CS 213 – Spring 2016

Lecture 10 – Feb 18

More on Inheritance: Why/When

Why Inheritance?

- The design aspect of inheritance is to model the "IS A" relationship between objects

- Examples:
  - Car **is a** MotorVehice (*every* car is a motor vehicle)
  - MotorCycle **is a** MotorVehicle (*every* motorcycle is a motor vehicle)
  - ColoredPoint **is a** Point (*every* colored point is a point)
  - Zebra **is a(n)** animal (*every* zebra is an animal)

- Inheritance then allows class on the right hand side of the **is a** to "hand down" its code to the class on the left hand side

- The RHS class (e.g. MotorVehicle) is the superclass (base class) and LHS class (e.g. Car) is the subclass

Why Inheritance?

- Handing down code results in reuse: there is only one copy to manage instead of two or more

- Creating an instance of Car does not automatically also create an instance of MotorVehicle. Inheritance does not mean that a subclass object (Car) has a superclass object (MotorVehicle) contained inside it. (A Car does not contain a MotorVehicle)

    - Which of these "**IS A**" relationship examples are accurate?:
        - Square is a rectangle
        - Cube is a square
        - Student is a Person
        - Employee is a Person

Square is a Rectangle. But does inheritance work?

```
public class Rectangle {
   int x, y, w, h;
   . . .
   public int area() {
     . . .
   }
   public int perimeter() {
     . . .
   }
   public void setSize(int w,
                       int h) {
     . . .
   }
}
```

```
public class Square extends
Rectangle {
   . . .
   public void setSize(int w,
                       int h) {
     // disallow stretching when
     // w is not equal to h
     ...
   }
}
```

Square is a Rectangle. But does inheritance work?

There are two important reasons why the Square extends Rectangle DESIGN idea does not work:

- The Square class does not provide any new functionality
- The inherited method setSize is overridden in a way that *restricts* the set size behavior

For inheritance to be used correctly, the subclass must provide **all** the functionality of the superclass AND more.

Also, if the subclass overrides an inherited method of the superclass, the overriding method must use **all** of the inherited method's implementation, AND add more.

Rectangle – Square Design Alternatives

Alternative 1: Code only a Rectangle class, and have it tell whether it is a square or not

```
public class Rectangle {
   public static final int DEFAULT_X = 100;
   public static final int DEFAULT_Y = 100;

   private int x=DEFAULT_X, y=DEFAULT_Y, w, h;
   private boolean isSquare = false;

   public Rectangle(int width, int height) {
      w = width; h = height;
   }

   // to be used if Square is needed
   public Rectangle(int side) {
      w = h = side; isSquare = true;
   }

   public boolean isSquare() {
      return isSquare;
   }

   public void setSize(int w, int h) {
      if (isSquare && w != h) {
         throw new IllegalArgumentException(
                  "w must be equal to h for square");
      }
      this.w = w; this.h = h;
   }
}
```

What if client "forgets" to use this constructor, and uses the other constructor correctly (by setting w = h), intending a square? Rectangle would not know of the intention, leading to problems in usage.

Rectangle – Square Design Alternatives

Alternative 2: Code a Rectangle class, and use delegation (composition) to have Square point to it

```
public class Rectangle {
   public static final
      int DEFAULT_X = 100;
   public static final
      int DEFAULT_Y = 100;

   private int x=DEFAULT_X,
           y=DEFAULT_Y, w, h;

   public Rectangle(int width,
                    int height) {
      w = width; h = height;
   }

   public void setSize(int w, int h) {
      this.w = w; this.h = h;
   }
   ...
}
```

```
public class Square {

   private Rectangle rect;

   public Square(int side) {
      rect = new Rectangle(side,side);
   }
   public void setSize(int side) {
      rect.setSize(side,side);
   }
   . . .
}
```

Square *is **composed** of Rectangle instance, i.e.* Square ***has a*** Rectangle

*Rectangle-specific functionality is **delegated** to* Rectangle *object*

Delegation/composition is a viable alternative to inheritance for code reuse

Employee is a Person. Student is a Person. Issues in Implementing with Inheritance

This example from "Object-Oriented Design using Java" by Dale Skrien

```
public class Person {
    String name, address;
    . . .
}
```

```
public class Student
extends Person {
    float gpa;
    . . .
}
```

```
public class Employee
extends Person {
    float salary;
    . . .
}
```

Scenario 1: A student graduates and becomes an employee of the university

Solution A: Replace Student object for this person with Employee object

- Data from Student object (e.g. transcripts) may need to be preserved, but there is no place for this in Employee object

Employee is a Person. Student is a Person. Issues in Implementing with Inheritance

This example from "Object-Oriented Design using Java" by Dale Skrien

---

```
public class Person {
    String name, address;
    . . .
}
```

```
public class Student
extends Person {
    float gpa;
    . . .
}
```

```
public class Employee
extends Person {
    float salary;
    . . .
}
```

Scenario 1: A student graduates and becomes an employee of the university

Solution B: Keep *inactive* Student object for this person, and create an *active* Employee object

- All Person-level data is duplicated in both objects (wasted space)

- Whenever a change is made to Person-level data in one (e.g. address), it must also be made in the other (drawback: tracking for synchronization)

Employee is a Person. Student is a Person. Issues in Implementing with Inheritance

This example from "Object-Oriented Design using Java" by Dale Skrien

---

```
public class Person {
    String name, address;
    . . .
}
```

```
public class Student
extends Person {
    float gpa;
    . . .
}
```

```
public class Employee
extends Person {
    float salary;
    . . .
}
```

Scenario 2: A Student is also an employee at the same time

Solution: Keep *active* Student object for this person, as well as *active* Employee object

- All Person-level data is duplicated in both objects (wasted space)

- Whenever a change is made to Person-level data in one (e.g. address), it must also be made in the other (drawback: tracking for synchronization)

Employee is a Person. Student is a Person. Issues in Implementing with Inheritance

OBSERVATION:

Employee and Student
are temporary ROLES
played by Person

In situations like this, inheritance is not a good design.

Instead, composition/delegation is a better design alternative.

Employee is a Person. Student is a Person.
ROLES: Composition/Delegation

```
public class Person {
   private String name;
   private String address;
   public String getAddress() {
       return address;
   }
   . . .
}
```

```
public class Student {
   private Person me;

   private Transcript myTranscript;
   public String getAddress() {
       return me.getAddress();
   }
   public float getGPA() {
       ...
   }
   . . .
}
```

Student ***refers to*** a Person *instance, i.e.* Student ***has a*** Person

Person-specific functionality is ***delegated*** *to* Person *object*

Employee can similarly refer to Person, delegating Person-specific tasks to the referenced Person object

If a student graduates and then becomes an employee, both inactive Student object and active Employee object can refer to *same* Person object. Thus, multiple roles played by the same person at the same, or different times, can be handled well by referencing/delegation.

Delegation for Roles

**If class B (e.g. Student) models a temporary role played by class A (e.g. Person),
then B should not be a subclass of A.**

**Instead, B should reference A and
use delegation to do A-specific stuff.**