

Re: Template open/save behavior

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Mac/microsoft.public.mac.office.word/2006-02/msg00322.html>

- *From:* Beth Rosengard <bethrosengard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 15 Feb 2006 11:33:19 -0800
-

Hi John,

On 2/14/06 8:34 PM, in article C018FA6D.2E3B8%john@xxxxxxxxxxxx, "John McGhie [MVP – Word and Word Macintosh]" <john@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

So I ask again (and more specifically): Can you point me to where in the ISO standards or Carnegie Mellon University publications "bug" is defined as a slang synonym for "defect"....

Yes, of course I could. I could even email you several megabytes of stuff on the subject. However, if you really want to research the dots and commas of the various Software Engineering standards, I think it is fair for me to expect you to be willing to do at least some of the work yourself.

In a debate :-), it is incumbent on the person making the claim to present the supporting evidence. Why would *I* want to help *you* make your point :-)?

The one most commonly cited internationally is:
<http://www.istqb.org/fileadmin/media/glossary-1.0.pdf>

Wow! Now that is really interesting. All this time I have been arguing over the meaning of the term "bug" and taking your word for the meaning of the term "defect". But according to the source you've quoted, the meaning of "defect" is synonymous with what you have called "Coding Defect" and I have called "bug"!

Let me back up a minute and explain (for anyone else still reading this :-)) how I came to that conclusion. On the page referenced above, the entry for "bug" says "See defect." The entry for "defect" says:

A flaw in a component or system that can cause the component or system to

Re: Template open/save behavior

fail to perform its required function, e.g. an incorrect statement or data definition. A defect, if encountered during execution, may cause a failure of the component or system.

[This is further supported by the definition of "debugging": "The process of finding, analyzing and removing the causes of failures in software."]

If the required function is to produce result X and the software does indeed produce result X, then the software cannot be said to have a bug, according to this definition that you quoted as (I assume) a definitive source.

The required function is, of course, determined by the software designer/manufacturer. It's *his* software.

Now it may be that the *user* would like to see a different result and believes that the designer has incorrectly understood the required function.

From the user's standpoint, the software has a design flaw (or defect), but not a bug.

Okay, before you go off on me and tell me that, no, it's the *user* who determines the required function (since I know that's what you're going to say), let me tell you what I *think* has happened in the software industry in regard to these terms.

I think that as the industry has matured, it has put greater and greater emphasis on what the *user* requires. I think that, as a consequence, the industry has broadened its definition of "defect" to take user requirements into account. I think that, for that reason, the industry has found it useful to broaden the meaning of the term "defect" and make it an umbrella term encompassing Design Defects, Coding Defects and Specification Defects. I think that, in the process, it has lost sight of the fact that *in the beginning*, "bug" meant "doesn't work as it was designed to work". I think that the International Software Testing Qualification Board needs to update its glossary and redefine "bug" or redefine "defect", because as the Glossary now reads, a bug is exactly what I have contended all along.

Nope. It has NEVER had that meaning within the industry.

And it says that where?

Read 'em and weep :-)

I ain't weepin' :-). "Bug" absolutely HAS had that meaning within the industry and your source proves it.

Re: Template open/save behavior

Re: Template open/save behavior

Cheers,

Beth

.