwards the report to another platform team.
- 14 **Owen:** List the ⁷ _____. Untested mobile behavior is unknown, not assumed identical and not assumed different.
- 15 **Isha:** The twenty-minute duration tells you how long I explored, not that I covered every possible interruption. I'll name the paths actually checked.
- 16 **Owen:** Exactly. The ⁸ _____ explains the session boundary. Report the actual paths and questions rather than using elapsed time as a proxy for exhaustive checking.
- 17 **Isha:** After the owner decides the warning rule, we can test against it. Until then the original observation stays attached to the clarification request.
- 18 **Owen:** That keeps ⁹ _____ separate from an unresolved finding. The eventual decision may change the classification without changing what you actually observed.
- 19 **Isha:** My summary will retain saved-value persistence, unsaved loss without warning, the missing warning rule, and no mobile coverage.
- 20 **Owen:** Good. That is a bounded ¹⁰ _____. It gives the next reviewer concrete evidence and one answerable follow-up question, rather than a broad label they have to reconstruct.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. test charter / 2. saved state / 3. observation / 4. requirement gap / 5. evidence trail / 6. usability concern / 7. scope exclusion / 8. timebox / 9. confirmed defect / 10. session outcome

[Why these answers fit, page 139](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently

Return to the case

Tester Isha completes a twenty-minute exploratory session with the charter Investigate interrupted profile edits. Navigating away after a saved edit preserves the value. Navigating away during an unsaved edit loses it without warning. Whether a warning is required is unspecified. Mobile behavior was not explored. Isha debriefs with product analyst Owen, who needs a factual record and a clarification request rather than a claim that every profile edit is broken.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which claim exceeds the evidence?

- A. No warning appeared in the explored unsaved path
- B. The session lasted twenty minutes
- C. Saved value persisted in the explored saved path
- D. Mobile shows the same result

2. Why avoid calling this a confirmed warning defect now?

- A. Unsaved changes cannot affect users
- B. Twenty minutes invalidates every finding
- C. The applicable warning requirement is unspecified
- D. Observations never matter

[Answers and explanations, page 141](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 7-14. Keep the warning requirement unresolved and mobile behavior untested.

An observation can be important before classification

Describe the exact sequence and what happened, then ask whether the intended behavior requires a warning. This preserves a potentially important user experience without inventing a requirement. Naming untested scope helps colleagues use the finding appropriately.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Separate the two paths and the missing rule

Complete the exploratory report without converting an observation into an unsupported requirement judgment.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

Mobile / warning / minutes / saved

- 01 **Tester:** The session lasted twenty ¹ _____.
- 02 **Analyst:** The ² _____ edit persisted after navigation.
- 03 **Tester:** The unsaved edit was lost without a ³ _____.
- 04 **Analyst:** ⁴ _____ behavior was not explored.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. minutes / 2. saved / 3. warning / 4. Mobile

[Why these answers fit, page 141](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently".

Isha: "Mobile wasn't explored. That needs to remain visible if someone forwards the report to another platform team." Owen: [missing response] Isha: "The twenty-minute duration tells you how long I explored, not that I covered every possible interruption. I'll name the paths actually checked." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** List the scope exclusion. Untested mobile behavior is unknown, not assumed identical and not assumed different.
- B.** That keeps confirmed defect separate from an unresolved finding. The eventual decision may change the classification without changing what you actually observed.
- C.** The evidence trail matters. A note saying profile loses data would omit the saved-versus-unsaved distinction and could misrepresent the finding.
- D.** So the saved state persisted in that sequence. Keep it separate from what happened when navigation occurred before the edit was saved.

[Answers and explanations, page 142](#)

A Read the situation

LESSON 08 / GIVING A RELEASE-EVIDENCE HANDOVER

Report pass, failure, and blocked counts while identifying the unmet critical-path criterion and preserving release ownership.

Seven passed is not ten completed

Fictional candidate Q20 has ten planned checks. Seven passed, one failed, and two are blocked by unavailable sample data. One blocked check is critical. The agreed exit criterion requires every critical-path check to be executed and reviewed. Tester Ben hands the evidence to release owner Mara. The critical blocked check means this criterion is not met. Mara has not made the release decision; the test summary is not approval.

People: Ben, Tester preparing the handover; Mara, Release decision owner.

Read the record

Choose one answer per question using the facts above.

1. How are the ten checks divided?

- A. Seven passed and three passed by assumption
- B. Eight passed and two failed
- C. Ten executed and reviewed
- D. Seven passed, one failed, two blocked

2. Why is the critical-path criterion unmet?

- A. All seven passes are invalid
- B. Every blocked check has failed
- C. No criterion exists
- D. One critical check is blocked and unexecuted

3. Who owns the release decision?

- A. The pass percentage
- B. Every user
- C. The unavailable sample data
- D. Mara

[Answers and explanations, page 143](#)

B Vocabulary in use

CORE TERMS

release candidate

Version proposed for release pending the relevant decision.

identify the release candidate

passed check

Executed check meeting its expected result.

report passed checks

blocked check

Check unable to proceed because a prerequisite is unavailable.

identify blocked checks

critical path

Essential workflow or route under the agreed release criteria here.

identify the critical path

execution status

Whether and how a test has been run.

distinguish execution status

test completion

End-of-stage accounting of performed work and unresolved items.

assess test completion

planned check

Test included in the intended checking scope.

count planned checks

failed check

Executed check not meeting its expected result.

report the failed check

sample data

Prepared input needed to execute a test.

obtain sample data

exit criterion

Condition required before leaving a testing stage.

assess the exit criterion

review status

Whether relevant evidence has received the required review.

report review status

pass rate

Proportion of passes under a stated denominator.

qualify the pass rate

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

release candidate **RELEASE CANDIDATE**

identify the release candidate

Keep the meaning precise: Version proposed for release pending the relevant decision.

sample data **SAMPLE DATA**

obtain sample data

Keep the meaning precise: Prepared input needed to execute a test.

B Precision and professional shorthand

EXTEND YOUR RANGE

denominator

Total used to calculate a fraction or percentage.
specify the denominator

open defect

Unresolved product issue recorded for follow-up.
retain the open defect

release authority

Permission or role empowered to decide release.
respect release authority

status breakdown

Separate counts or categories explaining the overall position.
give the status breakdown

criterion exception

Explicit authorized departure from an agreed criterion.
document a criterion exception

unexecuted check

Planned check that has not actually run.
disclose the unexecuted check

blocked dependency

Missing prerequisite preventing a check from proceeding.
resolve the blocked dependency

readiness evidence

Results and records relevant to whether criteria are satisfied.
present readiness evidence

decision pending

Status showing that a decision has not been made.
keep decision pending

evidence handover

Transfer of results, limits, and unresolved dependencies.
prepare the evidence handover

risk register

Record of identified risks and their handling.
update the risk register

release disposition

Recorded decision on whether and how to proceed.
record the release disposition

Say it in context

Stress the highlighted expression. Keep the surrounding words connected; pause at the end of the phrase.

pass rate PASS RATE

qualify the pass rate

Keep the meaning precise: Proportion of passes under a stated denominator.

release authority RELEASE AUTHORITY

respect release authority

Keep the meaning precise: Permission or role empowered to decide release.

C Phrases that move the work forward

Identify the candidate

This handover concerns Q20.

Give passes

Seven checks passed.

Give blockers

Two checks are blocked by unavailable sample data.

State the criterion

All critical-path checks must be executed and reviewed.

Separate blocked and failed

Blocked does not mean executed and failed.

Qualify the percentage

Name whether the denominator is planned or executed checks.

Request the dependency

The blocked checks need their sample data.

Avoid implying approval

The decision remains pending.

State the total

Ten checks were planned.

Give failures

One check failed.

Identify the critical gap

One blocked check is critical.

State the consequence

That criterion is not currently met.

Separate blocked and passed

Missing data cannot count as a pass.

Preserve the failure

Keep the failed check visible alongside the blockers.

Name authority

Mara owns the release decision.

Close the handover

Report the full breakdown, unmet criterion, and next evidence needed.

Precision in real exchanges

Purpose: Give failures

Useful wording: One check failed.

Purpose: Give blockers

Useful wording: Two checks are blocked by unavailable sample data.

D Choose the response that fits

Choose one response for each situation. Preserve the facts, the decision boundary, and the purpose of the exchange.

1. How many checks have executed?

- A.** Seven
- B.** Two
- C.** Eight
- D.** Ten

2. Which pair states pass proportions with matching denominators?

- A.** 70% of planned; 87.5% of executed
- B.** 87.5% of planned; 70% of executed
- C.** 70% of both planned and executed
- D.** 87.5% of both planned and executed

3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Executed check not meeting its expected result. Which term fits?

- A.** failed check
- B.** open defect
- C.** criterion exception
- D.** execution status

D Choose the response that fits / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Seven passed is not ten completed". Ben: "I'll keep blocked separate from failed. Those two never executed, so there's no result showing either success or an expectation mismatch." Mara: [missing response] Ben: "Eight ran: seven passes plus one failure. Ten is the planned total, not the number completed." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Yes. The failed check needs its own follow-up. It shouldn't vanish when the report focuses on enabling the unexecuted checks.
- B.** Keep that status breakdown in the headline. A pass percentage alone won't tell me whether our critical-path condition has been met.
- C.** Correct. A blocked check isn't a pass by default, and it isn't an executed failure. Name why it couldn't proceed.
- D.** Then state the exit criterion is unmet. A majority of passes doesn't substitute for that missing critical evidence.

[Answers and explanations, page 143](#)

One useful distinction

Seven plus one plus two accounts for all ten planned checks. Eight have executed; two have not. Seven out of ten planned is 70 percent, while seven out of eight executed is 87.5 percent. Neither percentage makes the critical blocked check disappear.

E Conversation

Seven passed is not ten completed

Seven passed is not ten completed

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

readiness evidence / blocked dependency / denominator / release authority /
status breakdown / blocked check / exit criterion / Review status / failed check /
execution status

- 01 **Ben:** Q20 has ten planned checks: seven passed, one failed, two blocked by unavailable sample data. One of the blocked checks is critical.
- 02 **Mara:** Keep that ¹ _____ in the headline. A pass percentage alone won't tell me whether our critical-path condition has been met.
- 03 **Ben:** It hasn't. Every critical-path check must execute and have its evidence reviewed, and the blocked one has no result to review.
- 04 **Mara:** Then state the ² _____ is unmet. A majority of passes doesn't substitute for that missing critical evidence.
- 05 **Ben:** I'll keep blocked separate from failed. Those two never executed, so there's no result showing either success or an expectation mismatch.
- 06 **Mara:** Correct. A ³ _____ isn't a pass by default, and it isn't an executed failure. Name why it couldn't proceed.
- 07 **Ben:** Eight ran: seven passes plus one failure. Ten is the planned total, not the number completed.
- 08 **Mara:** That makes ⁴ _____ unambiguous. The remaining two still need their prerequisites before they can run.
- 09 **Ben:** Seven over ten planned is seventy percent. Seven over eight executed is eighty-seven-point-five. Both leave the critical blocker unresolved.
- 10 **Mara:** Exactly. Every rate needs its ⁵ _____. A higher-looking percentage doesn't change what actually happened.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Seven passed is not ten completed

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Ben:** I'll retain the failed result alongside the blockers. Otherwise the missing-data discussion could overshadow a defect we actually observed.
- 12 **Mara:** Yes. The ⁶ _____ needs its own follow-up. It shouldn't vanish when the report focuses on enabling the unexecuted checks.
- 13 **Ben:** The data request is still pending. I won't write data received or assume the tests will pass once somebody supplies it.
- 14 **Mara:** Keep that ⁷ _____ explicit. Requesting a prerequisite, receiving it, and executing a check are separate stages.
- 15 **Ben:** And even after execution, the criterion still requires review. I'll show that separately instead of copying completed into every column.
- 16 **Mara:** Good. ⁸ _____ can't be inferred from a test run. Account for both parts of the requirement.
- 17 **Ben:** The report will say criterion unmet, no granted exception, and your production decision pending. This handoff isn't a sign-off.
- 18 **Mara:** That respects ⁹ _____. I own the decision, but I haven't made it or authorized an exception.
- 19 **Ben:** Final status: Q20, seven passed, one failed, two blocked including one critical, missing data, required review, and decision pending.
- 20 **Mara:** That's usable ¹⁰ _____. It supports an explicit decision without concealing the failed check or implying the blocked critical path has passed.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. status breakdown / 2. exit criterion / 3. blocked check / 4. execution status / 5. denominator / 6. failed check / 7. blocked dependency / 8. Review status / 9. release authority / 10. readiness evidence

[Why these answers fit, page 144](#)

F Check accuracy and scope

Seven passed is not ten completed

Return to the case

Fictional candidate Q20 has ten planned checks. Seven passed, one failed, and two are blocked by unavailable sample data. One blocked check is critical. The agreed exit criterion requires every critical-path check to be executed and reviewed. Tester Ben hands the evidence to release owner Mara. The critical blocked check means this criterion is not met. Mara has not made the release decision; the test summary is not approval.

Choose one answer per question. Use the case facts and keep any uncertainty or limits intact.

1. Which criterion statement is justified?

- A. It does not apply to blocked checks
- B. It is automatically waived by missing data
- C. It is unmet because a critical check remains unexecuted
- D. It is met because most checks passed

2. Which handover is complete?

- A. Q20: seven passed, one failed, two blocked including one critical; criterion unmet; Mara's decision pending
- B. Q20 passed because seven is a majority
- C. Q20 has only two minor gaps
- D. Q20 approved automatically

[Answers and explanations, page 146](#)

Listen for the distinction

Swap roles for turns 7-16. Say the denominator with each percentage and keep execution separate from review.

Do not let a percentage hide a blocker

A headline pass count can sound reassuring while omitting an unexecuted critical path. Give the complete breakdown, explain the relevant criterion, and name the missing evidence. Keep your report of readiness conditions separate from the authorized release decision.

F Say it / transfer to a new case

Account for every planned check

Complete the Q20 handover. The release decision has not been made.

Complete the four gaps. With a partner, read alternate roles, then switch. Studying alone, read both roles and pause before each response.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

Two / One / Seven / pending

- 01 **Tester:** ¹ _____ checks passed.
- 02 **Owner:** ² _____ check failed.
- 03 **Tester:** ³ _____ checks are blocked by missing sample data.
- 04 **Owner:** The release decision remains ⁴ _____.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. Seven / 2. One / 3. Two / 4. pending

[Why these answers fit, page 146](#)

Rebuild the exchange

Choose the missing response. Read the completed three-turn exchange aloud, changing roles on the second reading.

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Seven passed is not ten completed". Ben: "The data request is still pending. I won't write data received or assume the tests will pass once somebody supplies it." Mara: [missing response] Ben: "And even after execution, the criterion still requires review. I'll show that separately instead of copying completed into every column." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** That respects release authority. I own the decision, but I haven't made it or authorized an exception.
- B.** Keep that blocked dependency explicit. Requesting a prerequisite, receiving it, and executing a check are separate stages.
- C.** Then state the exit criterion is unmet. A majority of passes doesn't substitute for that missing critical evidence.
- D.** Good. Review status can't be inferred from a test run. Account for both parts of the requirement.

[Answers and explanations, page 147](#)

Review 4 / Meaning and context

Use language from the lessons you have completed. Choose one answer per question.

Case file

Revisit "Reporting exploratory findings" and "Giving a release-evidence handover". Choose precise terminology, then reconstruct the missing responses using both neighboring turns. The final two questions also revisit earlier conversations.

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Keeping keyboard tab navigation within an open modal dialog. Which term fits?

- A. follow-up question
- B. state transition
- C. finding
- D. focus containment

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Condition required before leaving a testing stage. Which term fits?

- A. release candidate
- B. status breakdown
- C. exit criterion
- D. denominator

3. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo". Lina: "We haven't been supplied a severity scale. I'll describe the observed consequences before assigning labels such as critical or minor." Marcus: [missing response] Lina: "Does discussing the typo urgently imply the export is cleared to ship? I'd like the meeting note to avoid linking those decisions." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A. Start with the functional impact of the export. A missing row affects the completeness of that workflow's output, even though the workflow runs monthly.
- B. That gives the typo immediate business timing. We should discuss it urgently for that reason, while keeping its presentation effect distinct from the export's missing data.
- C. Use the applicable defect classification process when those labels are assigned. For this discussion, the concrete effects and timing are enough to explain the competing concerns.
- D. No. Priority concerns what receives attention and when. It is not permission to ship a known issue, and we have not finalized the repair order either.

Review 4 / Meaning and context / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Seven passed is not ten completed". Ben: "The report will say criterion unmet, no granted exception, and your production decision pending. This handoff isn't a sign-off." Mara: [missing response] Ben: "Final status: Q20, seven passed, one failed, two blocked including one critical, missing data, required review, and decision pending." Which response belongs in the gap?

- A.** Keep that blocked dependency explicit. Requesting a prerequisite, receiving it, and executing a check are separate stages.
- B.** That respects release authority. I own the decision, but I haven't made it or authorized an exception.
- C.** Good. Review status can't be inferred from a test run. Account for both parts of the requirement.
- D.** Then state the exit criterion is unmet. A majority of passes doesn't substitute for that missing critical evidence.

[Answers and explanations, page 157](#)

Language for the next case

Three conditions, not three separate promises

condition combinations

The rule depends on combinations of three conditions; testing one all-qualifying and one all-disqualifying case leaves six feasible combinations unchecked.

Evan: Not yet. We need the condition combinations. The second case could reject for just one reason while the other restrictions are broken.

negative cases

Each proposed negative case makes one required condition fail while the other two qualify, allowing the relevant restriction to affect the expected outcome.

Evan: Those add useful negative cases. Keep the other conditions qualifying so the restriction you're targeting can determine the outcome.

inclusive threshold

At least one hundred includes exactly one hundred; eligibility is assessed on the pre-discount subtotal and is not recalculated from the discounted total.

Evan: Yes. That's an inclusive threshold. Test that equality separately from a qualifying hundred-twenty-dollar example.

masking

Other disqualifying conditions can hide a missing membership check; an inactive basket below the threshold and already redeemed would reject even if membership were ignored.

Evan: Exactly. That is masking in this example. Use an inactive member with one hundred twenty dollars and no redemption to expose that omission.

decision table

The full table records all eight feasible combinations of the three binary conditions and their expected discounts; only active, threshold-met, not-redeemed qualifies.

Evan: Right. The full decision table makes that explicit. Two executed combinations cover two of its eight columns, not all eight.

coverage denominator

The denominator here is eight feasible columns of the stated full decision table; two executed columns give twenty-five percent, not a general measure of software correctness.

Evan: Keep the coverage denominator visible. A percentage without its coverage items invites a much broader interpretation.

Read the phrases aloud. Then complete the conversation on the following pages using the word bank.

Conversation

Three conditions, not three separate promises

Fictional promotion: give a \$10 discount only when membership is active, basket subtotal before discount is at least \$100, and the offer has not already been redeemed. Otherwise discount is zero. These three yes/no conditions have eight feasible combinations. Existing cases cover active/\$120/not redeemed and inactive/\$80/already redeemed. Both passed. No other combinations or threshold values have been tested.

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

condition combinations / decision table / negative cases / inclusive threshold /
coverage denominator / masking

- 01 **Zara:** Both promotion tests passed. One qualifies on every condition; the other fails all three. Do those results show that each restriction works independently?
- 02 **Evan:** Not yet. We need the ¹ _____. The second case could reject for just one reason while the other restrictions are broken.
- 03 **Zara:** So if the implementation accidentally ignored membership, our inactive eighty-dollar redeemed basket would still reject because of the other conditions.
- 04 **Evan:** Exactly. That is ² _____ in this example. Use an inactive member with one hundred twenty dollars and no redemption to expose that omission.
- 05 **Zara:** That isolated negative case should get zero discount. We also need active membership with ninety-nine dollars ninety-nine, and active membership with an already redeemed offer.
- 06 **Evan:** Those add useful ³ _____. Keep the other conditions qualifying so the restriction you're targeting can determine the outcome.

Conversation / continued

- 07 **Zara:** There are three yes-or-no conditions, so two times two times two gives eight combinations. Only one combination earns the ten-dollar discount.
- 08 **Evan:** Right. The full ⁴ _____ makes that explicit. Two executed combinations cover two of its eight columns, not all eight.
- 09 **Zara:** At exactly one hundred dollars, active and not redeemed should qualify. The threshold is before discount, so the resulting ninety doesn't disqualify it afterward.
- 10 **Evan:** Yes. That's an ⁵ _____. Test that equality separately from a qualifying hundred-twenty-dollar example.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Three conditions, not three separate promises

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Zara:** The two existing cases give twenty-five percent of the full table's combinations. That doesn't mean twenty-five percent of the software is correct.
- 12 **Evan:** Keep the ⁶ _____ visible. A percentage without its coverage items invites a much broader interpretation.
- 13 **Zara:** Could we minimize the table by grouping cases where a disqualifying condition already determines the outcome?
- 14 **Evan:** A reduced table can be useful, but then describe its rules and denominator. Don't report full eight-column execution coverage from a smaller unexecuted plan.
- 15 **Zara:** And adding six planned combinations doesn't mean those combinations have passed. We'll need the actual outputs against their expectations.
- 16 **Evan:** Correct. Keep design coverage and execution evidence separate. A complete plan can still reveal failures when run.
- 17 **Zara:** I'll attach the eight combinations, mark only the two executed ones passed, and add focused checks at ninety-nine ninety-nine and one hundred.
- 18 **Evan:** Good. Include the ten-dollar amount too; eligibility alone wouldn't catch the implementation applying the wrong discount to a qualifying basket.
- 19 **Zara:** The summary will say two of eight combinations exercised, equality untested, and the new combinations and threshold checks proposed.
- 20 **Evan:** That accurately describes the gap. We can explain why the extra cases matter without pretending the initial two passes established every part of the rule.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. condition combinations / 2. masking / 3. negative cases / 4. decision table / 5. inclusive threshold / 6. coverage denominator

[Why these answers fit, page 160](#)

Qualify before applying the discount

Same promotion rule. All amounts are pre-discount subtotals. A: active, \$100, not redeemed. B: inactive, \$140, not redeemed. C: active, \$100, already redeemed. D: active, \$99.99, not redeemed. Expectations only; these cases have not run.

Complete the exchange using each phrase once. Read both roles, then switch roles and repeat with the bank covered.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

A / 10 / membership / unexecuted

- 01 **Analyst:** The only qualifying case is ¹ _____ .
- 02 **Developer:** Its expected discount is ² _____ dollars.
- 03 **Analyst:** B fails the ³ _____ condition.
- 04 **Developer:** The execution status of these cases is ⁴ _____ .

CHECK THE GAPS

1. A / 2. 10 / 3. membership / 4. unexecuted

[Why these answers fit, page 160](#)

Keep the distinction audible

Challenge incomplete test combinations using an explicit eligibility rule.

Language for the next case

Which mutation score are we reporting?

mutant

A mutant is a deliberately modified program variant used to assess test sensitivity; the twelve variants are not twelve discovered production defects.

Paula: Check what each mutant status means before dividing. This report counts timeout as detected and excludes compile error from valid variants.

timeout

Under the supplied Stryker-style definitions, a timeout counts as detected and remains a separate status; it is not silently classified as survived or compile error.

Paula: Don't relabel them. A timeout counts as detected under these definitions. Six plus two gives eight detected variants.

valid mutants

The supplied definitions give eleven valid mutants after excluding the one compile error; eight detected divided by eleven is 72.7 percent when rounded to one decimal place.

Paula: Correct. Eight divided by eleven valid mutants gives seventy-two-point-seven percent. Don't divide by twelve generated variants.

Killed

Killed means a test detected an active modified variant by failing; it is not the count of production defects or of failing original-program tests.

Paula: Exactly. Killed describes the modified run. Keep it distinct from the baseline suite's result.

No coverage

The no-coverage variant is undetected and included in valid variants for the overall score, but it is excluded from the covered-code denominator in this report.

Paula: Yes. No coverage is undetected here. Excluding it would change which score you're reporting.

covered-code score

The covered-code score uses ten covered variants and gives eighty percent; it excludes the no-coverage variant and must not replace the overall 72.7 percent score without its label.

Paula: That's the covered-code score, not the overall score. The labels explain why both figures can be correct.

Read the phrases aloud. Then complete the conversation on the following pages using the word bank.

Conversation

Which mutation score are we reporting?

Fictional completed Stryker-style report: 12 mutants total; 6 killed, 2 timeout, 2 survived, 1 no coverage, 1 compile error. Use these report definitions: detected = killed + timeout; valid = detected + survived + no coverage; covered = detected + survived. Overall score = detected/valid; covered-code score = detected/covered. Round percentages to one decimal place. These are deliberately modified program variants, not observed production defects.

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

Killed / valid mutants / No coverage / timeout / covered-code score / mutant

- 01 **Nikhil:** The report has twelve variants and six killed. I started to write fifty percent, but the dashboard shows a different score.
- 02 **Paula:** Check what each ¹ _____ status means before dividing. This report counts timeout as detected and excludes compile error from valid variants.
- 03 **Nikhil:** The six killed variants each caused at least one test to fail. That is the desired detection, not six failures in our original program.
- 04 **Paula:** Exactly. ² _____ describes the modified run. Keep it distinct from the baseline suite's result.
- 05 **Nikhil:** There are two timeouts. I was going to move them to survived because no assertion failure is listed.
- 06 **Paula:** Don't relabel them. A ³ _____ counts as detected under these definitions. Six plus two gives eight detected variants.

Conversation / continued

- 07 **Nikhil:** The one no-coverage variant is different from the two survived variants that ran without a failing test. Does it still enter the overall denominator?
- 08 **Paula:** Yes. ⁴ _____ is undetected here. Excluding it would change which score you're reporting.
- 09 **Nikhil:** Then valid is eight detected plus two survived plus one no coverage: eleven. The compile error is outside that denominator.
- 10 **Paula:** Correct. Eight divided by eleven ⁵ _____ gives seventy-two-point-seven percent. Don't divide by twelve generated variants.

Conversation continues on the next page.

Which mutation score are we reporting?

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Nikhil:** For covered, we use eight detected plus two survived, so ten. Eight over ten is eighty percent.
- 12 **Paula:** That's the ⁶ _____, not the overall score. The labels explain why both figures can be correct.
- 13 **Nikhil:** A colleague read eighty percent as eighty percent of the product's defects prevented. We don't have evidence for that.
- 14 **Paula:** No. These ratios describe this mutation set and these test runs. They aren't estimates of all real defects or a release guarantee.
- 15 **Nikhil:** For the survivors, should I immediately add assertions until every one is killed? Some modifications might not change observable behavior for the supported inputs.
- 16 **Paula:** Review them first. An equivalent variant and an inadequately tested behavior require different explanations; survival alone doesn't establish which one it is.
- 17 **Nikhil:** I'll also retain the timeout and compile-error details. Counting timeout as detected doesn't mean the underlying run conditions need no attention.
- 18 **Paula:** Right. Preserve the tool's categories and investigate the evidence as needed. Don't change a status merely to make a headline score improve.
- 19 **Nikhil:** My handoff will show twelve total, eleven valid, eight detected, seventy-two-point-seven overall, eighty covered, and the remaining categories.
- 20 **Paula:** Include the definitions with the report. That lets someone reproduce the arithmetic and understand the limits instead of comparing unlike percentages.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. mutant / 2. Killed / 3. timeout / 4. No coverage / 5. valid mutants / 6. covered-code score

[Why these answers fit, page 162](#)

Keep uncovered variants in the overall score

New completed report using the same definitions: 10 total; 4 killed, 1 timeout, 2 survived, 2 no coverage, 1 compile error. Round percentages to one decimal place.

Complete the exchange using each phrase once. Read both roles, then switch roles and repeat with the bank covered.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

9 / 55.6 / 5 / 71.4

- 01 **Engineer:** The detected count is ¹ _____ .
- 02 **Lead:** The valid count is ² _____ .
- 03 **Engineer:** The overall score is ³ _____ percent.
- 04 **Lead:** The covered-code score is ⁴ _____ percent.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. 5 / 2. 9 / 3. 55.6 / 4. 71.4

[Why these answers fit, page 162](#)

Keep the distinction audible

Read mutation-test categories and state a score with its actual numerator and denominator.

Language for the next case

The modal is labeled, but focus is outside

initial focus

The supplied opening criterion requires focus to move inside the modal; leaving it on the background page fails that behavior even when labels pass a scan.

Omar: Then the initial focus behavior is wrong for our criterion. A visible overlay doesn't tell us where keyboard input goes.

keyboard sequence

The recorded keyboard sequence identifies the exact actions and focus targets observed; unperformed Shift+Tab checks must remain pending rather than inherit a result.

Omar: Good. Keep the keyboard sequence and actual focus targets in the report. That gives me a reproducible behavior to inspect.

modal semantics

Modal semantics describe the intended interface meaning; an accessibility attribute alone does not implement keyboard containment, initial focus, or focus restoration.

Omar: No. The modal semantics must match implemented behavior. An attribute doesn't do all the focus management for us.

focus containment

The case requires forward and reverse tab navigation to stay within the open modal; moving focus to a background link violates that containment.

Omar: That breaks the required focus containment. We need to test the forward and reverse cycle inside, not just whether the first button can be clicked.

focus restoration

For this case, the invoking Edit Address button still exists and is the explicitly required return target; closing the overlay without returning focus does not satisfy that criterion.

Omar: Then focus restoration also needs correction. Closing visually is only one part of that interaction.

automated scan

The automated scan supplies the stated label result only; it does not replace the observed keyboard checks or establish untested screen-reader behavior.

Omar: Exactly. The automated scan and manual results belong together with their boundaries, not as competing claims that one erases the other.

Read the phrases aloud. Then complete the conversation on the following pages using the word bank.

Conversation

The modal is labeled, but focus is outside

Fictional Edit Address modal. Acceptance criteria: opening moves focus inside; Tab and Shift+Tab cycle within the modal; Escape closes it; closing returns focus to the still-present Edit Address button. Tested desktop build A6: labels pass the automated scan, but opening leaves keyboard focus on the background page, Tab reaches a background link, and Escape closes without restoring focus. Screen-reader behavior has not been tested.

Complete the numbered gaps. Use each bank entry once; some entries contain several words.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

modal semantics / focus containment / focus restoration / initial focus /
keyboard sequence / automated scan

- 01 **Leah:** The label scan passes, but I can't complete the keyboard acceptance check. Opening Edit Address leaves focus on the page behind the modal.
- 02 **Omar:** Then the ¹ _____ behavior is wrong for our criterion. A visible overlay doesn't tell us where keyboard input goes.
- 03 **Leah:** When I press Tab, a background link receives focus. The modal is still on screen, so the visual state and keyboard path disagree.
- 04 **Omar:** That breaks the required ² _____. We need to test the forward and reverse cycle inside, not just whether the first button can be clicked.
- 05 **Leah:** I haven't completed a reverse-cycle check yet. I'll record that as pending rather than infer its result from the forward failure.
- 06 **Omar:** Good. Keep the ³ _____ and actual focus targets in the report. That gives me a reproducible behavior to inspect.

Conversation / continued

- 07 **Leah:** Escape closes the overlay, but focus doesn't return to the Edit Address button. The button is still present and our criterion names it.
- 08 **Omar:** Then ⁴ _____ also needs correction. Closing visually is only one part of that interaction.
- 09 **Leah:** Someone suggested adding aria-modal true. Does the attribute itself trap keyboard focus or choose the return target?
- 10 **Omar:** No. The ⁵ _____ must match implemented behavior. An attribute doesn't do all the focus management for us.

Conversation continues on the next page.

The modal is labeled, but focus is outside

CONVERSATION / CONTINUED

- 11 **Leah:** I'll retain the passing label result, but not mark the whole dialog accessible. We haven't tested it with a screen reader.
- 12 **Omar:** Exactly. The ⁶ _____ and manual results belong together with their boundaries, not as competing claims that one erases the other.
- 13 **Leah:** For the defect steps, I'll identify build A6, open from the button using the keyboard, then record where focus lands and where Tab takes it.
- 14 **Omar:** Include the browser and operating-system versions you actually used when attaching the run record. Don't fill those fields with guesses.
- 15 **Leah:** After a fix, I'll check both directions across the first and last tabbable controls, then Escape and the return target.
- 16 **Omar:** Yes. That's the proposed verification sequence. We shouldn't say it passed until those actions have actually been checked on the revised build.
- 17 **Leah:** And the starting control inside the dialog should follow our design decision. The general pattern doesn't require every dialog to focus the same type of element.
- 18 **Omar:** Correct. Content and workflow can affect the appropriate initial target. Here, our supplied criterion requires an inside target, not a guessed universal first field.
- 19 **Leah:** The handoff is labels passed; opening, forward containment, and restoration failed; reverse cycling pending; screen-reader checks not performed.
- 20 **Omar:** That is actionable. It preserves what works, what failed, and what still needs evidence without turning one automated result into a blanket approval.

CHECK THE GAPS

1. initial focus / 2. focus containment / 3. keyboard sequence / 4. focus restoration / 5. modal semantics / 6. automated scan

[Why these answers fit, page 164](#)

A visible close is only part of the check

New fictional modal: opening moves focus inside; forward Tab cycles inside; Shift+Tab has not been checked. Escape closes it, but focus remains on the page body instead of the still-present invoking button required by its criterion. Labels passed an automated scan. Screen-reader behavior is untested.

Complete the exchange using each phrase once. Read both roles, then switch roles and repeat with the bank covered.

WORD AND PHRASE BANK

unchecked / untested / passed / failed

- 01 **Tester:** Forward containment has ¹ _____ .
- 02 **Developer:** Reverse cycling remains ² _____ .
- 03 **Tester:** Focus restoration has ³ _____ .
- 04 **Developer:** Screen-reader behavior is ⁴ _____ .

CHECK THE GAPS

1. passed / 2. unchecked / 3. failed / 4. untested

[Why these answers fit, page 164](#)

Keep the distinction audible

Report keyboard behavior separately from an automated accessibility scan.

01 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. Which case is contradictory?

A. Cancellation exactly 24 hours before the event

The two supplied examples disagree specifically at exactly twenty-four hours.

[Return to the exercise, page 4](#)

A2. Who can clarify the intended rule?

C. The requirement owner

The scenario gives the requirement owner authority to clarify the equality case.

[Return to the exercise, page 4](#)

A3. What is outside this discussion?

D. Time-zone handling

Time-zone handling is explicitly excluded from this exercise's scope.

[Return to the exercise, page 4](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which question isolates the unresolved rule?

D. At exactly 24 hours before the event, should cancellation be accepted or rejected?

Only the equality question asks for the intended outcome at the conflicting endpoint; observed behavior and excluded time zones do not settle it.

[Return to the exercise, page 8](#)

D2. What should serve as the test expectation?

C. The explicitly clarified requirement

A justified expectation must follow the agreed rule rather than an unsupported assumption.

[Return to the exercise, page 8](#)

01 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Condition used to judge whether a requirement is met. Which term fits?

C. acceptance criterion

A Not here. traceability: Ability to link a test or result to its supporting requirement. The usual combination is "maintain traceability".

B Not here. inclusive limit: Limit that includes the endpoint itself. The usual combination is "specify an inclusive limit".

C Correct. acceptance criterion: Condition used to judge whether a requirement is met. The usual combination is "refine the acceptance criterion".

D Not here. business rule: Product behavior specified for a business purpose. The usual combination is "confirm the business rule".

[Return to the exercise, page 8](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?". Maya: "My first reading included the endpoint, but I haven't treated that as an approved product rule. I need the owner's decision." Dev: [missing response] Maya: "The precise question is accept or reject at exactly twenty-four hours. I want to leave time-zone conversion outside this particular clarification." Which response belongs in the gap?

A. Good. Label it an assumption until the requirement decision is explicit. Your reading may be reasonable, but it is not enough to declare the product correct or defective.

A Correct. This is Dev's response in turn 6. It connects Maya's preceding point with Maya's follow-up. Assumption marks Maya's preferred interpretation as unconfirmed rather than an agreed cancellation rule.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Maya says: "Before I finalize the cancellation test, can we resolve the two examples for exactly twenty-four hours before the event? One accepts it; one rejects it." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Maya says: "They describe the same endpoint, not nearby times. I can't give the test two incompatible expected outcomes for the same condition." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 20, after Maya says: "For now: equality unresolved, expected result pending, time zones outside this discussion. I haven't selected accept or reject." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 8](#)

E / Conversation

1. equality case

Turn 2. Equality case is the input exactly twenty-four hours before the event, where the examples disagree.

01 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. contradiction

Turn 4. Contradiction identifies the incompatible accept and reject outcomes assigned to the same input.

3. assumption

Turn 6. Assumption marks Maya's preferred interpretation as unconfirmed rather than an agreed cancellation rule.

4. scope boundary

Turn 8. Scope boundary excludes time-zone handling and keeps the discussion focused on the conflicting endpoint rule.

5. test oracle

Turn 10. Test oracle is the reference for correct behavior and cannot be established merely by copying the current implementation.

6. decision record

Turn 12. Decision record preserves the owner's clarified outcome so examples and tests can consistently refer to it.

7. inclusive limit

Turn 14. Inclusive limit would include the endpoint, but that interpretation has not yet been selected for this requirement.

8. clarification request

Turn 16. Clarification request asks for the missing authoritative outcome while retaining the evidence of the conflicting examples.

9. traceability

Turn 18. Traceability links the updated test and examples to the requirement decision that justifies their expectation.

10. pass/fail judgment

Turn 20. Pass/fail judgment requires an agreed expected outcome, which the unresolved equality case does not yet provide.

[Return to the conversation, page 10](#)

01 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which status is accurate now?

A. Equality remains unresolved

No owner decision has resolved the contradictory equality examples yet.

[Return to the exercise, page 12](#)

F2. What should follow clarification?

A. Align the examples and link the test to the decision

Updating conflicting examples and preserving the decision supports consistent test expectations.

[Return to the exercise, page 12](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. 24

Tester: The examples conflict at exactly 24 hours.

Turn 1. Both examples concern the exact twenty-four-hour boundary before the event.

2. unresolved

Owner: The equality case remains unresolved.

Turn 2. No decision has selected acceptance or rejection for that exact case.

3. result

Tester: The test needs an agreed expected result.

Turn 3. A test judgment requires an authoritative expected result for the input.

4. discussion

Owner: Time-zone handling is outside this discussion.

Turn 4. The scenario explicitly excludes time-zone handling from this focused clarification.

[Return to the conversation, page 13](#)

01 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?". Maya: "I'll hold off calling the boundary inclusive. That describes one possible decision, and the other example currently says the opposite." Dev: [missing response] Maya: "I can attach the two examples and the one equality question. That should give the owner a focused decision instead of a vague requirement complaint." Which response belongs in the gap?

C. Exactly. An inclusive limit is one possible decision, not a fact we have already agreed. Keep the options separate from the final rule.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Maya says: "Once the outcome is agreed, I'll record it and correct the conflicting example. A note saying clarified without the actual rule won't be enough." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Maya says: "I can attach the two examples and the one equality question. That should give the owner a focused decision instead of a vague requirement complaint." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Correct. This is Dev's response in turn 14. It connects Maya's preceding point with Maya's follow-up. Inclusive limit would include the endpoint, but that interpretation has not yet been selected for this requirement.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 18, after Maya says: "I'll link the updated expectation to that decision. Silently changing an example would hide why we chose the new outcome." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 13](#)

02 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. Which build did Hana test?

D. Q12

The reported omission was observed specifically on build Q12.

[Return to the exercise, page 14](#)

A2. What did Joel successfully export?

C. One item

Joel's successful attempt used one item rather than Hana's three-item selection.

[Return to the exercise, page 14](#)

A3. What frequency is established?

A. Two omissions in two attempts with the saved selection

Hana observed the same omission in both of her two stated attempts.

[Return to the exercise, page 14](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which title best preserves the evidence?

A. Q12 export omits last item from saved three-item selection, observed twice

The title includes the build, input, behavior, and bounded observed frequency.

[Return to the exercise, page 18](#)

D2. Why does Joel's result not refute Hana's?

D. The selection size differs

A one-item input does not reproduce the reported three-item conditions.

[Return to the exercise, page 18](#)

02 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Retained set of items used as input. Which term fits?

C. saved selection

A Not here. selection size: Number of items included in the chosen input. The usual combination is "compare selection size".

B Not here. reproduction run: Repeat intended to check the reported behavior. The usual combination is "perform a reproduction run".

C Correct. saved selection: Retained set of items used as input. The usual combination is "reuse the saved selection".

D Not here. equivalent mutant: Modified variant with the same observable behavior for the relevant domain. The usual combination is "investigate an equivalent mutant".

[Return to the exercise, page 18](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "I'll attach the output alongside it. The export isn't empty; comparing selected and exported items shows which one disappeared." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "For frequency, I'm writing two out of two attempts. Always would make it sound as though I'd tested a much larger set." Which response belongs in the gap?

D. That distinguishes the actual output from a total failure. We need the precise omission, not just export broken.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Hana says: "Q12 exported only two of my three selected items. The last selected item is missing, and I got the same omission in both attempts." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 20, after Hana says: "My handoff will include both observations and the exact reproducer, with two attempts out of two and untested conditions listed." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Hana says: "Your one-item pass should stay too. It doesn't erase my failure, but neither should we erase a genuine successful case." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Correct. This is Joel's response in turn 6. It connects Hana's preceding point with Hana's follow-up. Actual output is the produced export, which demonstrates the specific missing final item rather than a total export failure.

[Return to the exercise, page 18](#)

E / Conversation

1. cannot reproduce

Turn 2. Cannot reproduce must be qualified by Joel's different one-item attempt rather than treated as refutation of Hana's conditions.

02 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. input parity

Turn 4. Input parity requires using the same saved three-item selection instead of comparing it with a different one-item input.

3. actual output

Turn 6. Actual output is the produced export, which demonstrates the specific missing final item rather than a total export failure.

4. denominator

Turn 8. Denominator is the two total attempts supporting the observed two-out-of-two frequency, not an unlimited set of exports.

5. reproduction run

Turn 10. Reproduction run describes the repeated attempt under the reported conditions, while leaving broader behavior untested.

6. defect report

Turn 12. Defect report can document reproducible behavior and conditions without inventing an internal explanation for the omission.

7. build identifier

Turn 14. Build identifier Q12 ties the observation to the tested software version and prevents assumptions about untested builds.

8. scope of evidence

Turn 16. Scope of evidence includes the separate one-item success and three-item failures without generalizing to untested conditions.

9. minimal reproduction

Turn 18. Minimal reproduction is a smaller retained failure example, which has not yet been established by the current observations.

10. evidence bundle

Turn 20. Evidence bundle combines the saved input, actual output, build, action, and frequency needed for a focused investigation.

[Return to the conversation, page 20](#)

02 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which next attempt is most directly relevant?

D. Use Q12 and the same saved three-item selection

Matching the reported build and input directly checks the existing reproduction.

[Return to the exercise, page 22](#)

F2. Which claim is unsupported?

B. Every selection size is affected

No selection sizes beyond the stated one-item and three-item cases have been checked.

[Return to the exercise, page 22](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. Q12

Tester: The tested build is Q12.

Turn 1. Hana's reported omission is tied specifically to build Q12.

2. three

Developer: The saved selection contains three items.

Turn 2. The reproducible input is the saved selection of three items.

3. last

Tester: The last selected item is omitted.

Turn 3. The reported defect removes the final selected item from the export.

4. two

Developer: The omission occurred in two attempts out of two.

Turn 4. Hana observed the omission in both of the two reported attempts.

[Return to the conversation, page 23](#)

02 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "I'll put Q12 first, then the saved input, export action, and item comparison. That should make the starting conditions clear." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "Your one-item pass should stay too. It doesn't erase my failure, but neither should we erase a genuine successful case." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. Good. The build identifier matters. A result from another version belongs in the record with that difference, not as an identical repeat.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Hana says: "Q12 exported only two of my three selected items. The last selected item is missing, and I got the same omission in both attempts." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Joel's response in turn 14. It connects Hana's preceding point with Hana's follow-up. Build identifier Q12 ties the observation to the tested software version and prevents assumptions about untested builds.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Hana says: "I suspect a loop boundary, but I don't have internal evidence. Should I leave that theory out of the title?" It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 10, after Hana says: "The second attempt used the same build and selection and lost the same final item. I haven't changed any code or checked a fix." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 23](#)

03 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. Which whole-number values are accepted by the rule?

D. 1 through 20 inclusive

The stated acceptance range includes both one and twenty.

[Return to the exercise, page 26](#)

A2. What is missing from 5, 10, and 15?

B. Endpoint and outside-range checks

All three proposed inputs lie inside the accepted range rather than at or beyond its limits.

[Return to the exercise, page 26](#)

A3. What is known about decimals?

B. Handling is unspecified

The supplied whole-number rule does not specify decimal handling.

[Return to the exercise, page 26](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which six-value set checks both endpoints and their immediate neighbors?

D. 0, 1, 2, 19, 20, 21

The correct set includes each endpoint and the nearest whole number on either side.

[Return to the exercise, page 30](#)

D2. Which expected result is correct?

C. Accept 20 and reject 21

Twenty is included in the stated range, while twenty-one lies above it.

[Return to the exercise, page 30](#)

03 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Input group accepted under the specified rule. Which term fits?

A. valid partition

A Correct. valid partition: Input group accepted under the specified rule. The usual combination is "sample the valid partition".

B Not here. decision rule: Condition-to-outcome relationship. The usual combination is "map the decision rule".

C Not here. input domain: Set of inputs relevant to the defined problem. The usual combination is "state the input domain".

D Not here. whole number: Number without a fractional part in the stated quantity context. The usual combination is "enter a whole number".

[Return to the exercise, page 30](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits". Rosa: "I propose zero, one, two, nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one. That includes each endpoint and the nearest relevant value on either side." Amir: [missing response] Rosa: "Two and nineteen are accepted, but they test just inside the edges. I'll explain that role rather than describe the extra values as more coverage without details." Which response belongs in the gap?

A. The adjacent value matters because a comparison can be wrong by one. Checking only five would not expose an error that rejects one but accepts the rest.

A Correct. This is Amir's response in turn 6. It connects Rosa's preceding point with Rosa's follow-up. Adjacent value refers to the nearest whole-number neighbor beside an endpoint, such as zero or two beside one.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Rosa says: "The nearest rejected whole-number values are zero and twenty-one. They check both sides of the accepted one-through-twenty range." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Rosa says: "I'll map below one, one through twenty, and above twenty to their outcomes, with decimal handling visibly unresolved rather than silently added to reject." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Rosa says: "The quantity tests use five, ten, and fifteen. All sit inside the accepted range, so none reaches the point where the rule changes." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 30](#)

E / Conversation

1. boundary value

Turn 2. Boundary value identifies an endpoint where the quantity rule changes between acceptance and rejection.

03 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. invalid partition

Turn 4. An invalid partition contains whole-number inputs outside the accepted one-through-twenty range that the rule says to reject.

3. adjacent value

Turn 6. Adjacent value refers to the nearest whole-number neighbor beside an endpoint, such as zero or two beside one.

4. boundary value analysis

Turn 8. Boundary value analysis concentrates case selection on endpoints and nearby inputs rather than only central accepted values.

5. expected result

Turn 10. Expected result states the outcome required by the rule, which is distinct from an actual result of an executed test.

6. inclusive range

Turn 12. Inclusive range includes both stated endpoints, so one and twenty belong to the accepted set.

7. decimal input

Turn 14. Decimal input falls outside the supplied whole-number rule and needs its own clarified handling policy.

8. decision table

Turn 16. A decision table maps the stated quantity regions to their required outcomes without inventing a decimal rule.

9. Case selection

Turn 18. Case selection concerns which meaningful conditions are checked, not merely how many tests exist.

10. coverage

Turn 20. Coverage describes the conditions addressed by the proposed cases, not proof that every defect is absent or every test has passed.

[Return to the conversation, page 32](#)

03 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which decimal statement is justified?

B. The rule requires clarification for decimals

The scenario provides no decimal policy or completed decimal checks.

[Return to the exercise, page 34](#)

F2. Which coverage claim is appropriate?

A. The proposed set addresses the missing edges but has not been executed

Case design identifies intended coverage, but execution evidence is still absent.

[Return to the exercise, page 34](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. 1

Tester: The accepted lower endpoint is 1.

Turn 1. One is explicitly included as the lower endpoint of the range.

2. 20

Developer: The accepted upper endpoint is 20.

Turn 2. Twenty is explicitly included as the upper endpoint of the range.

3. 21

Tester: The whole number immediately above the range is 21.

Turn 3. Twenty-one is the nearest whole number above the accepted upper endpoint.

4. unspecified

Developer: Decimal handling remains unspecified.

Turn 4. The stated rule provides no handling policy for decimal input.

[Return to the conversation, page 35](#)

03 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Five, ten, and fifteen never touch the limits". Rosa: "What about one point five? The stated rule covers whole-number quantities, and we haven't been given a fractional-input policy." Amir: [missing response] Rosa: "I'll map below one, one through twenty, and above twenty to their outcomes, with decimal handling visibly unresolved rather than silently added to reject." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. Then decimal input needs a separate clarification. We should not invent rounding, truncation, acceptance, or rejection and present it as an existing requirement.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 20, after Rosa says: "I'll submit the six cases and expected outcomes as a proposal, not a pass report. The separate decimal question remains open." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Amir's response in turn 14. It connects Rosa's preceding point with Rosa's follow-up. Decimal input falls outside the supplied whole-number rule and needs its own clarified handling policy.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 18, after Rosa says: "We can retain useful interior cases, but their count won't establish edge coverage. Three central examples still miss both endpoints." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 10, after Rosa says: "At the lower edge, zero should reject and one and two should accept. Those are expectations; the new cases haven't run." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 35](#)

04 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. What did the smoke test cover?

B. Sign-in and opening the account page

The supplied smoke test covers only sign-in and opening the account page.

[Return to the exercise, page 36](#)

A2. Which paths use the changed formatter?

A. Account-save and existing export

The formatter is shared by account-save and the existing export path.

[Return to the exercise, page 36](#)

A3. How much time remains?

B. One hour

The scenario allows one hour for additional checking, not unlimited coverage.

[Return to the exercise, page 36](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which summary is accurate?

B. Smoke passed for sign-in and page opening; save and export remain untested

The summary preserves the exact checked scope and both missing consumer paths.

[Return to the exercise, page 40](#)

D2. Why include export in follow-up?

D. It uses the changed formatter

Shared-component usage creates a relevant change-impact question for the existing export path.

[Return to the exercise, page 40](#)

04 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Component used by more than one path or feature. Which term fits?

D. shared component

A Not here. execution evidence: Record of checks actually run and their results. The usual combination is "distinguish execution evidence".

B Not here. coverage gap: Relevant behavior not yet checked. The usual combination is "report the coverage gap".

C Not here. coverage claim: Statement about what the tests have exercised. The usual combination is "limit the coverage claim".

D Correct. shared component: Component used by more than one path or feature. The usual combination is "identify the shared component".

[Return to the exercise, page 40](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "Opening the page doesn't compare the formatted saved value. It also doesn't generate an export whose contents we can check." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "We have one hour. I'd focus on each consumer's output, with an explicit expected representation, before spending time on unrelated screens." Which response belongs in the gap?

C. That's the coverage gap. We have basic access evidence, not results for the two consumers of the changed formatter.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Elena says: "Sign-in and opening the account page passed. I don't want that smoke result reported as account-save or export tested; neither path ran." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 14, after Elena says: "Both proposed checks are still planned. I'll update their statuses only after execution gives us actual results." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Correct. This is Sam's response in turn 6. It connects Elena's preceding point with Elena's follow-up. Coverage gap names the untested account-save and export behavior that the narrow smoke test did not exercise.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Elena says: "We have one hour. I'd focus on each consumer's output, with an explicit expected representation, before spending time on unrelated screens." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 40](#)

E / Conversation

1. smoke test

Turn 2. Smoke test describes the small basic check set, not evidence that every changed behavior has been exercised.

04 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. shared component

Turn 4. Shared component identifies the formatter used by both account-save and export, linking both paths to the modification.

3. coverage gap

Turn 6. Coverage gap names the untested account-save and export behavior that the narrow smoke test did not exercise.

4. selection rationale

Turn 8. Selection rationale explains why the changed formatter's consumers deserve attention within the limited testing time.

5. timebox

Turn 10. Timebox is the one-hour limit on additional work, which does not expand the meaning of the evidence collected.

6. change impact

Turn 12. Change impact concerns the plausible effect of the modified formatter on both consumers without asserting an unmeasured failure probability.

7. execution evidence

Turn 14. Execution evidence consists of actual performed checks and results, not a planned check list.

8. residual risk

Turn 16. Residual risk is the uncertainty or exposure remaining after the checks actually completed, including unfinished planned work.

9. test objective

Turn 18. Test objective specifies the formatted behavior to verify in each consumer path rather than only opening a screen.

10. test summary

Turn 20. Test summary combines checked scope, actual results, proposed follow-up, and limits without claiming complete coverage or release approval.

[Return to the conversation, page 42](#)

04 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. What does one hour justify?

B. Prioritized checks with disclosed gaps

The timebox limits testing and requires explicit reporting of remaining uncertainty.

[Return to the exercise, page 44](#)

F2. Which statement confuses plan and evidence?

A. Both paths passed because we intend to check them

Intending to run checks provides no evidence that either path has passed.

[Return to the exercise, page 44](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. smoke

Tester: The smoke test covered sign-in and opening the page.

Turn 1. The initial smoke test was limited to those two basic actions.

2. formatter

Lead: Both paths use the changed formatter.

Turn 2. The formatter is shared by account-save and the existing export path.

3. tested

Tester: Neither account-save nor export has been tested.

Turn 3. The scenario provides no execution result for either consumer path.

4. hour

Lead: We have one hour for further checking.

Turn 4. One hour is the stated time available for additional testing.

[Return to the conversation, page 45](#)

04 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "Both proposed checks are still planned. I'll update their statuses only after execution gives us actual results." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "If only one consumer finishes, I'll identify which one and its result. I won't combine it with the other under formatter verified." Which response belongs in the gap?

D. Keep execution evidence separate from intention. A planned check doesn't become passed because we expect it to be straightforward.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 6, after Elena says: "Opening the page doesn't compare the formatted saved value. It also doesn't generate an export whose contents we can check." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Elena says: "We have one hour. I'd focus on each consumer's output, with an explicit expected representation, before spending time on unrelated screens." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Elena says: "Sign-in and opening the account page passed. I don't want that smoke result reported as account-save or export tested; neither path ran." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Correct. This is Sam's response in turn 14. It connects Elena's preceding point with Elena's follow-up. Execution evidence consists of actual performed checks and results, not a planned check list.

[Return to the exercise, page 45](#)

05 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. When does the search check fail?

B. After the cleanup check

The reported failure occurs when cleanup runs before search on T8.

[Return to the exercise, page 48](#)

A2. What does cleanup remove?

C. The shared sample record search expects

Cleanup deletes the same sample record required by the search check.

[Return to the exercise, page 48](#)

A3. What changes between the observations?

B. Order and relevant starting state, not code

No code change occurs; the supplied difference concerns test order and shared data.

[Return to the exercise, page 48](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which explanation matches the evidence?

D. Cleanup removes data needed by the later search check

The supplied shared-record relationship explains the observed order-dependent interference.

[Return to the exercise, page 52](#)

D2. What comparison most directly tests the reported interference?

B. Record presence before search alone and after cleanup on T8

The difference is the shared record removed by cleanup; matching the build while observing record presence targets that interference.

[Return to the exercise, page 52](#)

05 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Preparation establishing a test's starting conditions. Which term fits?

C. setup

A Not here. sample record: Prepared data item used for testing. The usual combination is "preserve the sample record".

B Not here. false alarm: Failure signal not caused by the claimed product defect. The usual combination is "investigate a false alarm".

C Correct. setup: Preparation establishing a test's starting conditions. The usual combination is "verify setup".

D Not here. interference: Effect of one check on another's operation. The usual combination is "remove test interference".

[Return to the exercise, page 52](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "Cleanup deletes what search expects". Noah: "A standalone rerun could turn the report green without fixing the sequence that lost the record. It would hide what we need to investigate." Aisha: [missing response] Noah: "We need to decide who creates and removes the sample. Right now cleanup assumes ownership of something search treats as available." Which response belongs in the gap?

A. Exactly. A rerun is another observation, not a repair. Keep its changed context visible instead of replacing the failure with it.

A Correct. This is Aisha's response in turn 6. It connects Noah's preceding point with Noah's follow-up. Rerun is another execution, whose success does not repair the original interference between cleanup and search.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 20, after Noah says: "My handoff will show T8, unchanged code, deletion of the expected record, and the two observed outcomes. The revised arrangement is not yet verified." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Noah says: "I'll retain the failing order and logs. The successful isolated run belongs beside them as a comparison, not as a replacement." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 10, after Noah says: "We could give each check its own records, or establish the required state explicitly without depending on another check's leftovers." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 52](#)

E / Conversation

1. execution order

Turn 2. Execution order is the relevant sequence in which cleanup precedes the failing search check on the same build.

05 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. order dependency

Turn 4. Order dependency means the search result depends on cleanup having run first and removed its required record.

3. rerun

Turn 6. Rerun is another execution, whose success does not repair the original interference between cleanup and search.

4. test data ownership

Turn 8. Test data ownership assigns responsibility for creating and removing records so one check does not invalidate another's preconditions.

5. test isolation

Turn 10. Test isolation prevents another check's state changes from determining whether search has its required starting data.

6. failure evidence

Turn 12. Failure evidence preserves the observed failing sequence and its conditions even when a different standalone attempt passes.

7. precondition

Turn 14. Precondition is the required sample-record state that must be established before the search check starts.

8. interference

Turn 16. Interference is cleanup's unintended effect on the later search check through removal of its required record.

9. verification run

Turn 18. Verification run checks the revised data arrangement under the relevant sequence instead of assuming the proposed fix succeeded.

10. environment state

Turn 20. Environment state includes the sample-record presence that changes between suite and standalone execution despite an unchanged build.

[Return to the conversation, page 54](#)

05 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which action is not a demonstrated fix?

B. Rerun alone until the check passes

A standalone pass leaves the original suite interference unresolved.

[Return to the exercise, page 56](#)

F2. What should verification include?

A. The relevant sequence after the data arrangement is corrected

Verification must address the sequence and starting-state problem that produced the failure.

[Return to the exercise, page 56](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. T8

Engineer: Both observations use build T8.

Turn 1. The scenario names T8 for both the suite and standalone observations.

2. cleanup

Tester: Search fails after cleanup.

Turn 2. Cleanup runs first and removes the record required by search.

3. record

Engineer: The shared sample record is removed.

Turn 3. The missing sample record is the relevant starting-state difference.

4. isolation

Tester: A standalone pass does not prove test isolation.

Turn 4. The original shared-data interference remains despite a successful standalone execution.

[Return to the conversation, page 57](#)

05 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Cleanup deletes what search expects". Noah: "The record's presence is required before the search assertion can mean anything. We shouldn't leave that hidden in the environment." Aisha: [missing response] Noah: "Cleanup also needs narrower ownership checks. A broad delete based on a shared label could still remove another test's record." Which response belongs in the gap?

A. Establish the precondition in setup. A missing fixture and an application search defect are different problems to report.

A Correct. This is Aisha's response in turn 14. It connects Noah's preceding point with Noah's follow-up. Precondition is the required sample-record state that must be established before the search check starts.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Noah says: "I'll retain the failing order and logs. The successful isolated run belongs beside them as a comparison, not as a replacement." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Noah says: "Cleanup also needs narrower ownership checks. A broad delete based on a shared label could still remove another test's record." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Noah says: "Search fails after cleanup on T8 but passes alone. I was about to enable reruns, though no code changed between these results." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 57](#)

06 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. What does the export defect do?

C. Omits the final row in one monthly workflow

The reported functional effect is a missing final export row in the monthly workflow.

[Return to the exercise, page 58](#)

A2. What will tomorrow's demonstration use?

A. The account page, with no export planned

The demonstration uses the account page, while export is not planned.

[Return to the exercise, page 58](#)

A3. What decision has already been made?

A. No final repair order or release approval is supplied

The scenario provides discussion facts but no final scheduling or release decision.

[Return to the exercise, page 58](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which comparison is accurate?

A. Export loses a row; the typo is widely visible and relevant to tomorrow's demo

The correct comparison preserves functional impact, reach, and event timing separately.

[Return to the exercise, page 62](#)

D2. What does the demonstration establish?

B. A timing reason to discuss the typo urgently

The planned account-page demonstration affects scheduling relevance, not defect correctness or release authority.

[Return to the exercise, page 62](#)

06 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Effect on the ability to perform the intended task. Which term fits?

C. functional impact

A Not here. cosmetic defect: Presentation issue without an established functional failure here. The usual combination is "classify a cosmetic defect carefully".

B Not here. decision owner: Person responsible for a specified decision. The usual combination is "identify the decision owner".

C Correct. functional impact: Effect on the ability to perform the intended task. The usual combination is "explain functional impact".

D Not here. risk acceptance: Authorized decision to proceed with identified exposure. The usual combination is "distinguish risk acceptance".

[Return to the exercise, page 62](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo". Lina: "The typo appears on every account page, including the one used in tomorrow's demonstration. No export is planned for that event." Marcus: [missing response] Lina: "So its visibility is broad, while the export has a different functional consequence. I don't want account-wide to become a substitute for an impact analysis." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. That gives the typo immediate business timing. We should discuss it urgently for that reason, while keeping its presentation effect distinct from the export's missing data.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Lina says: "Does discussing the typo urgently imply the export is cleared to ship? I'd like the meeting note to avoid linking those decisions." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Marcus's response in turn 6. It connects Lina's preceding point with Lina's follow-up. Business timing captures the upcoming demonstration's relevance to scheduling without equating it with greater functional harm.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 10, after Lina says: "We haven't been supplied a severity scale. I'll describe the observed consequences before assigning labels such as critical or minor." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Lina says: "Before we rank these issues, can we separate missing export data from the heading typo? Tomorrow's demonstration affects urgency, but not the underlying consequences." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 62](#)

E / Conversation

1. functional impact

Turn 2. Functional impact identifies what the export defect prevents or corrupts, here completeness of the exported rows.

06 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. Frequency

Turn 4. Frequency describes how often the monthly workflow occurs and does not determine the seriousness of a missing row by itself.

3. business timing

Turn 6. Business timing captures the upcoming demonstration's relevance to scheduling without equating it with greater functional harm.

4. Reach

Turn 8. Reach describes the affected surfaces, such as every account page, rather than the degree of functional damage.

5. defect classification

Turn 10. Defect classification should follow the actual agreed categories rather than invented labels based only on frequency or visibility.

6. Priority

Turn 12. Priority concerns urgency or work order and does not itself authorize release with an unresolved defect.

7. disposition

Turn 14. Disposition is the specific handling decision for each issue, which must not be replaced by a vague handled status.

8. workaround

Turn 16. Workaround is an alternative way to complete the task, and none has been established for the incomplete export.

9. evidence-based comparison

Turn 18. Evidence-based comparison uses the stated effects and demonstration scope without inventing severity ratings, workarounds, or approvals.

10. risk acceptance

Turn 20. Risk acceptance is an explicit authorized decision about identified exposure, not an inference from urgency or a triage conversation.

[Return to the conversation, page 64](#)

06 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which claim needs more evidence?

B. A workaround exists for the export

No alternative export method or verified workaround is supplied.

[Return to the exercise, page 67](#)

F2. Which statement avoids a false decision?

D. The repair order and release disposition still need agreement

The scenario gives no final scheduling or authorization decision.

[Return to the exercise, page 67](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. row

Tester: The export omits the final row.

Turn 1. The supplied export defect concerns the final row of the monthly output.

2. page

Lead: The typo appears on every account page.

Turn 2. The heading typo has stated visibility across every account page.

3. tomorrow

Tester: The demonstration is tomorrow.

Turn 3. Tomorrow is the event timing that makes the account-page typo immediately relevant.

4. undecided

Lead: The final repair order is still undecided.

Turn 4. No final repair sequence is supplied by the scenario's discussion facts.

[Return to the conversation, page 68](#)

06 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo".
Lina: "Then each issue needs a recorded outcome once decided: corrected, deferred, or still pending. Handled wouldn't tell the next person which one applies." **Marcus:** [missing response] **Lina:** "We also don't have a verified alternative export method. I won't soften the risk statement by inventing a workaround." **Which response belongs in the gap?**

B. Exactly. Record the disposition once the authorized decision is made. Do not write deferred as though it meant corrected.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 20, after Lina says: "I'll leave the repair order and release disposition pending. Strongly arguing for urgency doesn't mean I can announce an authorization." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Marcus's response in turn 14. It connects Lina's preceding point with Lina's follow-up. Disposition is the specific handling decision for each issue, which must not be replaced by a vague handled status.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Lina says: "So its visibility is broad, while the export has a different functional consequence. I don't want account-wide to become a substitute for an impact analysis." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Lina says: "Monthly is the workflow frequency, not proof that the missing row is harmless. We should retain the actual completeness problem in the description." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 68](#)

07 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. What was the session's charter?

A. Investigate interrupted profile edits

The stated exploratory goal concerns interruption during profile editing.

[Return to the exercise, page 71](#)

A2. What happens after a saved edit?

B. Navigating away preserves the value

The saved-edit observation shows persistence after navigating away.

[Return to the exercise, page 71](#)

A3. What is unresolved?

D. Whether a warning is required for unsaved edits

Warning requirements are unspecified even though the no-warning behavior was observed.

[Return to the exercise, page 71](#)

D / Response choices

D1. Which report matches the observations?

D. Saved edits persist; unsaved edits are lost without warning

The two stated navigation sequences have different outcomes that must remain separate.

[Return to the exercise, page 75](#)

D2. What should be requested?

C. Clarification of whether an unsaved-edit warning is required

The missing rule concerns the intended warning behavior for unsaved navigation.

[Return to the exercise, page 75](#)

07 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Fixed time allocated to an investigation. Which term fits?

C. timebox

A Not here. user journey: Sequence of actions a user takes toward an objective. The usual combination is "describe the user journey".

B Not here. scope exclusion: Area explicitly not covered by the investigation. The usual combination is "list a scope exclusion".

C Correct. timebox: Fixed time allocated to an investigation. The usual combination is "respect the timebox".

D Not here. saved state: Data retained after a completed save under the observed behavior. The usual combination is "verify saved state".

[Return to the exercise, page 75](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently". Isha: "When I left during an unsaved edit, the change disappeared without a warning. I didn't observe saved values disappearing in that sequence." Owen: [missing response] Isha: "The requirement doesn't say whether a warning is required. I can raise that question without choosing the policy myself." Which response belongs in the gap?

A. That is a specific observation. We can record both the lost change and the absence of a warning without yet deciding whether either violates a requirement.

A Correct. This is Owen's response in turn 6. It connects Isha's preceding point with Isha's follow-up. Observation reports the actual loss of the unsaved change without warning, without inventing an intended-behavior rule.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Isha says: "The requirement doesn't say whether a warning is required. I can raise that question without choosing the policy myself." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Isha says: "The lack of warning may confuse users, but I haven't established that it violates an agreed rule. Both points can stay in the report." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Isha says: "The twenty-minute duration tells you how long I explored, not that I covered every possible interruption. I'll name the paths actually checked." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 75](#)

E / Conversation

1. test charter

Turn 2. Test charter names the session's purpose, investigating interrupted profile edits, rather than a claim of complete feature coverage.

07 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. saved state

Turn 4. Saved state refers to the value retained after the completed save, which persisted through the observed navigation.

3. observation

Turn 6. Observation reports the actual loss of the unsaved change without warning, without inventing an intended-behavior rule.

4. requirement gap

Turn 8. Requirement gap identifies the missing warning rule needed to classify the observed behavior against intended expectations.

5. evidence trail

Turn 10. Evidence trail connects the question to the recorded action sequence and outcome so another person can investigate it.

6. usability concern

Turn 12. Usability concern can flag a potentially confusing user experience before an unspecified warning policy is resolved.

7. scope exclusion

Turn 14. Scope exclusion records that mobile behavior was not explored and prevents the observed result being generalized to it.

8. timebox

Turn 16. Timebox is the twenty-minute duration of the investigation, not a measure proving complete coverage of interruptions.

9. confirmed defect

Turn 18. Confirmed defect requires evidence of a departure from an applicable expectation, which the missing warning rule does not yet provide.

10. session outcome

Turn 20. Session outcome summarizes the explored behaviors and remaining questions without claiming all profile edits or mobile behavior were tested.

[Return to the conversation, page 77](#)

07 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which claim exceeds the evidence?

D. Mobile shows the same result

Mobile was explicitly not explored, so its behavior is unknown.

[Return to the exercise, page 79](#)

F2. Why avoid calling this a confirmed warning defect now?

C. The applicable warning requirement is unspecified

A confirmed requirement violation needs an applicable expectation, which is missing for the warning.

[Return to the exercise, page 79](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. minutes

Tester: The session lasted twenty minutes.

Turn 1. Twenty minutes is the stated duration of the exploratory session.

2. saved

Analyst: The saved edit persisted after navigation.

Turn 2. The value remained when navigation followed a completed save.

3. warning

Tester: The unsaved edit was lost without a warning.

Turn 3. No warning appeared in the observed unsaved-navigation sequence.

4. Mobile

Analyst: Mobile behavior was not explored.

Turn 4. Mobile is explicitly outside the behavior explored in this session.

[Return to the conversation, page 80](#)

07 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Saved edits persist; unsaved edits disappear silently". Isha: "Mobile wasn't explored. That needs to remain visible if someone forwards the report to another platform team." Owen: [missing response] Isha: "The twenty-minute duration tells you how long I explored, not that I covered every possible interruption. I'll name the paths actually checked." Which response belongs in the gap?

A. List the scope exclusion. Untested mobile behavior is unknown, not assumed identical and not assumed different.

A Correct. This is Owen's response in turn 14. It connects Isha's preceding point with Isha's follow-up. Scope exclusion records that mobile behavior was not explored and prevents the observed result being generalized to it.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 18, after Isha says: "After the owner decides the warning rule, we can test against it. Until then the original observation stays attached to the clarification request." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 10, after Isha says: "I'll record edit, no save, navigate away, change absent, no warning. Saying profile loses data would omit the condition that makes this finding meaningful." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Isha says: "The charter was interrupted profile edits. In the saved path, I saved first and then navigated away; the value remained." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 80](#)

08 / Answers and explanations

A / Read the situation

A1. How are the ten checks divided?

D. Seven passed, one failed, two blocked

The stated totals are seven passes, one failure, and two blocked checks.

[Return to the exercise, page 81](#)

A2. Why is the critical-path criterion unmet?

D. One critical check is blocked and unexecuted

The criterion requires execution and review of every critical-path check, including the blocked one.

[Return to the exercise, page 81](#)

A3. Who owns the release decision?

D. Mara

Mara is explicitly named as the owner of the unresolved release decision.

[Return to the exercise, page 81](#)

D / Response choices

D1. How many checks have executed?

C. Eight

Seven passed checks plus one failed check equals eight executed checks.

[Return to the exercise, page 85](#)

D2. Which pair states pass proportions with matching denominators?

A. 70% of planned; 87.5% of executed

Seven divided by ten planned is 70%; seven divided by eight executed is 87.5%. Neither rate satisfies the missing critical-path criterion.

[Return to the exercise, page 85](#)

08 / Answers and explanations / continued

D3. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Executed check not meeting its expected result. Which term fits?

A. failed check

A Correct. failed check: Executed check not meeting its expected result. The usual combination is "report the failed check".

B Not here. open defect: Unresolved product issue recorded for follow-up. The usual combination is "retain the open defect".

C Not here. criterion exception: Explicit authorized departure from an agreed criterion. The usual combination is "document a criterion exception".

D Not here. execution status: Whether and how a test has been run. The usual combination is "distinguish execution status".

[Return to the exercise, page 85](#)

D4. Rebuild the exchange from "Seven passed is not ten completed". Ben: "I'll keep blocked separate from failed. Those two never executed, so there's no result showing either success or an expectation mismatch." Mara: [missing response] Ben: "Eight ran: seven passes plus one failure. Ten is the planned total, not the number completed." Which response belongs in the gap?

C. Correct. A blocked check isn't a pass by default, and it isn't an executed failure. Name why it couldn't proceed.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Ben says: "I'll retain the failed result alongside the blockers. Otherwise the missing-data discussion could overshadow a defect we actually observed." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Ben says: "Q20 has ten planned checks: seven passed, one failed, two blocked by unavailable sample data. One of the blocked checks is critical." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Correct. This is Mara's response in turn 6. It connects Ben's preceding point with Ben's follow-up. Blocked check means execution is prevented by a missing prerequisite, not that the expected result was met or violated.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Ben says: "It hasn't. Every critical-path check must execute and have its evidence reviewed, and the blocked one has no result to review." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 85](#)

E / Conversation

1. status breakdown

Turn 2. Status breakdown accounts separately for all ten planned checks instead of hiding failure and blockers behind the pass count.

08 / Answers and explanations / continued

2. exit criterion

Turn 4. Exit criterion requires execution and review of every critical-path check, which the blocked critical check prevents us from satisfying.

3. blocked check

Turn 6. Blocked check means execution is prevented by a missing prerequisite, not that the expected result was met or violated.

4. execution status

Turn 8. Execution status separates the eight checks that ran from the two that could not run due to missing data.

5. denominator

Turn 10. Denominator determines whether the reported pass proportion uses ten planned checks or eight executed checks.

6. failed check

Turn 12. Failed check records an executed expectation mismatch and must remain visible separately from the unavailable-data blockers.

7. blocked dependency

Turn 14. Blocked dependency is the unavailable sample data that must be resolved before the affected checks can execute.

8. Review status

Turn 16. Review status is a separate requirement from execution under the stated criterion, so running a check alone is not sufficient.

9. release authority

Turn 18. Release authority remains with Mara, and the evidence report does not itself grant approval or an exception.

10. readiness evidence

Turn 20. Readiness evidence presents actual results and unmet conditions for the decision maker without claiming release approval.

[Return to the conversation, page 87](#)

08 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Accuracy and scope

F1. Which criterion statement is justified?

C. It is unmet because a critical check remains unexecuted

Every critical-path check must execute and be reviewed, and one remains blocked.

[Return to the exercise, page 89](#)

F2. Which handover is complete?

A. Q20: seven passed, one failed, two blocked including one critical; criterion unmet; Mara's decision pending

The complete handover includes all statuses, the critical gap, criterion consequence, and decision ownership.

[Return to the exercise, page 89](#)

F / Guided speaking

1. Seven

Tester: Seven checks passed.

Turn 1. The scenario establishes seven passed checks out of the ten planned.

2. One

Owner: One check failed.

Turn 2. One executed check failed and must remain distinct from blocked checks.

3. Two

Tester: Two checks are blocked by missing sample data.

Turn 3. Two checks could not execute because their required sample data was unavailable.

4. pending

Owner: The release decision remains pending.

Turn 4. Mara has not made the release decision, and the report is not approval.

[Return to the conversation, page 90](#)

08 / Answers and explanations / continued

F / Rebuild the exchange

1. Rebuild the exchange from "Seven passed is not ten completed". Ben: "The data request is still pending. I won't write data received or assume the tests will pass once somebody supplies it." Mara: [missing response] Ben: "And even after execution, the criterion still requires review. I'll show that separately instead of copying completed into every column." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. Keep that blocked dependency explicit. Requesting a prerequisite, receiving it, and executing a check are separate stages.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 18, after Ben says: "The report will say criterion unmet, no granted exception, and your production decision pending. This handoff isn't a sign-off." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Mara's response in turn 14. It connects Ben's preceding point with Ben's follow-up. Blocked dependency is the unavailable sample data that must be resolved before the affected checks can execute.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Ben says: "It hasn't. Every critical-path check must execute and have its evidence reviewed, and the blocked one has no result to review." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Ben says: "And even after execution, the criterion still requires review. I'll show that separately instead of copying completed into every column." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 90](#)

Review 1 / Explanations

Cumulative review

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Outcome observed when the test is executed. Which term fits?

B. actual result

A Not here. Boolean condition: Condition with a true or false value. The usual combination is "combine Boolean conditions".

B Correct. actual result: Outcome observed when the test is executed. The usual combination is "record the actual result".

C Not here. equality case: Input exactly equal to the specified threshold. The usual combination is "clarify the equality case".

D Not here. postcondition: State expected after the relevant action. The usual combination is "define the postcondition".

[Return to the exercise, page 24](#)

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Absence of something that should be included. Which term fits?

C. omission

A Not here. scope of evidence: Range of conditions actually supported by observations. The usual combination is "limit the scope of evidence".

B Not here. mutation testing: Checking test sensitivity using deliberately modified program variants. The usual combination is "interpret mutation testing results".

C Correct. omission: Absence of something that should be included. The usual combination is "report the final-item omission".

D Not here. defect report: Record describing a suspected or confirmed product problem. The usual combination is "submit a defect report".

[Return to the exercise, page 24](#)

Review 1 / Explanations / continued

3. Rebuild the exchange from "Exactly twenty-four hours: accept or reject?". Maya: "Could I copy what the application currently does into the expected result? It would finish the script, but wouldn't show whether the behavior is intended." Dev: [missing response] Maya: "Once the outcome is agreed, I'll record it and correct the conflicting example. A note saying clarified without the actual rule won't be enough." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. That would not establish the test oracle. We need the intended rule first, otherwise the test can repeat an existing mistake and still appear to pass.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Maya says: "Before I finalize the cancellation test, can we resolve the two examples for exactly twenty-four hours before the event? One accepts it; one rejects it." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Dev's response in turn 10. It connects Maya's preceding point with Maya's follow-up. Test oracle is the reference for correct behavior and cannot be established merely by copying the current implementation.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Maya says: "The precise question is accept or reject at exactly twenty-four hours. I want to leave time-zone conversion outside this particular clarification." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Maya says: "Once the outcome is agreed, I'll record it and correct the conflicting example. A note saying clarified without the actual rule won't be enough." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 24](#)

Review 1 / Explanations / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "If you reduce the input and the same omission remains, record that smaller case. We don't yet know the smallest failing selection." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "My handoff will include both observations and the exact reproducer, with two attempts out of two and untested conditions listed." Which response belongs in the gap?

D. That would establish a minimal reproduction. I'll start with the known saved selection before trying to remove anything from it.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Hana says: "Exactly. I'm reporting this saved selection on Q12, not claiming that every export fails. Other builds and sizes haven't been checked." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Hana says: "Q12 exported only two of my three selected items. The last selected item is missing, and I got the same omission in both attempts." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Hana says: "For frequency, I'm writing two out of two attempts. Always would make it sound as though I'd tested a much larger set." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Correct. This is Joel's response in turn 18. It connects Hana's preceding point with Hana's follow-up. Minimal reproduction is a smaller retained failure example, which has not yet been established by the current observations.

[Return to the exercise, page 24](#)

Review 2 / Explanations

Cumulative review

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Group of inputs expected to follow the same relevant rule. Which term fits?

B. equivalence partition

A Not here. coverage item: Rule, value, or condition counted in a coverage assessment. The usual combination is "identify the coverage item".

B Correct. equivalence partition: Group of inputs expected to follow the same relevant rule. The usual combination is "identify an equivalence partition".

C Not here. rejection region: Set of inputs the stated rule rejects. The usual combination is "cover the rejection region".

D Not here. inclusive range: Range containing both stated endpoints. The usual combination is "specify an inclusive range".

[Return to the exercise, page 46](#)

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Route producing output for external use. Which term fits?

D. export path

A Not here. residual risk: Risk remaining after the checks or controls performed. The usual combination is "disclose residual risk".

B Not here. smoke test: Small check set used to detect major basic failures. The usual combination is "pass the smoke test".

C Not here. test objective: Purpose a particular check is meant to serve. The usual combination is "define the test objective".

D Correct. export path: Route producing output for external use. The usual combination is "check the export path".

[Return to the exercise, page 46](#)

Review 2 / Explanations / continued

3. Rebuild the exchange from "Three selected, two exported, twice". Hana: "The second attempt used the same build and selection and lost the same final item. I haven't changed any code or checked a fix." Joel: [missing response] Hana: "I suspect a loop boundary, but I don't have internal evidence. Should I leave that theory out of the title?" Which response belongs in the gap?

A. Call that a reproduction run of the failure. It is not confirmation testing of a repaired version, because no repair has been tested.

A Correct. This is Joel's response in turn 10. It connects Hana's preceding point with Hana's follow-up. Reproduction run describes the repeated attempt under the reported conditions, while leaving broader behavior untested.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 14, after Hana says: "I'll put Q12 first, then the saved input, export action, and item comparison. That should make the starting conditions clear." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Hana says: "I suspect a loop boundary, but I don't have internal evidence. Should I leave that theory out of the title?" It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Hana says: "Q12 exported only two of my three selected items. The last selected item is missing, and I got the same omission in both attempts." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 46](#)

Review 2 / Explanations / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "I'll also check the content, not merely that Save or Export can be clicked. Otherwise we'd repeat the smoke-test limitation." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "Current update: narrow smoke pass, save and export untested, shared formatter changed, one hour available, focused follow-up proposed." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. Exactly. The test objective is the changed formatting behavior in each path. Make the assertion answer that question.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Elena says: "For export, the rationale is the shared formatter, not evidence that it already fails. I don't have a failure probability to attach." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Sam's response in turn 18. It connects Elena's preceding point with Elena's follow-up. Test objective specifies the formatted behavior to verify in each consumer path rather than only opening a screen.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 14, after Elena says: "Both proposed checks are still planned. I'll update their statuses only after execution gives us actual results." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 6, after Elena says: "Opening the page doesn't compare the formatted saved value. It also doesn't generate an export whose contents we can check." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 46](#)

Review 3 / Explanations

Cumulative review

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Prepared data or state used by multiple checks. Which term fits?

C. shared fixture

A Not here. state leakage: Unintended influence of one test's state on another. The usual combination is "detect state leakage".

B Not here. rerun: Another execution of an existing check. The usual combination is "qualify a rerun result".

C Correct. shared fixture: Prepared data or state used by multiple checks. The usual combination is "isolate a shared fixture".

D Not here. environment state: Relevant current conditions in the test setting. The usual combination is "compare environment state".

[Return to the exercise, page 69](#)

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Presence of all required data items. Which term fits?

C. data completeness

A Not here. release blocker: Issue preventing release under the applicable criteria. The usual combination is "identify a release blocker".

B Not here. triage: Structured review to classify issues and decide next handling. The usual combination is "bring a defect to triage".

C Correct. data completeness: Presence of all required data items. The usual combination is "verify data completeness".

D Not here. defect classification: Assignment of an issue to a defined category. The usual combination is "explain defect classification".

[Return to the exercise, page 69](#)

Review 3 / Explanations / continued

3. Rebuild the exchange from "The account page opens; the changed paths are unchecked". Elena: "I can't promise full regression coverage in that hour. I'll keep the uncompleted checks visible if the time runs out." Sam: [missing response] Elena: "For export, the rationale is the shared formatter, not evidence that it already fails. I don't have a failure probability to attach." Which response belongs in the gap?

C. Right. The timebox constrains the work; it doesn't redefine a short check set as full coverage.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Elena says: "For export, the rationale is the shared formatter, not evidence that it already fails. I don't have a failure probability to attach." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 6, after Elena says: "Opening the page doesn't compare the formatted saved value. It also doesn't generate an export whose contents we can check." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Correct. This is Sam's response in turn 10. It connects Elena's preceding point with Elena's follow-up. Timebox is the one-hour limit on additional work, which does not expand the meaning of the evidence collected.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 18, after Elena says: "I'll also check the content, not merely that Save or Export can be clicked. Otherwise we'd repeat the smoke-test limitation." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 69](#)

Review 3 / Explanations / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo".

Lina: "My comparison will show the missing row, the typo's reach, and the demonstration's actual scope. It won't invent consequences we haven't observed."

Marcus: [missing response] **Lina:** "I'll leave the repair order and release disposition pending. Strongly arguing for urgency doesn't mean I can announce an authorization." Which response belongs in the gap?

D. That is an evidence-based comparison. It gives the team a clear basis for scheduling discussion without pretending a decision has already been reached.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 8, after Lina says: "So its visibility is broad, while the export has a different functional consequence. I don't want account-wide to become a substitute for an impact analysis." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Lina says: "Before we rank these issues, can we separate missing export data from the heading typo? Tomorrow's demonstration affects urgency, but not the underlying consequences." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Lina says: "We also don't have a verified alternative export method. I won't soften the risk statement by inventing a workaround." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Correct. This is Marcus's response in turn 18. It connects Lina's preceding point with Lina's follow-up. Evidence-based comparison uses the stated effects and demonstration scope without inventing severity ratings, workarounds, or approvals.

[Return to the exercise, page 69](#)

Review 4 / Explanations

Cumulative review

1. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Keeping keyboard tab navigation within an open modal dialog. Which term fits?

D. focus containment

A Not here. follow-up question: Specific unresolved point for further investigation or clarification. The usual combination is "record a follow-up question".

B Not here. state transition: Change from one defined condition to another. The usual combination is "record the state transition".

C Not here. finding: Recorded result or question arising from investigation. The usual combination is "report a finding".

D Correct. focus containment: Keeping keyboard tab navigation within an open modal dialog. The usual combination is "verify focus containment".

[Return to the exercise, page 91](#)

2. A colleague needs the term for this meaning: Condition required before leaving a testing stage. Which term fits?

C. exit criterion

A Not here. release candidate: Version proposed for release pending the relevant decision. The usual combination is "identify the release candidate".

B Not here. status breakdown: Separate counts or categories explaining the overall position. The usual combination is "give the status breakdown".

C Correct. exit criterion: Condition required before leaving a testing stage. The usual combination is "assess the exit criterion".

D Not here. denominator: Total used to calculate a fraction or percentage. The usual combination is "specify the denominator".

[Return to the exercise, page 91](#)

Review 4 / Explanations / continued

3. Rebuild the exchange from "The missing export row and tomorrow's visible typo".
Lina: "We haven't been supplied a severity scale. I'll describe the observed consequences before assigning labels such as critical or minor." **Marcus:** [missing response] **Lina:** "Does discussing the typo urgently imply the export is cleared to ship? I'd like the meeting note to avoid linking those decisions." Which response belongs in the gap?

C. Use the applicable defect classification process when those labels are assigned. For this discussion, the concrete effects and timing are enough to explain the competing concerns.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 2, after Lina says: "Before we rank these issues, can we separate missing export data from the heading typo? Tomorrow's demonstration affects urgency, but not the underlying consequences." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Not here. This line belongs to turn 6, after Lina says: "The typo appears on every account page, including the one used in tomorrow's demonstration. No export is planned for that event." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

C Correct. This is Marcus's response in turn 10. It connects Lina's preceding point with Lina's follow-up. Defect classification should follow the actual agreed categories rather than invented labels based only on frequency or visibility.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 12, after Lina says: "Does discussing the typo urgently imply the export is cleared to ship? I'd like the meeting note to avoid linking those decisions." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 91](#)

Review 4 / Explanations / continued

4. Rebuild the exchange from "Seven passed is not ten completed". Ben: "The report will say criterion unmet, no granted exception, and your production decision pending. This handoff isn't a sign-off." Mara: [missing response] Ben: "Final status: Q20, seven passed, one failed, two blocked including one critical, missing data, required review, and decision pending." Which response belongs in the gap?

B. That respects release authority. I own the decision, but I haven't made it or authorized an exception.

A Not here. This line belongs to turn 14, after Ben says: "The data request is still pending. I won't write data received or assume the tests will pass once somebody supplies it." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

B Correct. This is Mara's response in turn 18. It connects Ben's preceding point with Ben's follow-up. Release authority remains with Mara, and the evidence report does not itself grant approval or an exception.

C Not here. This line belongs to turn 16, after Ben says: "And even after execution, the criterion still requires review. I'll show that separately instead of copying completed into every column." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

D Not here. This line belongs to turn 4, after Ben says: "It hasn't. Every critical-path check must execute and have its evidence reviewed, and the blocked one has no result to review." It addresses that point, not the missing turn in the supplied exchange.

[Return to the exercise, page 91](#)

Additional case 1 / Explanations

Extended conversation

1. condition combinations

Turn 2. The rule depends on combinations of three conditions; testing one all-qualifying and one all-disqualifying case leaves six feasible combinations unchecked.

2. masking

Turn 4. Other disqualifying conditions can hide a missing membership check; an inactive basket below the threshold and already redeemed would reject even if membership were ignored.

3. negative cases

Turn 6. Each proposed negative case makes one required condition fail while the other two qualify, allowing the relevant restriction to affect the expected outcome.

4. decision table

Turn 8. The full table records all eight feasible combinations of the three binary conditions and their expected discounts; only active, threshold-met, not-redeemed qualifies.

5. inclusive threshold

Turn 10. At least one hundred includes exactly one hundred; eligibility is assessed on the pre-discount subtotal and is not recalculated from the discounted total.

6. coverage denominator

Turn 12. The denominator here is eight feasible columns of the stated full decision table; two executed columns give twenty-five percent, not a general measure of software correctness.

[Return to the conversation, page 94](#)

Transfer exchange

1. A

Analyst: The only qualifying case is A .

Turn 1. A meets all three requirements; exactly one hundred satisfies the inclusive threshold.

Additional case 1 / Explanations / continued

2. 10

Developer: Its expected discount is 10 dollars.

Turn 2. The rule supplies a ten-dollar discount for a qualifying basket, not ten percent.

3. membership

Analyst: B fails the membership condition.

Turn 3. B meets the subtotal and redemption conditions but is inactive, so membership alone prevents eligibility.

4. unexecuted

Developer: The execution status of these cases is unexecuted .

Turn 4. The setup explicitly supplies expected outcomes without completed test runs.

[Return to the conversation, page 97](#)

Additional case 2 / Explanations

Extended conversation

1. mutant

Turn 2. A mutant is a deliberately modified program variant used to assess test sensitivity; the twelve variants are not twelve discovered production defects.

2. Killed

Turn 4. Killed means a test detected an active modified variant by failing; it is not the count of production defects or of failing original-program tests.

3. timeout

Turn 6. Under the supplied Stryker-style definitions, a timeout counts as detected and remains a separate status; it is not silently classified as survived or compile error.

4. No coverage

Turn 8. The no-coverage variant is undetected and included in valid variants for the overall score, but it is excluded from the covered-code denominator in this report.

5. valid mutants

Turn 10. The supplied definitions give eleven valid mutants after excluding the one compile error; eight detected divided by eleven is 72.7 percent when rounded to one decimal place.

6. covered-code score

Turn 12. The covered-code score uses ten covered variants and gives eighty percent; it excludes the no-coverage variant and must not replace the overall 72.7 percent score without its label.

[Return to the conversation, page 99](#)

Transfer exchange

1. 5

Engineer: The detected count is 5 .

Turn 1. Four killed plus one timeout equals five detected under the supplied report definitions.

Additional case 2 / Explanations / continued

2. 9

Lead: The valid count is 9 .

Turn 2. Five detected plus two survived plus two no coverage equals nine; exclude the one compile error.

3. 55.6

Engineer: The overall score is 55.6 percent.

Turn 3. Five divided by nine times one hundred is 55.555..., rounded to 55.6 percent.

4. 71.4

Lead: The covered-code score is 71.4 percent.

Turn 4. Covered equals five detected plus two survived, or seven; five divided by seven rounds to 71.4 percent.

[Return to the conversation, page 102](#)

Additional case 3 / Explanations

Extended conversation

1. initial focus

Turn 2. The supplied opening criterion requires focus to move inside the modal; leaving it on the background page fails that behavior even when labels pass a scan.

2. focus containment

Turn 4. The case requires forward and reverse tab navigation to stay within the open modal; moving focus to a background link violates that containment.

3. keyboard sequence

Turn 6. The recorded keyboard sequence identifies the exact actions and focus targets observed; unperformed Shift+Tab checks must remain pending rather than inherit a result.

4. focus restoration

Turn 8. For this case, the invoking Edit Address button still exists and is the explicitly required return target; closing the overlay without returning focus does not satisfy that criterion.

5. modal semantics

Turn 10. Modal semantics describe the intended interface meaning; an accessibility attribute alone does not implement keyboard containment, initial focus, or focus restoration.

6. automated scan

Turn 12. The automated scan supplies the stated label result only; it does not replace the observed keyboard checks or establish untested screen-reader behavior.

[Return to the conversation, page 104](#)

Transfer exchange

1. passed

Tester: Forward containment has passed .

Turn 1. The supplied forward Tab observation meets the stated inside-cycle requirement.

Additional case 3 / Explanations / continued

2. unchecked

Developer: Reverse cycling remains unchecked .

Turn 2. No Shift+Tab result is supplied, so forward success cannot establish reverse behavior.

3. failed

Tester: Focus restoration has failed .

Turn 3. The criterion requires return to the invoking button, but the observed target is the page body.

4. untested

Developer: Screen-reader behavior is untested .

Turn 4. The setup explicitly says no screen-reader check was performed; the label scan is not that evidence.

[Return to the conversation, page 107](#)

Find a phrase by purpose

Agreeing the expected result

Locate the ambiguity: The two examples disagree at exactly twenty-four hours.

Name the first outcome: One example allows the cancellation.

Name the second outcome: The other rejects the same case.

[Full phrase bank, page 7](#)

Making a failure reproducible

Identify the build: I observed this on Q12.

Identify the input: I used the saved selection of three items.

State the action: I exported that selection.

[Full phrase bank, page 17](#)

Choosing cases at boundaries and across rules

State the domain: The rule concerns whole-number quantities.

State the range: One through twenty are accepted, including both endpoints.

Describe existing cases: Five, ten, and fifteen are interior values.

[Full phrase bank, page 29](#)

Explaining coverage and change risk

State the narrow success: Sign-in and opening the account page passed.

Name the change: The shared formatter changed.

Identify both consumers: Account-save and export use that formatter.

[Full phrase bank, page 39](#)

Find a phrase by purpose / continued

Investigating inconsistent automated results

Identify the build: Both observations are on T8.

Report the failing order: Search fails after cleanup.

Report the comparison: Search passes when run alone.

[Full phrase bank, page 51](#)

Separating impact from scheduling in triage

Name the export effect: The export omits its final row.

Limit the affected workflow: The observed issue affects the monthly workflow.

Name the typo's reach: The heading typo appears on every account page.

[Full phrase bank, page 61](#)

Reporting exploratory findings

Name the charter: The session investigated interrupted profile edits.

State the timebox: I explored for twenty minutes.

Separate the saved path: After saving, navigation preserved the value.

[Full phrase bank, page 74](#)

Giving a release-evidence handover

Identify the candidate: This handover concerns Q20.

State the total: Ten checks were planned.

Give passes: Seven checks passed.

[Full phrase bank, page 84](#)

Vocabulary index

acceptance criterion[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**account-save path**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**actual result**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**affected workflow**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**assumption**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**blocked check**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**Boolean condition**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**boundary value**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**branch coverage**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**business rule**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**cannot reproduce**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**change impact**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**cleanup**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**confirmed defect**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**continuous integration**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**cosmetic defect**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**coverage claim**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**coverage gap**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**covered-code score**[Case 2, p. 98](#)**critical path**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**data completeness**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**decimal input**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**acceptance region**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**actual output**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**adjacent value**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**ambiguity**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**automated scan**[Case 3, p. 103](#)**blocked dependency**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**boundary**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**boundary value analysis**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**build identifier**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**business timing**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**case selection**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**clarification request**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**condition combinations**[Case 1, p. 93](#)**consumer path**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**contradiction**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**counterexample**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**coverage denominator**[Case 1, p. 93](#)**coverage item**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**criterion exception**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**customer demonstration**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**debrief**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**decision owner**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)

Vocabulary index / continued

decision pending[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**decision rule**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**defect classification**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**defer**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**dependency mapping**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**disposition**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**environment state**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**equivalence partition**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**evidence bundle**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**evidence trail**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**exclusive limit**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**execution order**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**exit criterion**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**expected result**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**export path**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**failure evidence**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**finding**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**focus containment**[Lesson 07, p. 72, Case 3, p. 103](#)**follow-up question**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**frequency**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**handoff note**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**inclusive range**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**decision record**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**decision table**[Lesson 03, p. 28, Case 1, p. 93](#)**defect report**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**denominator**[Lesson 02, p. 15, Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**deterministic setup**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**environment detail**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**equality case**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**equivalent mutant**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**evidence handover**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**evidence-based comparison**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**execution evidence**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**execution status**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**expected output**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**exploratory testing**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**failed check**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**false alarm**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**flaky test**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**focus restoration**[Lesson 07, p. 73, Case 3, p. 103](#)**formatter**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**functional impact**[Lesson 04, p. 38, Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**inclusive limit**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**inclusive threshold**[Case 1, p. 93](#)

Vocabulary index / continued

initial focus[Case 3, p. 103](#)**input parity**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**interior value**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**keyboard sequence**[Case 3, p. 103](#)**log excerpt**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**masking**[Case 1, p. 93](#)**mobile coverage**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**mutant**[Case 2, p. 98](#)**navigation away**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**No coverage**[Case 2, p. 98](#)**off-by-one error**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**open defect**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**out-of-range value**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**pass/fail judgment**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**persistence**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**postcondition**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**priority**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**reach**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**regression testing**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**release authority**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**release candidate**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**release recommendation**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**input domain**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**interference**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**invalid partition**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**Killed**[Case 2, p. 98](#)**lower bound**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**minimal reproduction**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**modal semantics**[Case 3, p. 103](#)**mutation testing**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**negative cases**[Case 1, p. 93](#)**observation**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**omission**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**order dependency**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**pass rate**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**passed check**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**planned check**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**precondition**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#), [Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**quarantine**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**readiness evidence**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**rejection region**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**release blocker**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**release disposition**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**repair order**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)

Vocabulary index / continued

reproduction frequency[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**reproduction steps**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**requirement gap**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**rerun**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**review status**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**risk register**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**sample data**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**saved selection**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**scheduling constraint**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**scope exclusion**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**selection rationale**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**session notes**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**setup**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**shared component**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**smoke test**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**standalone run**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**state transition**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**suite run**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**test basis**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**test charter**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**test data ownership**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**test isolation**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**reproduction run**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**requirement**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**requirement owner**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**residual risk**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**risk acceptance**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**risk-based testing**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**sample record**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**saved state**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**scope boundary**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**scope of evidence**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**selection size**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**session outcome**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**severity**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**shared fixture**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**stakeholder impact**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**state leakage**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**status breakdown**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**teardown**[Lesson 05, p. 49](#)**test case**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**test completion**[Lesson 08, p. 82](#)**test fixture**[Lesson 02, p. 15](#)**test objective**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)

Vocabulary index / continued

test oracle[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**test scope**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**threshold**[Lesson 01, p. 5](#)**timeout**[Case 2, p. 98](#)**triage**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**unique test data**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**unspecified behavior**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**unverified condition**[Lesson 02, p. 16](#)**usability concern**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**valid mutants**[Case 2, p. 98](#)**validation message**[Lesson 03, p. 28](#)**visibility**[Lesson 06, p. 59](#)**warning prompt**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**workaround**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**test priority**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#)**test summary**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**timebox**[Lesson 04, p. 37](#), [Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**traceability**[Lesson 01, p. 6](#)**unexecuted check**[Lesson 08, p. 83](#)**unsaved change**[Lesson 07, p. 72](#)**untested path**[Lesson 04, p. 38](#)**upper bound**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**user journey**[Lesson 07, p. 73](#)**valid partition**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)**verification run**[Lesson 05, p. 50](#)**waiver**[Lesson 06, p. 60](#)**whole number**[Lesson 03, p. 27](#)

References and publication notes

All cases, organizations, figures, and conversations are fictional teaching material, not transcripts. Communication practice does not replace qualified advice or current workplace procedures.

[1] International Software Testing Qualifications Board. Foundation Level Syllabus v4.0.1.

Terminology reference for boundaries, exploratory sessions, and reporting. Copyright in the syllabus belongs to its authors and ISTQB; these cases are original. Source checked 10 October 2026.

https://istqb.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/ISTQB_CTFL_Syllabus_v4.0.1.pdf

[2] pytest Documentation. Flaky Tests.

Background on shared state and order-dependent results. The fictional cleanup and search scenario does not prescribe a particular framework. Source checked 10 October 2026.

<https://docs.pytest.org/en/stable/explanation/flaky.html>

[3] MDN Web Docs. When and How to File Bugs with Browsers.

Context for reproducible examples, versions, and expected versus actual results. No source code examples are reproduced. Source checked 10 October 2026.

https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Learn_web_development/Howto/Web_mechanics/File_browser_bugs

Companion course

The website offers the eight-lesson course and related practice. This book can be used independently. No audio access or external account is needed for its exercises.

<https://englishladder.com/efsp-software-quality-assurance.html>

Clear findings. Useful next checks.

Eight testing conversations build precise reporting and productive challenge: expected results, reproduction, boundary cases, change risk, inconsistent automation, triage, exploratory findings, and release handovers.

Agreeing the expected result

The exact twenty-four-hour case has two conflicting expected outcomes. Neither the word within nor the current implementation resolves that conflict by itself. Request an explicit accept-or-reject decision for equality.

Making a failure reproducible

Two out of two describes Hana's observed attempts with the saved three-item selection on Q12. It is not a universal failure rate for every input, every session, or every build.

Choosing cases at boundaries and across rules

One and twenty are accepted endpoints. Zero and twenty-one are adjacent rejected whole-number values. Two and nineteen check just inside the range. The existing five, ten, and fifteen do not test these edges.

Explaining coverage and change risk

Opening the account page does not establish correct account-save formatting, and it does not exercise export. Both use the changed formatter. Existing behavior can need regression checking even when the visible update is described as an account change.

Phil Stilwell

© 2026 Phil Stilwell. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the author, except as permitted by law.

English Ladder / English for Work / Revised 2026 edition

This publication includes AI-generated text and cover illustration, revised and checked during production. Brand artwork remains the English Ladder mark. This edition makes no claim of independent professional certification.

Typeface: Bitstream Vera, embedded under its accompanying license. Illustration created with OpenAI's native image generator for this edition. The copyright notice is not a claim to ownership of third-party frameworks or references.