

O'REILLY®

10th
Anniversary
Updated for Java 8

Head First Design Patterns

A Brain-Friendly Guide


Avoid those embarrassing coupling mistakes



Discover the secrets of the Patterns Guru



Find out how Starbuzz Coffee doubled their stock price with the Decorator pattern



Learn why everything your friends know about Factory pattern is probably wrong



Load the patterns that matter straight into your brain



See why Jim's love life improved when he cut down his inheritance

Eric Freeman & Elisabeth Robson
with Kathy Sierra & Bert Bates

Head First: Design Patterns

Eric Freeman

Elisabeth Robson

Bert Bates

Kathy Sierra



Beijing • Boston • Farnham • Sebastopol • Tokyo

To the Gang of Four, whose insight and expertise in capturing and communicating Design Patterns has changed the face of software design forever, and bettered the lives of developers throughout the world.

But *seriously*, when are we going to see a second edition? After all, it's been only *ten twenty years*.

Praise for *Head First Design Patterns*

“I received the book yesterday and started to read it on the way home... and I couldn’t stop. I took it to the gym and I expect people saw me smiling a lot while I was exercising and reading. This is très ‘cool’. It is fun, but they cover a lot of ground and they are right to the point. I’m really impressed.”

— **Erich Gamma, IBM Distinguished Engineer, and coauthor of *Design Patterns* with the rest of the Gang of Four — Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson and John Vlissides**

“*Head First Design Patterns* manages to mix fun, belly-laughs, insight, technical depth, and great practical advice in one entertaining and thought-provoking read. Whether you are new to design patterns, or have been using them for years, you are sure to get something from visiting Objectville.”

— **Richard Helm, coauthor of *Design Patterns* with rest of the Gang of Four — Erich Gamma, Ralph Johnson and John Vlissides**

“I feel like a thousand pounds of books have just been lifted off of my head.”

— **Ward Cunningham, inventor of the Wiki and founder of the Hillside Group**

“This book is close to perfect, because of the way it combines expertise and readability. It speaks with authority and it reads beautifully. It’s one of the very few software books I’ve ever read that strikes me as indispensable. (I’d put maybe 10 books in this category, at the outside.)”

— **David Gelernter, Professor of Computer Science, Yale University, and author of *Mirror Worlds* and *Machine Beauty***

“A Nose Dive into the realm of patterns, a land where complex things become simple, but where simple things can also become complex. I can think of no better tour guides than Eric and Elisabeth.”

— **Miko Matsumura, Industry Analyst, The Middleware Company Former Chief Java Evangelist, Sun Microsystems**

“I laughed, I cried, it moved me.”

— **Daniel Steinberg, Editor-in-Chief, java.net**

“My first reaction was to roll on the floor laughing. After I picked myself up, I realized that not only is the book technically accurate, it is the easiest-to-understand

introduction to design patterns that I have seen.”

— **Dr. Timothy A. Budd, Associate Professor of Computer Science at Oregon State University and author of more than a dozen books, including *C++ for Java Programmers***

“Jerry Rice runs patterns better than any receiver in the NFL, but Eric and Elisabeth have out run him. Seriously...this is one of the funniest and smartest books on software design I’ve ever read.”

— **Aaron LaBerge, SVP Technology & Product Development, ESPN**

More Praise for *Head First Design Patterns*

“Great code design is, first and foremost, great information design. A code designer is teaching a computer how to do something, and it is no surprise that a great teacher of computers should turn out to be a great teacher of programmers. This book’s admirable clarity, humor, and substantial doses of clever make it the sort of book that helps even non-programmers think well about problem-solving.”

— **Cory Doctorow, co-editor of Boing Boing and author of *Down and Out in the Magic Kingdom* and *Someone Comes to Town, Someone Leaves Town***

“There’s an old saying in the computer and videogame business — well, it can’t be that old because the discipline is not all that old — and it goes something like this: Design is Life. What’s particularly curious about this phrase is that even today almost no one who works at the craft of creating electronic games can agree on what it means to ‘design’ a game. Is the designer a software engineer? An art director? A storyteller? An architect or a builder? A pitch person or a visionary? Can an individual indeed be in part all of these? And most importantly, who the %\$!#&* cares?

It has been said that the ‘designed by’ credit in interactive entertainment is akin to the ‘directed by’ credit in filmmaking, which in fact allows it to share DNA with perhaps the single most controversial, overstated, and too often entirely lacking in humility credit grab ever propagated on commercial art. Good company, eh? Yet if Design is Life, then perhaps it is time we spent some quality cycles thinking about what it is. Eric Freeman and Elisabeth Robson have intrepidly volunteered to look behind the code curtain for us in *Head First Design Patterns*. I’m not sure either of them cares all that much about the PlayStation or X-Box, nor should they. Yet they do address the notion of design at a significantly honest level such that anyone looking for ego reinforcement of his or her own brilliant auteurship is best advised not to go digging here where truth is stunningly revealed. Sophists and circus barkers need not apply. Next-generation literati, please come equipped with a pencil.”

— **Ken Goldstein, Executive Vice President & Managing Director, Disney Online**

“Just the right tone for the geeked-out, casual-cool guru coder in all of us. The right reference for practical development strategies — gets my brain going without having to slog through a bunch of tired, stale professor-speak.”

— **Travis Kalanick, CEO and cofounder of Uber and Member of the MIT TR100**

“This book combines good humor, great examples, and in-depth knowledge of Design Patterns in such a way that makes learning fun. Being in the entertainment technology industry, I am intrigued by the Hollywood Principle and the home theater Facade Pattern, to name a few. The understanding of Design Patterns not only helps us create reusable and maintainable quality software, but also helps sharpen our problem-solving skills across all problem domains. This book is a must-read for all computer professionals and students.”

— **Newton Lee, Founder and Editor-in-Chief, Association for Computing Machinery’s (ACM) Computers in Entertainment**
(acmcie.org)

Praise for other books by Eric Freeman and Elisabeth Robson

“I literally love this book. In fact, I kissed this book in front of my wife.”

— **Satish Kumar**

“*Head First HTML and CSS* is a thoroughly modern introduction to forward-looking practices in web page markup and presentation. It correctly anticipates readers’ puzzlements and handles them just in time. The highly graphic and incremental approach precisely mimics the best way to learn this stuff: make a small change and see it in the browser to understand what each new item means.”

— **Danny Goodman, author of *Dynamic HTML: The Definitive Guide***

“The Web would be a much better place if every HTML author started off by reading this book.”

— **L. David Baron, Technical Lead, Layout & CSS, Mozilla Corporation <http://dbaron.org/>**

“My wife stole the book. She’s never done any web design, so she needed a book like *Head First HTML and CSS* to take her from beginning to end. She now has a list of websites she wants to build — for our son’s class, our family...If I’m lucky, I’ll get the book back when she’s done.”

— **David Kaminsky, Master Inventor, IBM**

“This book takes you behind the scenes of JavaScript and leaves you with a deep understanding of how this remarkable programming language works.”

— **Chris Fuselier, Engineering Consultant**

“I wish I’d had *Head First JavaScript Programming* when I was starting out!”

— **Chris Fuselier, Engineering Consultant**

“The *Head First* series utilizes elements of modern learning theory, including constructivism, to bring readers up to speed quickly. The authors have proven with this book that expert-level content can be taught quickly and efficiently. Make no mistake here, this is a serious JavaScript book, and yet, fun reading!”

— **Frank Moore, Web designer and developer**

“Looking for a book that will keep you interested (and laughing) but teach you some serious programming skills? *Head First JavaScript Programming* is it!”

— **Tim Williams, software entrepreneur**

Other O'Reilly books by Eric Freeman and Elisabeth Robson

Head First JavaScript Programming

Head First HTML and CSS

Head First HTML5 Programming

Other related books from O'Reilly

Head First Java

Head First EJB

Head First Servlets & JSP

Learning Java

Java in a Nutshell

Java Enterprise in a Nutshell

Java Examples in a Nutshell

Java Cookbook

J2EE Design Patterns

Authors of Head First Design Patterns



Eric is described by Head First series co-creator Kathy Sierra as “one of those rare individuals fluent in the language, practice, and culture of multiple domains from hipster hacker, corporate VP, engineer, think tank.”

Professionally, Eric recently ended nearly a decade as a media company executive — having held the position of CTO of Disney Online & Disney.com at The Walt Disney Company. Eric is now devoting his time to WickedlySmart, a startup he co-created with Elisabeth.

By training, Eric is a computer scientist, having studied with industry luminary David Gelernter during his Ph.D. work at Yale University. His dissertation is credited as the seminal work in alternatives to the desktop metaphor, and also as the first implementation of activity streams, a concept he and Dr. Gelernter developed.

In his spare time, Eric is deeply involved with music; you’ll find Eric’s latest project, a collaboration with ambient music pioneer Steve Roach, available on the iPhone app store under the name Immersion Station.

Eric lives with his wife and young daughter in Austin, Texas. His daughter is

a frequent vistor to Eric's studio, where she loves to turn the knobs of his synths and audio effects.

Write to Eric at eric@wickedlysmart.com or visit his site at ericfreeman.com.



Elisabeth is a software engineer, writer, and trainer. She has been passionate about technology since her days as a student at Yale University, where she earned a Masters of Science in Computer Science and designed a concurrent, visual programming language and software architecture.

Elisabeth's been involved with the Internet since the early days; she co-created the award-winning web site, The Ada Project, one of the first web sites designed to help women in computer science find career and mentorship information online.

She's currently co-founder of WickedlySmart, an online education experience centered on web technologies, where she creates books, articles, videos, and more. Previously, as Director of Special Projects at O'Reilly Media, Elisabeth produced in-person workshops and online courses on a variety of technical topics and developed her passion for creating learning experiences to help people understand technology. Prior to her work with O'Reilly, Elisabeth spent time spreading fairy dust at The Walt Disney Company, where she led research and development efforts in digital media.

When not in front of her computer, you'll find Elisabeth hiking, cycling, or

kayaking in the great outdoors, with her camera nearby, or cooking vegetarian meals.

You can send her email at beth@wickedlysmart.com or visit her blog at elisabethrobson.com.

Creators of the Head First series (and co-conspirators on this book)



Kathy has been interested in learning theory since her days as a game designer (she wrote games for Virgin, MGM, and Amblin'). She developed much of the Head First format while teaching New Media Authoring for UCLA Extension's Entertainment Studies program. More recently, she's been a master trainer for Sun Microsystems, teaching Sun's Java instructors how to teach the latest Java technologies, and developing several of Sun's certification exams. Together with Bert Bates, she has been actively using the Head First concepts to teach thousands of developers. Kathy is the founder of javaranch.com, which won a 2003 and 2004 Software Development magazine Jolt Cola Productivity Award. You might catch her teaching Java on the Java Jam Geek Cruise (geekcruises.com).

Likes: running, skiing, skateboarding, playing with her Icelandic horses, and weird science. Dislikes: entropy.

You can find her on [javaranch](http://javaranch.com), or occasionally blogging at seriouspony.com. Write to her at kathy@wickedlysmart.com.

Bert is a long-time software developer and architect, but a decade-long stint in artificial intelligence drove his interest in learning theory and technology-

based training. He's been helping clients become better programmers ever since. Recently, he's been heading up the development team for several of Sun's Java Certification exams.

He spent the first decade of his software career travelling the world to help broadcast clients like Radio New Zealand, the Weather Channel, and the Arts & Entertainment Network (A & E). One of his all-time favorite projects was building a full rail system simulation for Union Pacific Railroad.

Bert is a long-time, hopelessly addicted *go* player, and has been working on a *go* program for way too long. He's a fair guitar player and is now trying his hand at banjo.

Look for him on javaranch, on the IGS go server, or you can write to him at terrapin@wickedlysmart.com.

How to Use This Book: Intro



In this section, we answer the burning question: “So, why DID they put that in a design patterns book?”

Who is this book for?

If you can answer “yes” to all of these:

- ① Do you know **Java**? (You don’t need to be a guru.)

NOTE

You’ll probably be okay if you know C# instead.

- ② Do you want to **learn, understand, remember**, and *apply* design patterns, including the OO design principles upon which design patterns are based?
- ③ Do you prefer **stimulating dinner party conversation** to dry, dull, academic lectures?

this book is for you.

Who should probably back away from this book?

If you can answer “yes” to any one of these:

- ① **Are you completely new to Java?**

(You don’t need to be advanced, and even if you don’t know Java, but you know C#, you’ll probably understand at least 80% of the code examples. You also might be okay with just a C++ background.)

- ② Are you a kick-butt OO designer/developer looking for a **reference book**?

③ Are you an architect looking for **enterprise** design patterns?

④ Are you **afraid to try something different**? Would you rather have a root canal than mix stripes with plaid? Do you believe that a technical book can’t be serious if Java components are anthropomorphized?

this book is not for you.



[note from marketing: this book is for anyone with a credit card.]

We know what you're thinking.

“How can this be a serious programming book?”

“What’s with all the graphics?”

“Can I actually learn it this way?”

And we know what your brain is thinking.

Your brain craves novelty. It’s always searching, scanning, *waiting* for something unusual. It was built that way, and it helps you stay alive.


Today, you’re less likely to be a tiger snack. But your brain’s still looking. You just never know.

So what does your brain do with all the routine, ordinary, normal things you encounter? Everything it *can* to stop them from interfering with the brain’s *real* job — recording things that matter. It doesn’t bother saving the boring things; they never make it past the “this is obviously not important” filter.

How does your brain *know* what’s important? Suppose you’re out for a day hike and a tiger jumps in front of you, what happens inside your head and body?

Neurons fire. Emotions crank up. *Chemicals surge.*

And that's how your brain knows...




This must be important! Don't forget it!

But imagine you're at home, or in a library. It's a safe, warm, tiger-free zone. You're studying. Getting ready for an exam. Or trying to learn some tough technical topic your boss thinks will take a week, ten days at the most.

Just one problem. Your brain's trying to do you a big favor. It's trying to make sure that this *obviously* non-important content doesn't clutter up scarce resources. Resources that are better spent storing the really big things. Like tigers. Like the danger of fire. Like how you should never again snowboard in shorts.

And there's no simple way to tell your brain, "Hey brain, thank you very much, but no matter how dull this book is, and how little I'm registering on the emotional Richter scale right now, I really do want you to keep this stuff around."




WE THINK OF A “HEAD FIRST” READER AS A LEARNER

So what does it take to *learn* something? First, you have to *get it*, then make sure you don’t *forget it*. It’s not about pushing facts into your head. Based on the latest research in cognitive science, neurobiology, and educational psychology, *learning* takes a lot more than text on a page. We know what turns your brain on.


Some of the Head First learning principles:

Make it visual. Images are far more memorable than words alone, and make learning much more effective (up to 89% improvement in recall and transfer studies). It also makes things more understandable. **Put the words within or near the graphics** they relate to, rather than on the bottom or on another page, and learners will be up to *twice* as likely to solve problems related to the content.



Use a conversational and personalized style. In recent studies, students performed up to 40% better on post-learning tests if the content spoke directly to the reader, using a first-person, conversational style rather than taking a formal tone. Tell stories instead of lecturing. Use casual language. Don't take yourself too seriously. Which would you pay more attention to: a stimulating dinner party companion, or a lecture?

Get the learner to think more deeply. In other words, unless you actively flex your neurons, nothing much happens in your head. A reader has to be motivated, engaged, curious, and inspired to solve problems, draw conclusions, and generate new knowledge. And for that, you need challenges, exercises, and thought-provoking questions, and activities that involve both sides of the brain, and multiple senses.



Get — and keep — the reader's attention. We've all had the "I really want to learn this but I can't stay awake past page one" experience. Your brain pays attention to things that are out of the ordinary, interesting, strange, eye-catching, unexpected. Learning a new, tough, technical topic doesn't have to be boring. Your brain will learn much more quickly if it's not.

Does it make sense to say Tub IS-A Bathroom? Bathroom IS-A Tub? Or is it a HAS-A relationship?



Touch their emotions. We now know that your ability to remember something is largely dependent on its emotional content. You remember what you *care* about. You remember when you *feel* something. No, we're not talking heart-wrenching stories about a boy and his dog. We're talking emotions like surprise, curiosity, fun, "what the...?", and the feeling of "I Rule!" that comes when you solve a puzzle, learn something everybody else thinks is hard, or realize you know something that "I'm more technical than thou" Bob from engineering *doesn't*.



Metacognition: thinking about thinking

If you really want to learn, and you want to learn more quickly and more deeply, pay attention to how you pay attention. Think about how you think. Learn how you learn.

Most of us did not take courses on metacognition or learning theory when we were growing up. We were *expected* to learn, but rarely *taught* to learn.

But we assume that if you're holding this book, you really want to learn design patterns. And you probably don't want to spend a lot of time. And you want to *remember* what you read, and be able to apply it. And for that, you've got to *understand* it. To get the most from this book, or *any* book or

learning experience, take responsibility for your brain. Your brain on *this* content.

The trick is to get your brain to see the new material you're learning as Really Important. Crucial to your well-being. As important as a tiger. Otherwise, you're in for a constant battle, with your brain doing its best to keep the new content from sticking.



So how DO you get your brain to think Design Patterns are as important as a tiger?

There's the slow, tedious way, or the faster, more effective way. The slow way is about sheer repetition. You obviously know that you *are* able to learn and remember even the dullest of topics, if you keep pounding on the same thing. With enough repetition, your brain says, "This doesn't *feel* important to him, but he keeps looking at the same thing *over and over and over*, so I suppose it must be."

The faster way is to do ***anything that increases brain activity***, especially different types of brain activity. The things on the previous page are a big part

of the solution, and they're all things that have been proven to help your brain work in your favor. For example, studies show that putting words *within* the pictures they describe (as opposed to somewhere else in the page, like a caption or in the body text) causes your brain to try to make sense of how the words and picture relate, and this causes more neurons to fire. More neurons firing = more chances for your brain to *get* that this is something worth paying attention to, and possibly recording.


A conversational style helps because people tend to pay more attention when they perceive that they're in a conversation, since they're expected to follow along and hold up their end. The amazing thing is, your brain doesn't necessarily *care* that the "conversation" is between you and a book! On the other hand, if the writing style is formal and dry, your brain perceives it the same way you experience being lectured to while sitting in a roomful of passive attendees. No need to stay awake.

But pictures and conversational style are just the beginning.

Here's what WE did

We used **pictures**, because your brain is tuned for visuals, not text. As far as your brain's concerned, a picture really is worth 1,024 words. And when text and pictures work together, we embedded the text in the pictures because your brain works more effectively when the text is within the thing the text refers to, as opposed to in a caption or buried in the text somewhere.

ONE TO MANY RELATIONSHIP



We used **redundancy**, saying the same thing in *different* ways and with different media types, and *multiple senses*, to increase the chance that the content gets coded into more than one area of your brain.

We used concepts and pictures in **unexpected** ways because your brain is tuned for novelty, and we used pictures and ideas with at least *some emotional content*, because your brain is tuned to pay attention to the biochemistry of emotions. That which causes you to *feel* something is more likely to be remembered, even if that feeling is nothing more than a little **humor, surprise, or interest**.

We used a personalized, **conversational style**, because your brain is tuned to pay more attention when it believes you're in a conversation than if it thinks you're passively listening to a presentation. Your brain does this even when you're *reading*.



The Patterns Guru

We included more than 40 **activities**, because your brain is tuned to learn and

remember more when you ***do*** things than when you read about things. And we made the exercises challenging-yet-do-able, because that's what most *people* prefer.

We used ***multiple learning styles***, because *you* might prefer step-by-step procedures, while someone else wants to understand the big picture first, while someone else just wants to see a code example. But regardless of your own learning preference, *everyone* benefits from seeing the same content represented in multiple ways.



We include content for ***both sides of your brain***, because the more of your brain you engage, the more likely you are to learn and remember, and the longer you can stay focused. Since working one side of the brain often means giving the other side a chance to rest, you can be more productive at learning for a longer period of time.



And we included ***stories*** and exercises that present ***more than one point of view***, because your brain is tuned to learn more deeply when it's forced to make evaluations and judgements.

We included ***challenges***, with exercises, and by asking ***questions*** that don't always have a straight answer, because your brain is tuned to learn and remember when it has to *work* at something. Think about it — you can't get your *body* in shape just by *watching* people at the gym. But we did our best to make sure that when you're working hard, it's on the *right* things. That ***you're not spending one extra dendrite*** processing a hard-to-understand example, or parsing difficult, jargon-laden, or overly terse text.

We used ***people***. In stories, examples, pictures, etc., because, well, because *you're* a person. And your brain pays more attention to *people* than it does to *things*.


We used an ***80/20*** approach. We assume that if you're going for a PhD in software design, this won't be your only book. So we don't talk about

everything. Just the stuff you'll actually *need*.



Here's what YOU can do to bend your brain into submission

So, we did our part. The rest is up to you. These tips are a starting point; listen to your brain and figure out what works for you and what doesn't. Try new things.



Cut this out and stick it on your refrigerator.

① Slow down. The more you understand, the less you have to memorize.

Don't just *read*. Stop and think. When the book asks you a question, don't just skip to the answer. Imagine that someone really is asking the question. The more deeply you force your brain to think, the better chance you have of learning and remembering.

② Do the exercises. Write your own notes.

We put them in, but if we did them for you, that would be like having someone else do your workouts for you. And don't just *look* at the

exercises. **Use a pencil.** There's plenty of evidence that physical activity *while* learning can increase the learning.

③ Read the “There Are No Dumb Questions”

That means all of them. They're not optional side-bars — ***they're part of the core content!*** Don't skip them.

④ Make this the last thing you read before bed. Or at least the last challenging thing.

Part of the learning (especially the transfer to long-term memory) happens *after* you put the book down. Your brain needs time on its own, to do more processing. If you put in something new during that processing-time, some of what you just learned will be lost.

⑤ Drink water. Lots of it.

Your brain works best in a nice bath of fluid. Dehydration (which can happen before you ever feel thirsty) decreases cognitive function.

⑥ Talk about it. Out loud.

Speaking activates a different part of the brain. If you're trying to understand something, or increase your chance of remembering it later, say it out loud. Better still, try to explain it out loud to someone else. You'll learn more quickly, and you might uncover ideas you hadn't known were there when you were reading about it.

⑦ Listen to your brain.

Pay attention to whether your brain is getting overloaded. If you find yourself starting to skim the surface or forget what you just read, it's time for a break. Once you go past a certain point, you won't learn faster by trying to shove more in, and you might even hurt the process.

⑧ Feel something!

Your brain needs to know that this *matters*. Get involved with the stories. Make up your own captions for the photos. Groaning over a bad joke is *still* better than feeling nothing at all.

⑨ Design something!

Apply this to something new you're designing, or refactor an older project. Just do *something* to get some experience beyond the exercises and activities in this book. All you need is a pencil and a problem to solve... a problem that might benefit from one or more design patterns.

Read Me

This is a learning experience, not a reference book. We deliberately stripped

out everything that might get in the way of learning whatever it is we're working on at that point in the book. And the first time through, you need to begin at the beginning, because the book makes assumptions about what you've already seen and learned.



We use simple UML-like diagrams.

Although there's a good chance you've run across UML, it's not covered in the book, and it's not a prerequisite for the book. If you've never seen UML before, don't worry, we'll give you a few pointers along the way. So in other words, you won't have to worry about Design Patterns and UML at the same time. Our diagrams are "UML-like" — while we try to be true to UML there are times we bend the rules a bit, usually for our own selfish artistic reasons.

We don't cover every single Design Pattern ever created.

There are a *lot* of Design Patterns. The original foundational patterns (known as the GoF patterns), enterprise Java patterns, JSP patterns, architectural patterns, game design patterns and a lot more. But our goal was to make sure the book weighed less than the person reading it, so we don't cover them all here. Our focus is on the core patterns that *matter* from the original GoF patterns, and making sure that you really, truly, deeply understand how and when to use them. You will find a brief look at some of the other patterns (the ones you're far less likely to use) in the appendix. In any case, once you're done with *Head First Design Patterns*, you'll be able to pick up any pattern catalog and get up to speed quickly.

The activities are NOT optional.

The exercises and activities are not add-ons; they're part of the core content of the book. Some of them are to help with memory, some for understanding, and some to help you apply what you've learned. ***Don't skip the exercises.***

The crossword puzzles are the only things you don't *have* to do, but they're good for giving your brain a chance to think about the words from a different context.

We use the word “composition” in the general OO sense, which is more flexible than the strict UML use of “composition.”

When we say “one object is composed with another object” we mean that they are related by a HAS-A relationship. Our use reflects the traditional use of the term and is the one used in the GoF text (you'll learn what that is later). More recently, UML has refined this term into several types of composition. If you are an UML expert, you'll still be able to read the book and you should be able to easily map the use of composition to more refined terms as you read.

The redundancy is intentional and important.

One distinct difference in a Head First book is that we want you to *really* get it. And we want you to finish the book remembering what you've learned. Most reference books don't have retention and recall as a goal, but this book is about *learning*, so you'll see some of the same concepts come up more than once.

The code examples are as lean as possible.

Our readers tell us that it's frustrating to wade through 200 lines of code looking for the two lines they need to understand. Most examples in this book are shown within the smallest possible context, so that the part you're trying to learn is clear and simple. Don't expect all of the code to be robust, or even complete — the examples are written specifically for learning, and aren't always fully-functional.

In some cases, we haven't included all of the import statements needed, but we assume that if you're a Java programmer, you know that `ArrayList` is in `java.util`, for example. If the imports were not part of the normal core JSE API, we mention it. We've also placed all the source code on the Web so you can download it. You'll find it at <http://wickedlysmart.com/head-first-design-patterns/>

Also, for the sake of focusing on the learning side of the code, we did not put our classes into packages (in other words, they're all in the Java default package). We don't recommend this in the real world, and when you download the code examples from this book, you'll find that all classes *are* in

packages.

The Brain Power exercises don't have answers.

For some of them, there is no right answer, and for others, part of the learning experience of the Brain Power activities is for you to decide if and when your answers are right. In some of the Brain Power exercises you will find hints to point you in the right direction.

Tech Reviewers

Valentin Crettaz

Jef Cumps



Barney Marispini



Ike Van Atta ↘




Fearless leader of
the HFDP Extreme
Review Team.



Jason Menard

Mark Spritzler ↗



Johannes de Jong ↗



Dirk Schreckmann





Philippe Maquet

In memory of Philippe Maquet

1960 - 2004

Your amazing technical expertise, relentless enthusiasm, and deep concern for the learner will inspire us always.

We will never forget you.

Acknowledgments

At O'Reilly:

Our biggest thanks to **Mike Loukides** at O'Reilly, for starting it all and helping to shape the Head First concept into a series. And a big thanks to the driving force behind Head First, **Tim O'Reilly**. Thanks to the clever Head First "series mom" **Kyle Hart**, "In Design King" **Ron Bilodeau**, rock-and-roll star **Ellie Volkhausen** for her inspired cover design, **Melanie Yarbrough** for shepherding production, **Colleen Gorman** and **Rachel Monaghan** for their hardcore copyedits, and **Bob Pfahler** for a much improved index. Finally, thanks to **Mike Hendrickson** and **Meghan Blanchette** for championing this book and building the team.

Our intrepid reviewers:

We are extremely grateful for our technical review director **Johannes deJong**. You are our hero, Johannes. And we deeply appreciate the contributions of the co-manager of the **Javaranch** review team, the late **Philippe Maquet**. You have single-handedly brightened the lives of thousands of developers, and the impact you've had on their (and our) lives is

forever. **Jef Cumps** is scarily good at finding problems in our draft chapters, and once again made a huge difference for the book. Thanks Jef! **Valentin Cretazz** (AOP guy), who has been with us from the very first Head First book, proved (as always) just how much we really need his technical expertise and insight. You rock Valentin (but lose the tie).

Two newcomers to the HF review team, **Barney Marispini** and **Ike Van Atta** did a kick butt job on the book — you guys gave us some *really* crucial feedback. Thanks for joining the team.

We also got some excellent technical help from Javaranch moderators/gurus **Mark Spritzler**, **Jason Menard**, **Dirk Schreckmann**, **Thomas Paul**, and **Margarita Isaeva**. And as always, thanks especially to the javaranch.com Trail Boss, **Paul Wheaton**.

Thanks to the finalists of the Javaranch “Pick the *Head First Design Patterns* Cover” contest. The winner, Si Brewster, submitted the winning essay that persuaded us to pick the woman you see on our cover. Other finalists include Andrew Esse, Gian Franco Casula, Helen Crosbie, Pho Tek, Helen Thomas, Sateesh Kommineni, and Jeff Fisher.

For the 2014 update to the book, we are so grateful to the following technical reviewers: George Hoffer, Ted Hill, Todd Bartoszkiewicz, Sylvain Tenier, Scott Davidson, Kevin Ryan, Rich Ward, Mark Francis Jaeger, Mark Masse, Glenn Ray, Bayard Fetler, Paul Higgins, Matt Carpenter, Julia Williams, Matt McCullough, and Mary Ann Belarmino.

Even more people^[1]

From Eric and Elisabeth

Writing a Head First book is a wild ride with two amazing tour guides: **Kathy Sierra** and **Bert Bates**. With Kathy and Bert you throw out all book writing convention and enter a world full of storytelling, learning theory, cognitive science, and pop culture, where the reader always rules. Thanks to both of you for letting us enter your amazing world; we hope we’ve done Head First justice. Seriously, this has been amazing. Thanks for all your careful guidance, for pushing us to go forward, and most of all, for trusting us (with your baby). You’re both certainly “wickedly smart” and you’re also the hippest 29-year-olds we know. So... what’s next?

A big thank you to **Mike Loukides**, **Mike Hendrickson**, and **Meghan**

Blanchette. Mike L. was with us every step of the way. Mike, your insightful feedback helped shape the book and your encouragement kept us moving ahead. Mike H., thanks for your persistence over five years in trying to get us to write a patterns book; we finally did it and we're glad we waited for Head First. And Meg, thanks for diving into the update with us; we couldn't have done it without you.

A very special thanks to **Erich Gamma**, who went far beyond the call of duty in reviewing this book (he even took a draft with him on vacation). Erich, your interest in this book inspired us and your thorough technical review improved it immeasurably. Thanks as well to the entire **Gang of Four** for their support & interest, and for making a special appearance in Objectville. We are also indebted to **Ward Cunningham** and the patterns community who created the Portland Pattern Repository — an indespensible resource for us in writing this book.

It takes a village to write a technical book: **Bill Pugh** and **Ken Arnold** gave us expert advice on Singleton. **Joshua Marinacci** provided rockin' Swing tips and advice. **John Brewer's** "Why a Duck?" paper inspired SimUDuck (and we're glad he likes ducks too). **Dan Friedman** inspired the Little Singleton example. **Daniel Steinberg** acted as our "technical liason" and our emotional support network. Thanks to Apple's **James Dempsey** for allowing us to use his MVC song. And thank you to **Richard Warburton** who made sure our Java 8 code updates were up to snuff for this updated edition of the book.

Last, a personal thank you to the **Javaranch review team** for their top-notch reviews and warm support. There's more of you in this book than you know.

From Kathy and Bert

We'd like to thank Mike Hendrickson for finding Eric and Elisabeth... but we can't. Because of these two, we discovered (to our horror) that we aren't the *only* ones who can do a Head First book. ;) However, if readers want to *believe* that it's really Kathy and Bert who did the cool things in the book, well, who are we to set them straight?

[1] The large number of acknowledgments is because we're testing the theory that everyone mentioned in a book acknowledgment will buy at least one copy, probably more, what with relatives and everything. If you'd like to be in the acknowledgment of our *next* book, and

you have a large family, write to us.


Chapter 1. Intro to Design Patterns: Welcome to Design Patterns



Someone has already solved your problems. In this chapter, you'll learn why (and how) you can exploit the wisdom and lessons learned by other developers who've been down the same design problem road and survived the trip. Before we're done, we'll look at the use and benefits of design patterns, look at some key OO design principles, and walk through an example of how one pattern works. The best way to use patterns is to *load your brain* with them and then *recognize places* in your designs and existing applications where you can *apply them*. Instead of *code reuse*, with patterns you get *experience reuse*.

It started with a simple SimUDuck app

Joe works for a company that makes a highly successful duck pond simulation game, *SimUDuck*. The game can show a large variety of duck species swimming and making quacking sounds. The initial designers of the system used standard OO techniques and created one Duck superclass from which all other duck types inherit.





In the last year, the company has been under increasing pressure from competitors. After a week long off-site brainstorming session over golf, the company executives think it's time for a big innovation. They need something *really* impressive to show at the upcoming shareholders meeting in Maui *next week*.

But now we need the ducks to FLY

The executives decided that flying ducks is just what the simulator needs to blow away the other duck sim competitors. And of course Joe's manager told them it'll be no problem for Joe to just whip something up in a week. "After all," said Joe's boss, "he's an OO programmer... *how hard can it be?*"





But something went horribly wrong...




Joe, I'm at the shareholder's meeting. They just gave a demo and there were **rubber duckies** flying around the screen. Was this your idea of a joke? You might want to spend some time on Monster.com...



What happened?

Joe failed to notice that not *all* subclasses of Duck should *fly*. When Joe added new behavior to the Duck superclass, he was also adding behavior that was *not* appropriate for some Duck subclasses. He now has flying inanimate objects in the SimUDuck program.

A localized update to the code caused a nonlocal side effect (flying rubber ducks)!



OK, so there's a
slight flaw in my design.
I don't see why they can't
just call it a "feature."
It's kind of cute...



What Joe thought was a great use of inheritance for the purpose of reuse hasn't turned out so well when it comes to maintenance.

Joe thinks about inheritance...

I could always just override the fly() method in rubber duck, the way I am with the quack() method...



```
RubberDuck
quack() { // squeak}
display() { // rubber duck }
fly() {
    // override to do nothing
}
```

But then what happens when we add wooden decoy ducks to the program? They aren't supposed to fly or quack...



DecoyDuck

```
quack() {
    // override to do nothing
}

display() { // decoy duck }

fly() {
    // override to do nothing
}
```

Here's another class in the hierarchy; notice that like RubberDuck, it doesn't fly, but it also doesn't quack.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL


Which of the following are disadvantages of using *inheritance* to provide Duck behavior? (Choose all that apply.)

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | A. Code is duplicated across subclasses. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | B. Runtime behavior changes are difficult. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | C. We can't make ducks dance. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | D. Hard to gain knowledge of all duck behaviors. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | E. Ducks can't fly and quack at the same time. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | F. Changes can unintentionally affect other ducks. |

How about an interface?

Joe realized that inheritance probably wasn't the answer, because he just got a memo that says that the executives now want to update the product every six months (in ways they haven't yet decided on). Joe knows the spec will keep changing and he'll be forced to look at and possibly override `fly()` and `quack()` for every new Duck subclass that's ever added to the program... *forever*.

So, he needs a cleaner way to have only *some* (but not *all*) of the duck types fly or quack.



I could take the `fly()` out of the Duck superclass, and make a *Flyable()* interface with a `fly()` method. That way, only the ducks that are *supposed* to fly will implement that interface and have a `fly()` method... and I might as well make a *Quackable*, too, since not all ducks can quack.



What do YOU think about this design?



What would you do if you were Joe?

We know that not *all* of the subclasses should have flying or quacking behavior, so inheritance isn't the right answer. But while having the subclasses implement Flyable and/or Quackable solves *part* of the problem (no inappropriately flying rubber ducks), it completely destroys code reuse for those behaviors, so it just creates a *different* maintenance nightmare. And of course there might be more than one kind of flying behavior even among the ducks that *do* fly...

At this point you might be waiting for a Design Pattern to come riding in on a white horse and save the day. But what fun would that be? No, we're going to figure out a solution the old-fashioned way — *by applying good OO software design principles*.



The one constant in software development

Okay, what's the **one thing you can always count on in software development?**

No matter where you work, what you're building, or what language you are programming in, what's the one true constant that will be with you always?

CHANGE

(use a mirror to see the answer)

No matter how well you design an application, over time an application must grow and change or it will *die*.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Lots of things can drive change. List some reasons you've had to change code in your applications (we put in a couple of our own to get you started).

My customers or users decide they want something else, or they want new functionality.

My company decided it is going with another database vendor and it is also purchasing its data from another supplier that uses a different data format. Argh!

Zeroing in on the problem...

So we know using inheritance hasn't worked out very well, since the duck behavior keeps changing across the subclasses, and it's not appropriate for *all* subclasses to have those behaviors. The Flyable and Quackable interface sounded promising at first — only ducks that really do fly will be Flyable, etc. — except Java interfaces have no implementation code, so no code reuse. And that means that whenever you need to modify a behavior, you're forced to track down and change it in all the different subclasses where that behavior is defined, probably introducing *new* bugs along the way!

Luckily, there's a design principle for just this situation.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Identify the aspects of your application that vary and separate them from what stays the same.

The first of many design principles. We'll spend more time on these throughout the book.

**Take what varies and “encapsulate” it so it won’t affect the rest of your code.
The result? Fewer unintended consequences from code changes and more flexibility in your systems!**

In other words, if you've got some aspect of your code that is changing, say with every new requirement, then you know you've got a behavior that needs to be pulled out and separated from all the stuff that doesn't change.

Here's another way to think about this principle: ***take the parts that vary and encapsulate them, so that later you can alter or extend the parts that vary without affecting those that don't.***

As simple as this concept is, it forms the basis for almost every design pattern. All patterns provide a way to let *some part of a system vary independently of all other parts*.

Okay, time to pull the duck behavior out of the Duck classes!

Separating what changes from what stays the same

Where do we start? As far as we can tell, other than the problems with `fly()` and `quack()`, the Duck class is working well and there are no other parts of it that appear to vary or change frequently. So, other than a few slight changes, we're going to pretty much leave the Duck class alone.

Now, to separate the “parts that change from those that stay the same,” we are going to create two sets of classes (totally apart from Duck), one for `fly` and one for `quack`. Each set of classes will hold all the implementations of the respective behavior. For instance, we might have *one* class that implements `quacking`, *another* that implements `squeaking`, and *another* that implements `silence`.


We know that `fly()` and `quack()` are the parts of the Duck class that vary across ducks.

To separate these behaviors from the Duck class, we'll pull both methods out of the Duck class and create a new set of classes to represent each behavior.

The Duck class is still the superclass of all ducks, but we are pulling out the fly and quack behaviors and putting them into another class structure.

Now flying and quacking each get their own set of classes.

Various behavior implementations are going to live here.



Designing the Duck Behaviors

So how are we going to design the set of classes that implement the fly and quack behaviors?

We'd like to keep things flexible; after all, it was the inflexibility in the duck behaviors that got us into trouble in the first place. And we know that we want to *assign* behaviors to the instances of Duck. For example, we might want to instantiate a new MallardDuck instance and initialize it with a specific *type* of flying behavior. And while we're there, why not make sure that we can change the behavior of a duck dynamically? In other words, we should include behavior setter methods in the Duck classes so that we can *change* the MallardDuck's flying behavior *at runtime*.

Given these goals, let's look at our second design principle:

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Program to an interface, not an implementation.

From now on, the Duck behaviors will live in a separate class — a class that implements a particular behavior interface.


That way, the Duck classes won't need to know any of the implementation details for their own behaviors.

We'll use an interface to represent each behavior — for instance, FlyBehavior and QuackBehavior — and each implementation of a *behavior* will implement one of those interfaces.

So this time it won't be the *Duck* classes that will implement the flying and quacking interfaces. Instead, we'll make a set of classes whose entire reason for living is to represent a behavior (for example, "squeaking"), and it's the *behavior* class, rather than the *Duck* class, that will implement the behavior interface.

This is in contrast to the way we were doing things before, where a behavior came either from a concrete implementation in the superclass *Duck*, or by providing a specialized implementation in the subclass itself. In both cases we were relying on an *implementation*. We were locked into using that specific implementation and there was no room for changing the behavior (other than writing more code).

With our new design, the *Duck* subclasses will use a behavior represented by an *interface* (FlyBehavior and QuackBehavior), so that the actual *implementation* of the behavior (in other words, the specific concrete behavior coded in the class that implements the FlyBehavior or QuackBehavior) won't be locked into the *Duck* subclass.





“Program to an *interface*” really means “Program to a *supertype*.”

The word *interface* is overloaded here. There's the *concept* of interface, but there's also the Java construct interface. You can *program to an interface*, without having to actually use a Java interface. The point is to exploit polymorphism by programming to a supertype so that the actual runtime object isn't locked into the code. And we could rephrase “program to a supertype” as “the declared type of the variables should be a supertype, usually an abstract class or interface, so that the objects assigned to those variables can be of any concrete implementation of the supertype, which means the class declaring them doesn't have to know about the actual object types!”

This is probably old news to you, but just to make sure we're all saying the same thing, here's a simple example of using a polymorphic type — imagine an abstract class `Animal`, with two concrete implementations, `Dog` and `Cat`.

Programming to an implementation would be:

```
Dog d = new Dog();
d.bark();
```

NOTE

Declaring the variable “`d`” as type `Dog` (a concrete implementation of `Animal`) forces us to code to a concrete implementation.

But **programming to an interface/supertype** would be:

```
Animal animal = new Dog();
animal.makeSound();
```

NOTE


We know it's a `Dog`, but we can now use the `animal` reference polymorphically.

Even better, rather than hardcoding the instantiation of the subtype (like `new Dog()`) into the code, **assign the concrete implementation object at runtime**:

```
a = getAnimal();
a.makeSound();
```


NOTE

We don't know WHAT the actual animal subtype is... all we care about is that it knows how to respond to `makeSound()`.



Implementing the Duck Behaviors

Here we have the two interfaces, FlyBehavior and QuackBehavior, along with the corresponding classes that implement each concrete behavior:



NOTE

With this design, other types of objects can reuse our fly and quack behaviors because these behaviors are no longer hidden away in our Duck classes!

And we can add new behaviors without modifying any of our existing behavior classes or touching any of the Duck classes that use flying behaviors.

So we get the benefit of REUSE without all the baggage that comes along with inheritance.

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: Do I always have to implement my application first, see where things are changing, and then go back and separate & encapsulate those things?

A: A: Not always; often when you are designing an application, you anticipate those areas that are going to vary and then go ahead and build the flexibility to deal with it into your code. You'll find that the principles and patterns can be applied at any stage of the development lifecycle.

Q: Q: Should we make Duck an interface too?

A: A: Not in this case. As you'll see once we've got everything hooked together, we do benefit by having Duck not be an interface, and having specific ducks, like MallardDuck, inherit common properties and methods. Now that we've removed what varies from the Duck inheritance, we get the benefits of this structure without the problems.

Q: Q: It feels a little weird to have a class that's just a behavior. Aren't classes supposed to represent things?

Aren't classes supposed to have both state AND behavior?

A: A: In an OO system, yes, classes represent things that generally have both state (instance variables) and methods. And in this case, the thing happens to be a behavior. But even a behavior can still have state and methods; a flying behavior might have instance variables representing the attributes for the flying (wing beats per minute, max altitude, and speed, etc.) behavior.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

- ① Using our new design, what would you do if you needed to add rocket-powered flying to the SimUDuck app?
- ② Can you think of a class that might want to use the Quack behavior that isn't a duck?

Answers:

- 1) Create a FlyRocketPowered class that implements the FlyBehavior interface.
- 2) One example, a duck call (a device that makes duck sounds).

Integrating the Duck Behavior


The key is that a Duck will now delegate its flying and quacking behavior, instead of using quacking and flying methods defined in the Duck class (or subclass).

Here's how:

① First we'll add two instance variables to the Duck class called *flyBehavior* and *quackBehavior* that are declared as the interface type (not a concrete class implementation type). Each duck object will set these variables polymorphically to reference the *specific* behavior type it would like at runtime (FlyWithWings, Squeak, etc.).

We'll also remove the *fly()* and *quack()* methods from the Duck class (and any subclasses) because we've moved this behavior out into the FlyBehavior and QuackBehavior classes.

We'll replace *fly()* and *quack()* in the Duck class with two similar methods, called *performFly()* and *performQuack()*; you'll see how they work next.



② Now we implement performQuack():

```
public class Duck {
    QuackBehavior quackBehavior;
    // more

    public void performQuack() {
        quackBehavior.quack();
    }
}
```

Each Duck has a reference to something that implements the QuackBehavior interface.

Rather than handling the quack behavior itself, the Duck object delegates that behavior to the object referenced by quackBehavior.

Pretty simple, huh? To perform the quack, a Duck just allows the object that is referenced by quackBehavior to quack for it.

In this part of the code we don't care what kind of object it is, ***all we care about is that it knows how to quack()***!

More integration...

③ Okay, time to worry about **how the flyBehavior and quackBehavior instance variables are set**. Let's take a look at the MallardDuck class:

```
public class MallardDuck extends Duck {
```

```
    public MallardDuck() {  
        quackBehavior = new Quack();  
        flyBehavior = new FlyWithWings();  
    }
```

Remember, MallardDuck inherits the quackBehavior and flyBehavior instance variables from class Duck.

A MallardDuck uses the Quack class to handle its quack, so when performQuack() is called, the responsibility for the quack is delegated to the Quack object and we get a real quack.

And it uses FlyWithWings as its FlyBehavior type.

```
    public void display() {  
        System.out.println("I'm a real Mallard duck");  
    }  
}
```

So MallardDuck's quack is a real live duck **quack**, not a **squeak** and not a **mute quack**. So what happens here? When a MallardDuck is instantiated, its constructor initializes the MallardDuck's inherited quackBehavior instance variable to a new instance of type Quack (a QuackBehavior concrete implementation class).

And the same is true for the duck's flying behavior — the MallardDuck's constructor initializes the flyBehavior instance variable with an instance of type FlyWithWings (a FlyBehavior concrete implementation class).



Wait a second, didn't you
say we should NOT program to an
implementation? But what are we doing in that
constructor? We're making a new instance of a
concrete Quack implementation class!

Good catch, that's exactly what we're doing... *for now*.

Later in the book we'll have more patterns in our toolbox that can help us fix it.

Still, notice that while we *are* setting the behaviors to concrete classes (by instantiating a behavior class like Quack or FlyWithWings and assigning it to our behavior reference variable), we could *easily* change that at runtime.

So, we still have a lot of flexibility here, but we're doing a poor job of initializing the instance variables in a flexible way. But think about it: since the quackBehavior instance variable is an interface type, we could (through the magic of polymorphism) dynamically assign a different QuackBehavior

implementation class at runtime.

Take a moment and think about how you would implement a duck so that its behavior could change at runtime. (You'll see the code that does this a few pages from now.)

Testing the Duck code

- ① Type and compile the Duck class below (`Duck.java`), and the MallardDuck class from two pages back (`MallardDuck.java`).

```
public abstract class Duck {  
    FlyBehavior flyBehavior;  
    QuackBehavior quackBehavior;  
    public Duck() {  
    }  
  
    public abstract void display();  
  
    public void performFly() {  
        flyBehavior.fly();  
    }  
  
    public void performQuack() {  
        quackBehavior.quack();  
    }  
  
    public void swim() {  
        System.out.println("All ducks float, even decoys!");  
    }  
}
```

Declare two reference variables for the behavior interface types. All duck subclasses (in the same package) inherit these.

Delegate to the behavior class.

- ② Type and compile the FlyBehavior interface (`FlyBehavior.java`) and the two behavior implementation classes (`FlyWithWings.java` and `FlyNoWay.java`).

```

public interface FlyBehavior {
    public void fly();
}



---


public class FlyWithWings implements FlyBehavior {
    public void fly() {
        System.out.println("I'm flying!!");
    }
}



---


public class FlyNoWay implements FlyBehavior {
    public void fly() {
        System.out.println("I can't fly");
    }
}

```

The interface that all flying behavior classes implement.

Flying behavior implementation for ducks that DO fly...

Flying behavior implementation for ducks that do NOT fly (like rubber ducks and decoy ducks).

③ Type and compile the QuackBehavior interface (QuackBehavior.java) and the three behavior implementation classes (Quack.java, MuteQuack.java, and Squeak.java).

```

public interface QuackBehavior {
    public void quack();
}



---


public class Quack implements QuackBehavior {
    public void quack() {
        System.out.println("Quack");
    }
}



---


public class MuteQuack implements QuackBehavior {
    public void quack() {
        System.out.println("<< Silence >>");
    }
}



---


public class Squeak implements QuackBehavior {
    public void quack() {
        System.out.println("Squeak");
    }
}

```

④ Type and compile the test class (MiniDuckSimulator.java).

```

public class MiniDuckSimulator {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        Duck mallard = new MallardDuck();
        mallard.performQuack();
        mallard.performFly();
    }
}

```

This calls the MallardDuck's inherited performQuack() method, which then delegates to the object's QuackBehavior (i.e., calls quack() on the duck's inherited quackBehavior reference). Then we do the same thing with MallardDuck's inherited performFly() method.

⑤ Run the code!

```

File Edit Window Help Yadayadayada
%java MiniDuckSimulator
Quack
I'm flying!!

```

Setting behavior dynamically

What a shame to have all this dynamic talent built into our ducks and not be using it! Imagine you want to set the duck's behavior type through a setter method on the duck subclass, rather than by instantiating it in the duck's constructor.

① Add two new methods to the Duck class:

```

public void setFlyBehavior(FlyBehavior fb) {
    flyBehavior = fb;
}

public void setQuackBehavior(QuackBehavior qb) {
    quackBehavior = qb;
}

```

Duck
FlyBehavior flyBehavior;
QuackBehavior quackBehavior;
swim()
display()
performQuack()
performFly()
setFlyBehavior()
setQuackBehavior()
// OTHER duck-like methods...

We can call these methods anytime we want to change the behavior of a duck on the fly.

NOTE

Editor note: gratuitous pun - fix

② Make a new Duck type (ModelDuck.java).

```
public class ModelDuck extends Duck {  
    public ModelDuck() {  
        flyBehavior = new FlyNoWay(); ← Our model duck begins life grounded...  
        quackBehavior = new Quack();  
    }  
  
    public void display() {  
        System.out.println("I'm a model duck");  
    }  
}
```

without a way to fly.

③ Make a new FlyBehavior type (FlyRocketPowered.java).

```
public class FlyRocketPowered implements FlyBehavior {  
    public void fly() {  
        System.out.println("I'm flying with a rocket!");  
    }  
}
```

That's okay, we're creating a rocket-powered flying behavior.



④ Change the test class (MiniDuckSimulator.java), add the ModelDuck, and make the ModelDuck rocket-enabled.

```

public class MiniDuckSimulator {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        Duck mallard = new MallardDuck();
        mallard.performQuack();
        mallard.performFly();
    }
}

```

```

Duck model = new ModelDuck();
model.performFly();
model.setFlyBehavior(new FlyRocketPowered());
model.performFly();
}

```

If it worked, the model duck dynamically changed its flying behavior! You can't do THAT if the implementation lives inside the Duck class.

⑤ Run it!

```

File Edit Window Help Yabababadoo
%java MiniDuckSimulator
Quack
I'm flying!!
I can't fly
I'm flying with a rocket!

```

The first call to `performFly()` delegates to the `flyBehavior` object, set in the `ModelDuck`'s constructor, which is a `FlyNoWay` instance.

This invokes the model's inherited behavior setter method, and...voilà! The model suddenly has rocket-powered flying capability!

To change a duck's behavior at runtime, just call the duck's setter method for that behavior.

The Big Picture on encapsulated behaviors


Okay, now that we've done the deep dive on the duck simulator design, it's time to come back up for air and take a look at the big picture.

Below is the entire reworked class structure. We have everything you'd expect: ducks extending Duck, fly behaviors implementing FlyBehavior, and quack behaviors implementing QuackBehavior.

Notice also that we've started to describe things a little differently. Instead of thinking of the duck behaviors as a *set of behaviors*, we'll start thinking of them as a *family of algorithms*. Think about it: in the SimUDuck design, the

algorithms represent things a duck would do (different ways of quacking or flying), but we could just as easily use the same techniques for a set of classes that implement the ways to compute state sales tax by different states.

Pay careful attention to the *relationships* between the classes. In fact, grab your pen and write the appropriate relationship (IS-A, HAS-A, and IMPLEMENTS) on each arrow in the class diagram.



HAS-A can be better than IS-A

The HAS-A relationship is an interesting one: each duck has a FlyBehavior and a QuackBehavior to which it delegates flying and quacking.

When you put two classes together like this you're using **composition**. Instead of *inheriting* their behavior, the ducks get their behavior by being *composed* with the right behavior object.

This is an important technique; in fact, we've been using our third design principle:

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Favor composition over inheritance.

As you've seen, creating systems using composition gives you a lot more flexibility. Not only does it let you encapsulate a family of algorithms into their own set of classes, but it also lets you ***change behavior at runtime*** as long as the object you're composing with implements the correct behavior interface.

Composition is used in many design patterns and you'll see a lot more about its advantages and disadvantages throughout the book.

BRAIN POWER

A duck call is a device that hunters use to mimic the calls (quacks) of ducks. How would you implement your own duck call that does *not* inherit from the Duck class?

MASTER AND STUDENT...

Master: Grasshopper, tell me what you have learned of the Object-Oriented ways.

Student: Master, I have learned that the promise of the object-oriented way is reuse.

Master: Grasshopper, continue...

Student: Master, through inheritance all good things may be reused and so we come to drastically cut development time like we swiftly cut bamboo in the woods.

Master: Grasshopper, is more time spent on code **before** or **after** development is complete?

Student: The answer is **after**, Master. We always spend more time maintaining and changing software than on initial development.

Master: So Grasshopper, should effort go into reuse **above** maintainability and extensibility?

Student: Master, I believe that there is truth in this.

Master: I can see that you still have much to learn. I would like for you to go and meditate on inheritance further. As you've seen, inheritance has its problems, and there are other ways of achieving reuse.

Speaking of Design Patterns...

CONGRATULATIONS ON YOUR FIRST PATTERN!



You just applied your first design pattern — the **STRATEGY** Pattern. That's right, you used the Strategy Pattern to rework the SimUDuck app. Thanks to this pattern, the simulator is ready for any changes those execs might cook up on their next business trip to Maui.

Now that we've made you take the long road to apply it, here's the formal definition of this pattern:

NOTE

The Strategy Pattern defines a family of algorithms, encapsulates each one, and makes them interchangeable. Strategy lets the algorithm vary independently from clients that use it.

Use THIS definition when you need to impress friends and influence key executives.

DESIGN PUZZLE

Below you'll find a mess of classes and interfaces for an action adventure game. You'll find classes for game characters along with classes for weapon behaviors the characters can use in the game. Each character can make use of one weapon at a time, but can change weapons at any time during the game. Your job is to sort it all out...


(Answers are at the end of the chapter.)

Your task:


- ① Arrange the classes.
- ② Identify one abstract class, one interface, and eight classes.
- ③ Draw arrows between classes.
 1. Draw this kind of arrow for inheritance ("extends").
 2. Draw this kind of arrow for interface ("implements").

3. Draw this kind of arrow for “HAS-A”. →

④ Put the method setWeapon() into the right class.



Overheard at the local diner...




What's the difference between these two orders? Not a thing! They're both the same order, except Alice is using twice the number of words and trying the patience of a grumpy short-order cook.

What's Flo got that Alice doesn't? **A shared vocabulary** with the short-order cook. Not only does that make it easier to communicate with the cook, but it gives the cook less to remember because he's got all the diner patterns in his head.

Design Patterns give you a shared vocabulary with other developers. Once you've got the vocabulary you can more easily communicate with other developers and inspire those who don't know patterns to start learning them. It also elevates your thinking about architectures by letting you **think at the pattern level**, not the nitty-gritty *object* level.

Overheard in the next cubicle...



So I created this broadcast class. It keeps track of all the objects listening to it, and anytime a new piece of data comes along it sends a message to each listener. What's cool is that the listeners can join the broadcast at any time or they can even remove themselves. It is really dynamic and loosely coupled!

Rick



Rick, why didn't you just say you are using the **Observer Pattern**?

Exactly. If you communicate in patterns, then other developers know immediately and precisely the design you're describing. Just don't get Pattern Fever... you'll know you have it when you start using patterns for Hello World...

BRAIN POWER

Can you think of other shared vocabularies that are used beyond OO design and dinner talk? (Hint: how about auto mechanics, carpenters, gourmet chefs, air traffic control.) What qualities are communicated along with the lingo?

Can you think of aspects of OO design that get communicated along with pattern names? What qualities get communicated along with the name “Strategy Pattern”?

The power of a shared pattern vocabulary

When you communicate using patterns you are doing more than just sharing LINGO.

Shared pattern vocabularies are POWERFUL. When you communicate with another developer or your team using patterns, you are communicating not just a pattern name but a whole set of qualities, characteristics, and constraints that the pattern represents.

NOTE

“We’re using the Strategy Pattern to implement the various behaviors of our ducks.” This tells you the duck behavior has been encapsulated into its own set of classes that can be easily expanded and changed, even at runtime if needed.

Patterns allow you to say more with less. When you use a pattern in a description, other developers quickly know precisely the design you have in mind.

Talking at the pattern level allows you to stay “in the design” longer. Talking about software systems using patterns allows you to keep the discussion at the design level, without having to dive down to the nitty-gritty details of implementing objects and classes.

NOTE

How many design meetings have you been in that quickly degrade into implementation details?

Shared vocabularies can turbo-charge your development team. A team well versed in design patterns can move more quickly with less room for misunderstanding.

NOTE

As your team begins to share design ideas and experience in terms of patterns, you will build a community of patterns users.

Shared vocabularies encourage more junior developers to get up to speed. Junior developers look up to experienced developers. When senior developers make use of design patterns, junior developers also become motivated to learn them. Build a community of pattern users at your organization.

NOTE


Think about starting a patterns study group at your organization. Maybe you can even get paid while you're learning...

How do I use Design Patterns?

We've all used off-the-shelf libraries and frameworks. We take them, write some code against their APIs, compile them into our programs, and benefit from a lot of code someone else has written. Think about the Java APIs and all the functionality they give you: network, GUI, IO, etc. Libraries and frameworks go a long way towards a development model where we can just pick and choose components and plug them right in. But... they don't help us structure our own applications in ways that are easier to understand, more maintainable and flexible. That's where Design Patterns come in.

Design patterns don't go directly into your code, they first go into your BRAIN. Once you've loaded your brain with a good working knowledge of patterns, you can then start to apply them to your new designs, and rework your old code when you find it's degrading into an inflexible mess of jungle spaghetti code.

A Bunch of Patterns



THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: If design patterns are so great, why can't someone build a library of them so I don't have to?

A: A: Design patterns are higher level than libraries. Design patterns tell us how to structure classes and objects to solve certain problems and it is our job to adapt those designs to fit our particular application.

Q: Q: Aren't libraries and frameworks also design patterns?

A: A: Frameworks and libraries are not design patterns; they provide specific implementations that we link into our code. Sometimes, however, libraries and frameworks make use of design patterns in their implementations. That's great, because once you understand design patterns, you'll more quickly understand APIs that are structured around design patterns.

Q: Q: So, there are no libraries of design patterns?

A: A: No, but you will learn later about pattern catalogs with lists of patterns that you can apply to your applications.



Skeptical Developer



Friendly Patterns Guru

Developer: Okay, hmm, but isn't this all just good object-oriented design; I mean as long as I follow encapsulation and I know about abstraction, inheritance, and polymorphism, do I really need to think about Design Patterns? Isn't it pretty straightforward? Isn't this why I took all those OO courses? I think Design Patterns are useful for people who don't know good

OO design.

Guru: Ah, this is one of the true misunderstandings of object-oriented development: that by knowing the OO basics we are automatically going to be good at building flexible, reusable, and maintainable systems.

Developer: No?

Guru: No. As it turns out, constructing OO systems that have these properties is not always obvious and has been discovered only through hard work.

Developer: I think I'm starting to get it. These, sometimes non-obvious, ways of constructing object-oriented systems have been collected...

Guru: ...yes, into a set of patterns called Design Patterns.

Developer: So, by knowing patterns, I can skip the hard work and jump straight to designs that always work?

Guru: Yes, to an extent, but remember, design is an art. There will always be tradeoffs. But, if you follow well thought-out and time-tested design patterns, you'll be way ahead.

Developer: What do I do if I can't find a pattern?

Remember, knowing concepts like abstraction, inheritance, and polymorphism does not make you a good object-oriented designer. A design guru thinks about how to create flexible designs that are maintainable and can cope with change.



Guru: There are some object-oriented principles that underlie the patterns, and knowing these will help you to cope when you can't find a pattern that matches your problem.

Developer: Principles? You mean beyond abstraction, encapsulation, and...

Guru: Yes, one of the secrets to creating maintainable OO systems is thinking about how they might change in the future, and these principles address those issues.

Tools for your Design Toolbox

You've nearly made it through the first chapter! You've already put a few tools in your OO toolbox; let's make a list of them before we move on to Chapter 2.

OO Basics

Abstraction
Encapsulation
Polymorphism
Inheritance

We assume you know the OO basics of using classes polymorphically, how inheritance is like design by contract, and how encapsulation works. If you are a little rusty on these, pull out your Head First Java and review, then skim this chapter again.

OO Principles

Encapsulate what varies.
Favor composition over inheritance.
Program to interfaces, not implementations.

We'll be taking a closer look at these down the road and also adding a few more to the list

OO Patterns

Strategy - defines a family of algorithms, encapsulates each one, and makes them interchangeable. Strategy lets the algorithm vary independently from clients that use it.

Throughout the book, think about how patterns rely on OO basics and principles.

One down, many to go!

BULLET POINTS


- Knowing the OO basics does not make you a good OO designer.
- Good OO designs are reusable, extensible, and maintainable.
- Patterns show you how to build systems with good OO design qualities.
- Patterns are proven object-oriented experience.
- Patterns don't give you code, they give you general solutions to design problems. You apply them to your specific application.

- Patterns aren't *invented*, they are *discovered*.
- Most patterns and principles address issues of *change* in software.
- Most patterns allow some part of a system to vary independently of all other parts.
- We often try to take what varies in a system and encapsulate it.
- Patterns provide a shared language that can maximize the value of your communication with other developers.

DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD

Let's give your right brain something to do.

It's your standard crossword; all of the solution words are from this chapter.




Across	Down
2. _____ what varies.	1. Patterns _____ in many applications.
4. Design patterns _____.	3. Favor this over inheritance.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>6. Java IO, Networking, Sound.</p> <p>9. Rubber ducks make a _____.</p> <p>13. Bartender thought they were called.</p> <p>15. Program to this, not an implementation.</p> <p>17. Patterns go into your _____.</p> <p>18. Learn from the other guy's _____.</p> <p>19. Development constant.</p> <p>20. Patterns give us a shared _____.</p> | <p>5. Dan was thrilled with this pattern.</p> <p>7. Most patterns follow from OO _____.</p> <p>8. Not your own _____.</p> <p>10. High level libraries.</p> <p>11. Joe's favorite drink.</p> <p>12. Pattern that fixed the simulator.</p> <p>13. Duck that can't quack.</p> <p>14. Grilled cheese with bacon.</p> <p>15. Duck demo was located here.</p> |
|--|---|

DESIGN PUZZLE SOLUTION

Character is the abstract class for all the other characters (King, Queen, Knight, and Troll), while WeaponBehavior is an interface that all weapon behaviors implement. So all actual characters and weapons are concrete classes.

To switch weapons, each character calls the setWeapon() method, which is defined in the Character superclass. During a fight the useWeapon() method is called on the current weapon set for a given character to inflict great bodily damage on another character.



SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Which of the following are disadvantages of using subclassing to provide specific Duck behavior? (Choose all that apply.) Here's our solution.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A.	Code is duplicated across subclasses.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	B.	Runtime behavior changes are difficult.
<input type="checkbox"/>	C.	We can't make duck's dance.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	D.	Hard to gain knowledge of all duck behaviors.
<input type="checkbox"/>	E.	Ducks can't fly and quack at the same time.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F.	Changes can unintentionally affect other ducks.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

What are some factors that drive change in your applications? You might have a very different list, but here's a few of ours. Look familiar? Here's our solution.

NOTE

My customers or users decide they want something else, or they want new functionality.

My company decided it is going with another database vendor and it is also purchasing its data from another supplier that uses a different data format. Argh!

Well, technology changes and we've got to update our code to make use of protocols.

We've learned enough building our system that we'd like to go back and do things a little better.

DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD SOLUTION

¹ R																					
² E	N	³ C	A	P	S	U	L	A	T	E											
C	O										⁴ R	⁵ O	C	K							
U	M	⁶ A	⁷ P	I	S						B				⁸ F						
R	P		R								⁹ S	Q	U	E	A	K					
	O		I	¹⁰ F		¹¹ M		¹² S		E					I						
¹³ D	E	S	I	G	N	E	R	P	A	T	T	E	R	N	S	L					
E	I		C		A		R		R		V				¹⁴ J		U				
C	T		I	M		T		A	E	E					R						
O	I		P	E		¹⁵ I	N	T	E	R	F	A	C	E							
Y	O		L	W		N	E				C			S							
D	N		E	O		I	G				K										
U	¹⁶ M	S	R			Y					¹⁷ B	R	A	I	N						
C	A		K								E										
K	¹⁸ S	U	C	C	E	S	S	S	E	S	¹⁹ C	H	A	N	G	E					
	I										N										
						²⁰ V	O	C	A	B	U	L	A	R	Y						

Chapter 2. The Observer Pattern: Keeping your Objects in the know



Don't miss out when something interesting happens! We've got a pattern that keeps your objects in the know when something they might care about happens. Objects can even decide at runtime whether they want to be kept informed. The Observer Pattern is one of the most heavily used patterns in the JDK, and it's incredibly useful. Before we're done, we'll also look at one-to-many relationships and loose coupling (yeah, that's right, we said coupling). With Observer, you'll be the life of the Patterns Party.

Congratulations!

Your team has just won the contract to build Weather-O-Rama, Inc.'s next-generation, Internet-based Weather Monitoring Station.



Statement of Work

Congratulations on being selected to build our next-generation, Internet-based Weather Monitoring Station!

The weather station will be based on our patent pending WeatherData object, which tracks current weather conditions (temperature, humidity, and barometric pressure). We'd like you to create an application that initially provides three display elements: current conditions, weather statistics, and a simple forecast, all updated in real time as the WeatherData object acquires the most recent measurements.

Further, this is an expandable weather station. Weather-ORama wants to release an API so that other developers can write their own weather displays and plug them right in. We'd like for you to supply that API!

Weather-O-Rama thinks we have a great business model: once the customers are hooked, we intend to charge them for each display they use. Now for the best part: we are going to pay you in stock options.

We look forward to seeing your design and alpha application.

Sincerely,


Johnny Hurricane

Johnny Hurricane, CEO

P.S. We are overnighting the WeatherData source files to you.

The Weather Monitoring application overview

The three players in the system are the weather station (the physical device that acquires the actual weather data), the WeatherData object (that tracks the data coming from the Weather Station and updates the displays), and the display that shows users the current weather conditions.



The WeatherData object knows how to talk to the physical Weather Station, to get updated data. The WeatherData object then updates its displays for the three different display elements: Current Conditions (shows temperature, humidity, and pressure), Weather Statistics, and a simple forecast.

Our job, if we choose to accept it, is to create an app that uses the WeatherData object to update three displays for current conditions, weather stats, and a forecast.

Unpacking the WeatherData class

As promised, the next morning the WeatherData source files arrive. When we peek inside the code, things look pretty straightforward:

```

WeatherData
getTemperature()
getHumidity()
getPressure()
measurementsChanged()
// other methods

```

These three methods return the most recent weather measurements for temperature, humidity, and barometric pressure, respectively.

We don't care HOW these variables are set; the WeatherData object knows how to get updated info from the Weather Station.

The developers of the WeatherData object left us a clue about what we need to add...

```

/*
 * This method gets called
 * whenever the weather measurements
 * have been updated
 *
 */
public void measurementsChanged() {
    // Your code goes here
}

```

WeatherData.java

Remember, this Current Conditions is just ONE of three different display screens. ↓



Display device

Our job is to implement measurementsChanged() so that it updates the three displays for current conditions, weather stats, and forecast.

What do we know so far?



The spec from Weather-O-Rama wasn't all that clear, but we have to figure out what we need to do. So, what do we know so far?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The WeatherData class has getter methods for three measurement values: temperature, humidity, and barometric pressure. <code>getTemperature()</code> <code>getHumidity()</code> <code>getPressure()</code>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The measurementsChanged() method is called any time new weather measurement data is available. (We don't know or care how this method is called; we just know that it <i>is</i> .) <code>measurementsChanged()</code>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	We need to implement three display elements that use the weather data: a <i>current conditions</i> display, a <i>statistics display</i> , and a <i>forecast</i> display. These displays must be updated each time WeatherData has new measurements. 
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The system must be expandable — other developers can create new custom display elements and users can add or remove as many display elements as they want to the application. Currently, we know about only the initial <i>three</i> display types (current conditions, statistics, and forecast). 

Taking a first, misguided SWAG at the Weather Station

Here's a first implementation possibility — we'll take the hint from the Weather-O-Rama developers and add our code to the measurementsChanged() method:

```

public class WeatherData {

    // instance variable declarations

    public void measurementsChanged() {
        float temp = getTemperature();
        float humidity = getHumidity();
        float pressure = getPressure();

        currentConditionsDisplay.update(temp, humidity, pressure);
        statisticsDisplay.update(temp, humidity, pressure);
        forecastDisplay.update(temp, humidity, pressure);
    }

    // other WeatherData methods here
}

```

Grab the most recent measurements by calling the WeatherData's getter methods (already implemented).

Now update the displays...

Call each display element to update its display, passing it the most recent measurements.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Based on our first implementation, which of the following apply? (Choose all that apply.)

<input type="checkbox"/>	A. We are coding to concrete implementations, not interfaces.
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. For every new display element we need to alter code.
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. We have no way to add (or remove) display elements at run time.
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. The display elements don't implement a common interface.
<input type="checkbox"/>	E. We haven't encapsulated the part that changes.
<input type="checkbox"/>	F. We are violating encapsulation of the WeatherData class.

Definition of SWAG: Scientific Wild A** Guess

What's wrong with our implementation?

Think back to all those **Chapter 1** concepts and principles...

```

public void measurementsChanged() {

    float temp = getTemperature();
    float humidity = getHumidity();
    float pressure = getPressure();

    currentConditionsDisplay.update(temp, humidity, pressure);
    statisticsDisplay.update(temp, humidity, pressure);
    forecastDisplay.update(temp, humidity, pressure);
}

```

Area of change. We need to encapsulate this.

By coding to concrete implementations we have no way to add or remove other display elements without making changes to the program.

At least we seem to be using a common interface to talk to the display elements... they all have an update() method that takes the temp, humidity, and pressure values.



We'll take a look at Observer, then come back and figure out how to apply it to the Weather Monitoring app.

Meet the Observer Pattern

You know how newspaper or magazine subscriptions work:

- ① A newspaper publisher goes into business and begins publishing

newspapers.


- ② You subscribe to a particular publisher, and every time there's a new edition it gets delivered to you. As long as you remain a subscriber, you get new newspapers.
- ③ You unsubscribe when you don't want papers anymore, and they stop being delivered.
- ④ While the publisher remains in business, people, hotels, airlines, and other businesses constantly subscribe and unsubscribe to the newspaper.



Publishers + Subscribers = Observer Pattern

If you understand newspaper subscriptions, you pretty much understand the Observer Pattern, only we call the publisher the SUBJECT and the subscribers the OBSERVERS.

Let's take a closer look:



A day in the life of the Observer Pattern

A Duck object comes along and tells the Subject that it wants to become an observer.

Duck really wants in on the action; those ints Subject is sending out whenever its state changes look pretty interesting...

The Duck object is now an official observer.

Duck is psyched... he's on the list and is waiting with great anticipation for the next notification so he can get an int.

The Subject gets a new data value!

Now Duck and all the rest of the observers get a notification that the Subject has changed.

The Mouse object asks to be removed as an observer.

The Mouse object has been getting ints for ages and is tired of it, so it decides it's

time to stop being an observer.

Mouse is outta here!

The Subject acknowledges the Mouse's request and removes it from the set of observers.



The Subject has another new int.

All the observers get another notification, except for the Mouse who is no longer included. Don't tell anyone, but the Mouse secretly misses those ints... maybe it'll ask to be an observer again some day.



Five-minute drama: a subject for observation



In today's skit, two post-bubble software developers encounter a real live head hunter...




1



2

Headhunter/Subject

Software Developer #1



3

Software Developer #2



4

Subject

- 5** Meanwhile, for Lori and Jill life goes on; if a Java job comes along, they'll get notified. After all, they are observers.



6

Subject



7

Observer

Observer

Jill lands her own job!



8

Observer



9

Subject

Two weeks later...



Jill's loving life, and no longer an observer. She's also enjoying the nice fat signing bonus that she got because the company didn't have to pay a headhunter.



But what has become of our dear Lori? We hear she's beating the headhunter at his own game. She's not only still an observer, she's got her own call list now, and she is notifying her own observers. Lori's a subject and an observer all in one.

The Observer Pattern defined


When you're trying to picture the Observer Pattern, a newspaper subscription service with its publisher and subscribers is a good way to visualize the pattern.

In the real world, however, you'll typically see the Observer Pattern defined like this:

NOTE

The Observer Pattern defines a one-to-many dependency between objects so that when one object changes state, all of its dependents are notified and updated automatically.

Let's relate this definition to how we've been talking about the pattern:



The Observer Pattern defines a **one-to-many relationship** between a set of objects. When the state of one object changes, all of its dependents are notified.

The subject and observers define the one-to-many relationship. The observers are dependent on the subject such that when the subject's state changes, the observers get notified. Depending on the style of notification, the observer may also be updated with new values.

As you'll discover, there are a few different ways to implement the Observer Pattern, but most revolve around a class design that includes Subject and Observer interfaces.

Let's take a look...

The Observer Pattern defined: the class diagram

Here's the Subject interface. Objects use this interface to register as observers and also to remove themselves from being observers.

Each subject can have many observers.

All potential observers need to implement the Observer interface. This interface just has one method, update(), that gets called when the Subject's state changes.

A concrete subject always implements the Subject interface. In addition to the register and remove methods, the concrete subject implements a notifyObservers() method that is used to update all the current observers whenever state changes.

ConcreteSubject


registerObserver() (...)
removeObserver() (...)
notifyObservers() (...)

getState()
setState()

The concrete subject may also have methods for setting and getting its state (more about this later).

ConcreteObserver

update()
// other Observer specific methods



THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: What does this have to do with one-to-many relationships?

A: A: With the Observer Pattern, the Subject is the object that contains the state and controls it. So, there is ONE subject with state. The observers, on the other hand, use the state, even if they don't own it. There are many observers and they rely on the Subject to tell them when its state changes. So there is a relationship between the ONE Subject to the MANY Observers.

Q: Q: How does dependence come into this?

A: A: Because the subject is the sole owner of that data, the observers are dependent on the subject to update them when the data changes. This leads to a cleaner OO design than allowing many objects to control the same data.

The power of Loose Coupling

When two objects are loosely coupled, they can interact, but have very little knowledge of each other.

The Observer Pattern provides an object design where subjects and observers are loosely coupled.

Why?

The only thing the subject knows about an observer is that it implements a certain interface (the Observer interface). It doesn't need to know the concrete class of the observer, what it does, or anything else about it.

We can add new observers at any time. Because the only thing the subject depends on is a list of objects that implement the Observer interface, we can add new observers whenever we want. In fact, we can replace any observer at runtime with another observer and the subject will keep purring along. Likewise, we can remove observers at any time.

We never need to modify the subject to add new types of observers. Let's say we have a new concrete class come along that needs to be an observer. We don't need to make any changes to the subject to accommodate the new class type; all we have to do is implement the Observer interface in the new class and register as an observer. The subject doesn't care; it will deliver notifications to any object that implements the Observer interface.

We can reuse subjects or observers independently of each other. If we have another use for a subject or an observer, we can easily reuse them because the two aren't tightly coupled.

Changes to either the subject or an observer will not affect the other. Because the two are loosely coupled, we are free to make changes to either, as long as the objects still meet their obligations to implement the subject or observer interfaces.

NOTE

How many different kinds of change can you identify here?

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Strive for loosely coupled designs between objects that interact.

Loosely coupled designs allow us to build flexible OO systems that can handle change because they minimize the interdependency between objects.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Before moving on, try sketching out the classes you'll need to implement the Weather Station, including the WeatherData class and its display elements. Make sure your diagram shows how all the pieces fit together and also how another developer might implement her own display element.

If you need a little help, read the next page; your teammates are already talking about how to design the Weather Station.

Cubicle conversation

Back to the Weather Station project. Your teammates have already started thinking through the problem...



Mary: Well, it helps to know we're using the Observer Pattern.

Sue: Right... but how do we apply it?

Mary: Hmm. Let's look at the definition again:

The Observer Pattern defines a one-to-many dependency between objects so

that when one object changes state, all its dependents are notified and updated automatically.

Mary: That actually makes some sense when you think about it. Our WeatherData class is the “one” and our “many” is the various display elements that use the weather measurements.

Sue: That’s right. The WeatherData class certainly has state... that’s the temperature, humidity, and barometric pressure, and those definitely change.

Mary: Yup, and when those measurements change, we have to notify all the display elements so they can do whatever it is they are going to do with the measurements.

Sue: Cool, I now think I see how the Observer Pattern can be applied to our Weather Station problem.

Mary: There are still a few things to consider that I’m not sure I understand yet.

Sue: Like what?

Mary: For one thing, how do we get the weather measurements to the display elements?

Sue: Well, looking back at the picture of the Observer Pattern, if we make the WeatherData object the subject, and the display elements the observers, then the displays will register themselves with the WeatherData object in order to get the information they want, right?

Mary: Yes... and once the Weather Station knows about a display element, then it can just call a method to tell it about the measurements.

Sue: We gotta remember that every display element can be different... so I think that’s where having a common interface comes in. Even though every component has a different type, they should all implement the same interface so that the WeatherData object will know how to send them the measurements.


Mary: I see what you mean. So every display will have, say, an update() method that WeatherData will call.

Sue: And update() is defined in a common interface that all the elements implement...

Designing the Weather Station


How does this diagram compare with yours?

Here's our subject interface. This should look familiar.



All our weather components implement the Observer interface. This gives the Subject a common interface to talk to when it comes time to update the observers.

Let's also create an interface for all display elements to implement. The display elements just need to implement a display() method.



Implementing the Weather Station

We're going to start our implementation using the class diagram and following Mary and Sue's lead (from a few pages back). You'll see later in this chapter that Java provides some built-in support for the Observer Pattern, however, we're going to get our hands dirty and roll our own for now. While in some cases you can make use of Java's built-in support, in a lot of cases it's more flexible to build your own (and it's not all that hard). So, let's get started with the interfaces:

```

public interface Subject {
    public void registerObserver(Observer o);
    public void removeObserver(Observer o);
    public void notifyObservers();
}

```

Both of these methods take an Observer as an argument; that is, the Observer to be registered or removed.

This method is called to notify all observers when the Subject's state has changed.

```

public interface Observer {
    public void update(float temp, float humidity, float pressure);
}

```

These are the state values the Observers get from the Subject when a weather measurement changes

```

public interface DisplayElement {
    public void display();
}

```

The DisplayElement interface just includes one method, display(), that we will call when the display element needs to be displayed.

The Observer interface is implemented by all observers, so they all have to implement the update() method. Here we're following Mary and Sue's lead and passing the measurements to the observers.

BRAIN POWER

Mary and Sue thought that passing the measurements directly to the observers was the most straightforward method of updating state. Do you think this is wise? Hint: is this an area of the application that might change in the future? If it did change, would the change be well encapsulated, or would it require changes in many parts of the code?

Can you think of other ways to approach the problem of passing the updated state to the observers?

Don't worry; we'll come back to this design decision after we finish the initial implementation.

Implementing the Subject interface in WeatherData

REMEMBER: we don't provide import and package statements in the code listings. Get the complete source code from <http://wickedlysmart.com/head-first-design-patterns/>.

Remember our first attempt at implementing the WeatherData class at the beginning of the chapter? You might want to refresh your memory. Now it's time to go back and do things with the Observer Pattern in mind...

```

public class WeatherData implements Subject {
    private ArrayList<Observer> observers;
    private float temperature;
    private float humidity;
    private float pressure;

    public WeatherData() {
        observers = new ArrayList<Observer>();
    }

    public void registerObserver(Observer o) {
        observers.add(o);
    }

    public void removeObserver(Observer o) {
        int i = observers.indexOf(o);
        if (i >= 0) {
            observers.remove(i);
        }
    }

    public void notifyObservers() {
        for (Observer observer : observers) {
            observer.update(temperature, humidity, pressure);
        }
    }

    public void measurementsChanged() {
        notifyObservers();
    }

    public void setMeasurements(float temperature, float humidity, float pressure) {
        this.temperature = temperature;
        this.humidity = humidity;
        this.pressure = pressure;
        measurementsChanged();
    }

    // other WeatherData methods here
}

```

Here we implement the Subject interface.

WeatherData now implements the Subject interface.

We've added an ArrayList to hold the Observers, and we create it in the constructor.

When an observer registers, we just add it to the end of the list.

Likewise, when an observer wants to unregister, we just take it off the list.

Here's the fun part; this is where we tell all the observers about the state. Because they are all Observers, we know they all implement update(), so we know how to notify them.

We notify the Observers when we get updated measurements from the Weather Station.

Okay, while we wanted to ship a nice little weather station with each book, the publisher wouldn't go for it. So, rather than reading actual weather data off a device, we're going to use this method to test our display elements. Or, for fun, you could write code to grab measurements off the Web.

Now, let's build those display elements

Now that we've got our WeatherData class straightened out, it's time to build the Display Elements. Weather-O-Rama ordered three: the current conditions display, the statistics display, and the forecast display. Let's take a look at the current conditions display; once you have a good feel for this display element, check out the statistics and forecast displays in the code directory. You'll see they are very similar.

```

public class CurrentConditionsDisplay implements Observer, DisplayElement {
    private float temperature;
    private float humidity;
    private Subject weatherData;

    public CurrentConditionsDisplay(Subject weatherData) {
        this.weatherData = weatherData;
        weatherData.registerObserver(this);
    }

    public void update(float temperature, float humidity, float pressure) {
        this.temperature = temperature;
        this.humidity = humidity;
        display(); ← When update() is called, we
    }                                save the temp and humidity
                                         and call display().
}

public void display() {
    System.out.println("Current conditions: " + temperature
        + "F degrees and " + humidity + "% humidity");
}
}

```

This display implements Observer so it can get changes from the WeatherData object.

It also implements DisplayElement, because our API is going to require all display elements to implement this interface.

The constructor is passed the weatherData object (the Subject) and we use it to register the display as an observer.

When update() is called, we save the temp and humidity and call display().

The display() method just prints out the most recent temp and humidity.

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: Is update() the best place to call display?

A: A: In this simple example it made sense to call display() when the values changed. However, you are right; there are much better ways to design the way the data gets displayed. We are going to see this when we get to the Model-View-Controller pattern.

Q: Q: Why did you store a reference to the Subject? It doesn't look like you use it again after the constructor.

A: A: True, but in the future we may want to un-register ourselves as an observer and it would be handy to already have a reference to the subject.

Power up the Weather Station



① First, let's create a test harness.

The Weather Station is ready to go. All we need is some code to glue everything together. Here's our first attempt. We'll come back later in the book and make sure all the components are easily pluggable via a configuration file. For now here's how it all works:

```
public class WeatherStation {  
    public static void main(String[] args) {  
        WeatherData weatherData = new WeatherData();  
  
        if you don't  
        want to  
        download the  
        code, you can  
        comment out  
        these two lines  
        and run it.  
        CurrentConditionsDisplay currentDisplay =  
            new CurrentConditionsDisplay(weatherData);  
        StatisticsDisplay statisticsDisplay = new StatisticsDisplay(weatherData);  
        ForecastDisplay forecastDisplay = new ForecastDisplay(weatherData);  
  
        weatherData.setMeasurements(80, 65, 30.4f);  
        weatherData.setMeasurements(82, 70, 29.2f);  
        weatherData.setMeasurements(78, 90, 29.2f);  
    }  
}  
First, create the  
WeatherData object.  
Create the three  
displays and  
pass them the  
WeatherData object.  
Simulate new weather  
measurements.
```

② Run the code and let the Observer Pattern do its magic.

```
File Edit Window Help StormyWeather  
%java WeatherStation  
Current conditions: 80.0F degrees and 65.0% humidity  
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 80.0/80.0/80.0  
Forecast: Improving weather on the way!  
Current conditions: 82.0F degrees and 70.0% humidity  
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 81.0/82.0/80.0  
Forecast: Watch out for cooler, rainy weather  
Current conditions: 78.0F degrees and 90.0% humidity  
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 80.0/82.0/78.0  
Forecast: More of the same  
%
```

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Johnny Hurricane, Weather-O-Rama's CEO, just called and they can't possibly ship without a Heat Index display element. Here are the details.

The heat index is an index that combines temperature and humidity to determine the apparent temperature (how hot it actually feels). To compute the heat index, you take the

temperature, T, and the relative humidity, RH, and use this formula:

```
heatindex =  
  
16.923 + 1.85212 * 10^-1 * T + 5.37941 * RH - 1.00254 * 10^-1 *  
T * RH + 9.41695 * 10^-3 * T^2 + 7.28898 * 10^-3 * RH^2 + 3.45372 *  
10^-4 * T^2 * RH - 8.14971 * 10^-4 * T * RH^2 + 1.02102 * 10^-5 * T^2 *  
RH^2 - 3.8646 * 10^-5 * T^3 + 2.91583 * 10^-5 * RH^3 + 1.42721 * 10^-6  
* T^3 * RH + 1.97483 * 10^-7 * T * RH^3 - 2.18429 * 10^-8 * T^3 * RH^2  
+ 8.43296 * 10^-10 * T^2 * RH^3 - 4.81975 * 10^-11 * T^3 * RH^3
```

So get typing!

Just kidding. Don't worry, you won't have to type that formula in; just create your own HeatIndexDisplay.java file and copy the formula from heatindex.txt into it.

NOTE

You can get heatindex.txt from wickedlysmart.com.

How does it work? You'd have to refer to *Head First Meteorology*, or try asking someone at the National Weather Service (or try a web search).

When you finish, your output should look like this:

Here's what changed in this output.

```
File Edit Window Help OverdaRainbow  
%java WeatherStation  
Current conditions: 80.0F degrees and 65.0% humidity  
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 80.0/80.0/80.0  
Forecast: Improving weather on the way!  
Heat index is 82.95535  
Current conditions: 82.0F degrees and 70.0% humidity  
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 81.0/82.0/80.0  
Forecast: Watch out for cooler, rainy weather  
Heat index is 86.90124  
Current conditions: 78.0F degrees and 90.0% humidity  
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 80.0/82.0/78.0  
Forecast: More of the same  
Heat index is 83.64967  
%
```

FIRESIDE CHATS

Tonight's talk: **A Subject and Observer spar over the right way to get state information to the Observer.**

Subject:	Observer:
----------	-----------


I'm glad we're finally getting a chance to chat in person.	
	Really? I thought you didn't care much about us Observers.
Well, I do my job, don't I? I always tell you what's going on... Just because I don't really know who you are doesn't mean I don't care. And besides, I do know the most important thing about you — you implement the Observer interface.	
	Yeah, but that's just a small part of who I am. Anyway, I know a lot more about you...
Oh yeah, like what?	
	Well, you're always passing your state around to us Observers so we can see what's going on inside you. Which gets a little annoying at times...
Well, excuse me. I have to send my state with my notifications so all you lazy Observers will know what happened!	
	Okay, wait just a minute here; first, we're not lazy, we just have other stuff to do in between your oh-so-important notifications, Mr. Subject, and second, why don't you let us come to you for the state we want rather than pushing it out to just everyone?
Well... I guess that might work. I'd have to open myself up even more, though, to let all you Observers come in and get the state that you need. That might be kind of dangerous. I can't let you come in and just snoop around looking at everything I've got.	
	Why don't you just write some public getter methods that will let us pull out the state we need?
Yes, I could let you pull my state. But won't that be less	

<p>convenient for you? If you have to come to me every time you want something, you might have to make multiple method calls to get all the state you want. That's why I like push better... then you have everything you need in one notification.</p>	
	<p>Don't be so pushy! There are so many different kinds of us Observers, there's no way you can anticipate everything we need. Just let us come to you to get the state we need. That way, if some of us only need a little bit of state, we aren't forced to get it all. It also makes things easier to modify later. Say, for example, you expand yourself and add some more state. If you use pull, you don't have to go around and change the update calls on every observer; you just need to change yourself to allow more getter methods to access our additional state.</p>
<p>Well, I can see the advantages to doing it both ways. I have noticed that there is a built-in Java Observer Pattern that allows you to use either push or pull.</p>	
	<p>Oh really? I think we're going to look at that next....</p>
<p>Great... maybe I'll get to see a good example of pull and change my mind.</p>	
	<p>What, us agree on something? I guess there's always hope.</p>

Using Java's built-in Observer Pattern

So far we've rolled our own code for the Observer Pattern, but Java has built-in support in several of its APIs. The most general is the `Observer` interface and the `Observable` class in the `java.util` package. These are quite similar to our `Subject` and `Observer` interfaces, but give you a lot of functionality out of the box. You can also implement either a push or pull style of update to your observers, as you will see.

To get a high-level feel for `java.util.Observer` and `java.util.Observable`, check out this reworked OO design for the `WeatherStation`:



How Java's built-in Observer Pattern works

The built-in Observer Pattern works a bit differently than the implementation

that we used on the Weather Station. The most obvious difference is that WeatherData (our subject) now extends the Observable class and inherits the add, delete, and notify Observer methods (among a few others). Here's how we use Java's version:


For an Object to become an observer...

As usual, implement the Observer interface (this time the `java.util.Observer` interface) and call `addObserver()` on any Observable object. Likewise, to remove yourself as an observer, just call `deleteObserver()`.

For the Observable to send notifications...

First of all you need to be Observable by extending the `java.util.Observable` superclass. From there it is a two-step process:

- ① You first must call the `setChanged()` method to signify that the state has changed in your object.
- ② Then, call one of two `notifyObservers()` methods:



For an Observer to receive notifications...

It implements the `update` method, as before, but the signature of the method is a bit different:

If you want to “push” data to the observers, you can pass the data as a data object to the `notifyObservers(arg)` method. If not, then the Observer has to

“pull” the data it wants from the Observable object passed to it. How? Let’s rework the Weather Station and you’ll see.



The `setChanged()` method is used to signify that the state has changed and that `notifyObservers()`, when it is called, should update its observers. If `notifyObservers()` is called without first calling `setChanged()`, the observers will NOT be notified. Let’s take a look behind the scenes of Observable to see how this works:

BEHIND THE SCENES

Pseudocode for the Observable class:

```

setChanged() {
    changed = true
}

notifyObservers(Object arg) {
    if (changed) {
        for every observer on the list {
            call update (this, arg)
        }
        changed = false
    }
}

notifyObservers() {
    notifyObservers(null)
}

```

The setChanged() method sets a changed flag to true.

notifyObservers() only notifies its observers if the changed flag is TRUE.

And after it notifies the observers, it sets the changed flag back to false.

Why is this necessary? The setChanged() method is meant to give you more flexibility in how you update observers by allowing you to optimize the notifications. For example, in our Weather Station, imagine if our measurements were so sensitive that the temperature readings were constantly fluctuating by a few tenths of a degree. That might cause the WeatherData object to send out notifications constantly. Instead, we might want to send out notifications only if the temperature changes more than half a degree and we could call setChanged() only after that happened.

You might not use this functionality very often, but it's there if you need it. In either case, you need to call setChanged() for notifications to work. If this functionality is something that is useful to you, you may also want to use the clearChanged() method, which sets the changed state back to false, and the hasChanged() method, which tells you the current state of the changed flag.

Reworking the Weather Station with the built-in support

First, let's rework WeatherData to use `java.util.Observable`

```

1 Make sure we are importing
the right Observable.
import java.util.Observable;

public class WeatherData extends Observable {
    private float temperature;
    private float humidity;
    private float pressure;

    public WeatherData() { }

    public void measurementsChanged() {
        setChanged();
        notifyObservers(); *
    }

    public void setMeasurements(float temperature, float humidity, float pressure) {
        this.temperature = temperature;
        this.humidity = humidity;
        this.pressure = pressure;
        measurementsChanged();
    }

    public float getTemperature() {
        return temperature;
    }

    public float getHumidity() {
        return humidity;
    }

    public float getPressure() {
        return pressure;
    }
}

```

2 We are now subclassing Observable.

3 We don't need to keep track of our observers anymore, or manage their registration and removal (the superclass will handle that), so we've removed the registerObserver(), removeObserver() and notifyObservers() methods.

4 Our constructor no longer needs to create a data structure to hold Observers.

* Notice we aren't sending a data object with the notifyObservers() call. That means we're using the PULL model.

5 We now first call setChanged() to indicate the state has changed before calling notifyObservers().

6 These methods aren't new, but because we are going to use "pull" we thought we'd remind you they are here. The Observers will use them to get at the WeatherData object's state.

Now, let's rework the CurrentConditionsDisplay

1 Again, make sure we are importing the right Observer/Observable.

```
import java.util.Observable;
import java.util.Observer;
```

2 We now are implementing the Observer interface from java.util.

```
public class CurrentConditionsDisplay implements Observer, DisplayElement {
    Observable observable;
    private float temperature;
    private float humidity;

    public CurrentConditionsDisplay(Observable observable) {
        this.observable = observable;
        observable.addObserver(this);
    }
```

3 Our constructor now takes an Observable and we use this to add the current conditions object as an Observer.

```
public void update(Observable obs, Object arg) {
    if (obs instanceof WeatherData) {
        WeatherData weatherData = (WeatherData)obs;
        this.temperature = weatherData.getTemperature();
        this.humidity = weatherData.getHumidity();
        display();
    }
}
```

4 We've changed the update() method to take both an Observable and the optional data argument.

```
public void display() {
    System.out.println("Current conditions: " + temperature
        + "F degrees and " + humidity + "% humidity");
}
```

5 In update(), we first make sure the observable is of type WeatherData and then we use its getter methods to obtain the temperature and humidity measurements. After that we call display().

CODE MAGNETS

The ForecastDisplay class is all scrambled up on the fridge. Can you reconstruct the code snippets to make it work? Some of the curly braces fell on the floor and they were too small to pick up, so feel free to add as many of those as you need!

```
public ForecastDisplay(Observable  
observable) {
```

```
    display();
```

```
    observable.addObserver(this);
```

```
if (observable instanceof WeatherData) {
```

```
public class ForecastDisplay implements  
Observer, DisplayElement {
```

```
    public void display() {  
        // display code here  
    }
```

```
    lastPressure = currentPressure;  
    currentPressure = weatherData.getPressure();
```

```
    private float currentPressure = 29.92f;  
    private float lastPressure;
```

```
WeatherData weatherData = (WeatherData) observable;
```

```
    public void update(Observable observable,  
                      Object arg) {
```

```
        import java.util.Observable;  
        import java.util.Observer;
```

Running the new code

Just to be sure, let's run the new code...

```
File Edit Window Help TryThisAtHome
%java WeatherStation
Forecast: Improving weather on the way!
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 80.0/80.0/80.0
Current conditions: 80.0F degrees and 65.0% humidity
Forecast: Watch out for cooler, rainy weather
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 81.0/82.0/80.0
Current conditions: 82.0F degrees and 70.0% humidity
Forecast: More of the same
Avg/Max/Min temperature = 80.0/82.0/78.0
Current conditions: 78.0F degrees and 90.0% humidity
%
```

Hmm, do you notice anything different? Look again...

You'll see all the same calculations, but mysteriously, the order of the text output is different. Why might this happen? Think for a minute before reading on...

Never depend on order of evaluation of the Observer notifications

The `java.util.Observable` has implemented its `notifyObservers()` method such that the Observers are notified in a *different* order than our own implementation. Who's right? Neither; we just chose to implement things in different ways.

What would be incorrect, however, is if we wrote our code to *depend* on a specific notification order. Why? Because if you need to change `Observable/Observer` implementations, the order of notification could change and your application would produce incorrect results. Now that's definitely not what we'd consider loosely coupled.



The dark side of `java.util.Observable`

Yes, good catch. As you've noticed, `Observable` is a class, not an *interface*, and worse, it doesn't even *implement* an interface. Unfortunately, the `java.util.Observable` implementation has a number of problems that limit its usefulness and reuse. That's not to say it doesn't provide some utility, but there are some large potholes to watch out for.

Observable is a class

You already know from our principles this is a bad idea, but what harm does it really cause?

First, because `Observable` is a *class*, you have to *subclass* it. That means you can't add on the `Observable` behavior to an existing class that already extends another superclass. This limits its reuse potential (and isn't that why we are

using patterns in the first place?).

Second, because there isn't an Observable interface, you can't even create your own implementation that plays well with Java's built-in Observer API. Nor do you have the option of swapping out the java.util implementation for another (say, a new, multithreaded implementation).

Observable protects crucial methods

If you look at the Observable API, the `setChanged()` method is protected. So what? Well, this means you can't call `setChanged()` unless you've subclassed Observable. This means you can't even create an instance of the Observable class and compose it with your own objects, you *have* to subclass. The design violates a second design principle here...*favor composition over inheritance*.

What to do?

Observable *may* serve your needs if you can extend `java.util.Observable`. On the other hand, you may need to roll your own implementation as we did at the beginning of the chapter. In either case, you know the Observer Pattern well and you're in a good position to work with any API that makes use of the pattern.

Other places you'll find the Observer Pattern in the JDK

The `java.util` implementation of Observer/Observable is not the only place you'll find the Observer Pattern in the JDK; both JavaBeans and Swing also provide their own implementations of the pattern. At this point you understand enough about Observer to explore these APIs on your own; however, let's do a quick, simple Swing example just for the fun of it.

NOTE

If you're curious about the Observer Pattern in JavaBeans, check out the `PropertyChangeListener` interface.


A little background...

Let's take a look at a simple part of the Swing API, the JButton. If you look under the hood at JButton's superclass, AbstractButton, you'll see that it has a lot of add/ remove listener methods. These methods allow you to add and

remove observers, or, as they are called in Swing, listeners, to listen for various types of events that occur on the Swing component. For instance, an ActionListener lets you “listen in” on any types of actions that might occur on a button, like a button press. You’ll find various types of listeners all over the Swing API.

A little life-changing application

Okay, our application is pretty simple. You’ve got a button that says “Should I do it?” and when you click on that button the listeners (observers) get to answer the question in any way they want. We’re implementing two such listeners, called the AngelListener and the DevilListener. Here’s how the application behaves:



And the code...

This life-changing application requires very little code. All we need to do is create a JButton object, add it to a JFrame and set up our listeners. We’re going to use inner classes for the listeners, which is a common technique in Swing programming. If you aren’t up on inner classes or Swing, you might want to review the “Getting GUI” chapter of *Head First Java*.

```

public class SwingObserverExample {
    JFrame frame;
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        SwingObserverExample example = new SwingObserverExample();
        example.go();
    }
    public void go() {
        frame = new JFrame();

        JButton button = new JButton("Should I do it?");
        button.addActionListener(new AngelListener());
        button.addActionListener(new DevilListener());

        // Set frame properties here
    }
}

class AngelListener implements ActionListener {
    public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent event) {
        System.out.println("Don't do it, you might regret it!");
    }
}

class DevilListener implements ActionListener {
    public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent event) {
        System.out.println("Come on, do it!");
    }
}

```

Simple Swing application that just creates a frame and throws a button in it.

Makes the devil and angel objects listeners (observers) of the button.

Code to set up the frame goes here.

Here are the class definitions for the observers, defined as inner classes (but they don't have to be).

Rather than update(), the actionPerformed() method gets called when the state in the subject (in this case the button) changes.



I've been using lambda
expressions in place of simple
action listeners in my Swing
code. Am I still using the
Observer Pattern?

NOTE

Lambda expressions were added in Java 8. If you aren't familiar with them, don't worry about it; you can continue using inner classes for your Swing observers.

Yes, you're still using the Observer Pattern. By using a lambda expression rather than an inner class, you're just skipping the step of creating an ActionListener object. With a lambda expression, you create a function object instead, and this function object is the observer. When you pass that function object to addActionListener(), Java ensures its signature matches actionPerformed(), the one method in the ActionListener interface.

Later, when the button is clicked, the button object notifies its observers — including the function objects created by the lambda expressions — that it's been clicked, and calls each listener's actionPerformed() method.

Let's take a look at how you'd use lambda expressions as observers to simplify our previous code:

The updated code, using lambda expressions

```
public class SwingObserverExample {  
    JFrame frame;  
    public static void main(String[] args) {  
        SwingObserverExample example = new SwingObserverExample();  
        example.go();  
    }  
    public void go() {  
        frame = new JFrame();  
  
        JButton button = new JButton("Should I do it?");  
        button.addActionListener(event ->  
            System.out.println("Don't do it, you might regret it!"));  
        button.addActionListener(event ->  
            System.out.println("Come on, do it!"));  
  
        // Set frame properties here  
    }  
}
```

We've replaced the AngelListener and DevilListener objects with lambda expressions that implement the same functionality that we had before.

When you click the button, the function objects created by the lambda expressions are notified and the method they implement is run. Using lambda expressions makes this code a lot more concise.

We've removed the two ActionListener classes (DevilListener and AngelListener) completely.

For more on lambda expressions, check out the Java docs, and Chapter 6.

Tools for your Design Toolbox

Welcome to the end of [Chapter 2](#). You've added a few new things to your OO toolbox...

OO Basics

Abstraction

OO Principles

Encapsulate what varies.

Favor composition over inheritance.

Program to interfaces, not implementations.

Strive for loosely coupled designs between objects that interact.

Here's your newest principle. Remember, loosely coupled designs are much more flexible and resilient to change.

OO Patterns

Strategy
encapsulation
interface
vary

Observer - defines a one-to-many dependency between objects so that when one object changes state, all its dependents are notified and updated automatically

A new pattern for communicating state to a set of objects in a loosely coupled manner. We haven't seen the last of the Observer Pattern—just wait until we talk about MVC!

BULLET POINTS

- The Observer Pattern defines a one-to-many relationship between objects.
- Subjects, or as we also know them, Observables, update Observers using a common interface.
- Observers are loosely coupled in that the Observable knows nothing about them, other than that they implement the Observer interface.
- You can push or pull data from the Observable when using the pattern (pull is considered more “correct”).
- Don’t depend on a specific order of notification for your Observers.
- Java has several implementations of the Observer Pattern, including the general purpose `java.util.Observable`.
- Watch out for issues with the `java.util.Observable` implementation.
- Don’t be afraid to create your own Observable implementation if needed.
- Swing makes heavy use of the Observer Pattern, as do many GUI frameworks.
- You’ll also find the pattern in many other places, including JavaBeans and RMI.


DESIGN PRINCIPLE CHALLENGE

For each design principle, describe how the Observer Pattern makes use of the principle.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE <i>Identify the aspects of your application that vary and separate them from what stays the same.</i>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
DESIGN PRINCIPLE <i>Program to an interface, not an implementation.</i>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
DESIGN PRINCIPLE <i>Favor composition over inheritance.</i>	<p><u>This is a hard one, hint: think about how observers and subjects work together.</u></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD

Time to give your right brain something to do again! This time all of the solution words are from [Chapter 2](#).



Across	Down
1. Observable is a _____, not an interface.	2. Ron was both an Observer and a _____.
3. Devil and Angel are _____ to the button.	3. You want to keep your coupling _____.
4. Implement this method to get notified.	7. He says you should go for it.
5. Jill got one of her own.	9. _____ can manage your observers for you.
6. CurrentConditionsDisplay implements this interface.	10. Java framework with lots of Observers.
8. How to get yourself off the Observer list.	11. Weather-O-Rama's CEO named after this kind of storm.
12. You forgot this if you're not getting notified when you think you should be.	13. Observers like to be _____ when something new happens.
15. One Subject likes to talk to _____ observers.	14. The WeatherData class _____ the
18. Don't count on this for notification.	
19. Temperature, humidity and _____.	

- | | |
|--|--|
| 20. Observers are _____ on the Subject. | Subject interface. |
| 21. Program to an _____ not an implementation. | 16. He didn't want any more ints, so he removed himself. |
| 22. A Subject is similar to a _____. | 17. CEO almost forgot the _____ index display
19. Subject initially wanted to _____ all the data to Observer. |

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Based on our first implementation, which of the following apply? (Choose all that apply.)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A. We are coding to concrete implementations, not interfaces. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | B. For every new display element we need to alter code. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C. We have no way to add display elements at run time. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | D. The display elements don't implement a common interface. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | E. We haven't encapsulated what changes. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | F. We are violating encapsulation of the WeatherData class. |

DESIGN PRINCIPLE CHALLENGE SOLUTION

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Identify the aspects of your application that vary and separate them from what stays the same.

The thing that varies in the Observer Pattern
is the state of the Subject and the number and
types of Observers. With this pattern, you can
vary the objects that are dependent on the state
of the Subject, without having to change that
Subject. That's called planning ahead!

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Program to an interface, not an implementation.

Both the Subject and Observer use interfaces.
The Subject keeps track of objects
implementing
the Observer interface, while the
observers
register with, and get notified by, the Subject

interface. As we've seen, this keeps things nice
and _____
loosely coupled.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Favor composition over inheritance.

The Observer Pattern uses composition to
compose _____
any number of Observers with their
Subjects.
These relationships aren't set up by some kind
of _____
inheritance hierarchy. No, they are set up at
runtime by
composition!

CODE MAGNETS SOLUTION

The ForecastDisplay class is all scrambled up on the fridge. Can you reconstruct the code snippets to make it work? Some of the curly braces fell on the floor and they were too small to pick up, so feel free to add as many of those as you need! Here's our solution.

```

import java.util.Observable;
import java.util.Observer;

public class ForecastDisplay implements
Observer, DisplayElement {

    private float currentPressure = 29.92f;
    private float lastPressure;

    public ForecastDisplay(Observable
observable) {

        WeatherData weatherData =
(WeatherData)observable;

        observable.addObserver(this);
    }

    public void update(Observable observable,
Object arg) {

        if (observable instanceof WeatherData) {


            lastPressure = currentPressure;
            currentPressure = weatherData.getPressure();

            display();
        }
    }


    public void display() {
        // display code here
    }
}

```

DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD SOLUTION



Chapter 3. The Decorator Pattern: Decorating Objects



Just call this chapter “**Design Eye for the Inheritance Guy.**” We’ll re-examine the typical overuse of inheritance and you’ll learn how to decorate your classes at runtime using a form of object composition. Why? Once you know the techniques of decorating, you’ll be able to give your (or someone else’s) objects new responsibilities *without making any code changes to the underlying classes.*


Welcome to Starbuzz Coffee



Starbuzz Coffee has made a name for itself as the fastest growing coffee shop around. If you've seen one on your local corner, look across the street; you'll see another one.


Because they've grown so quickly, they're scrambling to update their ordering systems to match their beverage offerings.

When they first went into business they designed their classes like this...



In addition to your coffee, you can also ask for several condiments like steamed milk, soy, and mocha (otherwise known as chocolate), and have it all topped off with whipped milk. Starbuzz charges a bit for each of these, so they really need to get them built into their order system.

Here's their first attempt...



Each cost method computes the cost of the coffee along with the other condiments in the order.



BRAIN POWER


It's pretty obvious that Starbuzz has created a maintenance nightmare for themselves. What happens when the price of milk goes up? What do they do when they add a new caramel topping?

Thinking beyond the maintenance problem, which of the design principles that we've covered so far are they violating?

Hint: they're violating two of them in a big way!



Well, let's give it a try. Let's start with the Beverage base class and add instance variables to represent whether or not each beverage has milk, soy, mocha, and whip...




Now let's add in the subclasses, one for each beverage on the menu:

The superclass cost() will calculate the costs for all of the condiments, while the overridden cost() in the subclasses will extend that functionality to include costs for that specific beverage type.

Each cost() method needs to compute the cost of the beverage and then add in the condiments by calling the superclass implementation of cost().

Beverage	
description	
milk	
soy	
mocha	
whip	
getDescription()	
cost()	
hasMilk()	
setMilk()	
hasSoy()	
setSoy()	
hasMocha()	
setMocha()	
hasWhip()	
setWhip()	
// Other useful methods..	



SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Write the cost() methods for the following classes (pseudo-Java is okay):

```
public class Beverage {  
    public double cost() {  
        }  
    }
```

```
public class DarkRoast extends Beverage {  
    public DarkRoast() {  
        description = "Most Excellent Dark Roast";  
    }  
    public double cost() {  
        }  
    }
```



See, five classes total. This is definitely the way to go.



I'm not so sure; I can see some potential problems with this approach by thinking about how the design might need to change in the future.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

What requirements or other factors might change that will impact this design?

Price changes for condiments will force us to alter existing code.

New condiments will force us to add new methods and alter the cost method in the superclass.

We may have new beverages. For some of these beverages (iced tea?), the condiments may not be appropriate, yet the Tea subclass will still inherit methods like hasWhip().

As we saw in Chapter 1, this is a very bad idea!

What if a customer wants a double mocha?

Your turn:

MASTER AND STUDENT...

Master: Grasshopper, it has been some time since our last meeting. Have you been deep in meditation on inheritance?

Student: Yes, Master. While inheritance is powerful, I have learned that it doesn't always lead to the most flexible or maintainable designs.

Master: Ah yes, you have made some progress. So, tell me, my student, how then will you achieve reuse if not through inheritance?

Student: Master, I have learned there are ways of "inheriting" behavior at runtime through composition and delegation.

Master: Please, go on...

Student: When I inherit behavior by subclassing, that behavior is set statically at compile time. In addition, all subclasses must inherit the same behavior. If however, I can extend an object's behavior through composition, then I can do this dynamically at runtime.

Master: Very good, Grasshopper, you are beginning to see the power of composition.

Student: Yes, it is possible for me to add multiple new responsibilities to objects through this technique, including responsibilities that were not even thought of by the designer of the superclass. And, I don't have to touch their code!

Master: What have you learned about the effect of composition on maintaining your code?

Student: Well, that is what I was getting at. By dynamically composing objects, I can add new functionality by writing new code rather than altering existing code. Because I'm not changing existing code, the chances of introducing bugs or causing unintended side effects in pre-existing code are much reduced.

Master: Very good. Enough for today, Grasshopper. I would like for you to go and meditate further on this topic... Remember, code should be closed (to change) like the lotus flower in the evening, yet open (to extension) like the lotus flower in the morning.

The Open-Closed Principle

Grasshopper is on to one of the most important design principles:

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Classes should be open for extension, but closed for modification.



Come on in; we're *open*. Feel free to extend our classes with any new behavior you like. If your needs or requirements change (and we know they will), just go ahead and make your own extensions.



Sorry, we're *closed*. That's right, we spent a lot of time getting this code

correct and bug free, so we can't let you alter the existing code. It must remain closed to modification. If you don't like it, you can speak to the manager.

Our goal is to allow classes to be easily extended to incorporate new behavior without modifying existing code. What do we get if we accomplish this? Designs that are resilient to change and flexible enough to take on new functionality to meet changing requirements.

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: Open for extension and closed for modification? That sounds very contradictory. How can a design be both?

A: A: That's a very good question. It certainly sounds contradictory at first. After all, the less modifiable something is, the harder it is to extend, right? As it turns out, though, there are some clever OO techniques for allowing systems to be extended, even if we can't change the underlying code. Think about the Observer Pattern (in [Chapter 2](#))... by adding new Observers, we can extend the Subject at any time, without adding code to the Subject. You'll see quite a few more ways of extending behavior with other OO design techniques.

Q: Q: Okay, I understand Observable, but how do I generally design something to be extensible, yet closed for modification?

A: A: Many of the patterns give us time-tested designs that protect your code from being modified by supplying a means of extension. In this chapter you'll see a good example of using the Decorator Pattern to follow the Open-Closed principle.

Q: Q: How can I make every part of my design follow the Open-Closed Principle?

A: A: Usually, you can't. Making OO design flexible and open to extension without the modification of existing code takes time and effort. In general, we don't have the luxury of tying down every part of our designs (and it would probably be wasteful). Following the Open-Closed Principle usually introduces new levels of abstraction, which adds complexity to our code. You want to concentrate on those areas that are most likely to change in your designs and apply the principles there.

Q: Q: How do I know which areas of change are more important?

A: A: That is partly a matter of experience in designing OO systems and also a matter of knowing the domain you are working in. Looking at other examples will help you learn to identify areas of change in your own designs.

While it may seem like a contradiction, there are techniques for allowing code to be extended without direct modification.

Be careful when choosing the areas of code that need to be extended; applying the Open-Closed Principle EVERYWHERE is wasteful and unnecessary, and can lead to complex, hard-to-understand code.

Meet the Decorator Pattern

Okay, we've seen that representing our beverage plus condiment pricing scheme with inheritance has not worked out very well — we get class explosions and rigid designs, or we add functionality to the base class that

isn't appropriate for some of the subclasses.

So, here's what we'll do instead: we'll start with a beverage and "decorate" it with the condiments at runtime. For example, if the customer wants a Dark Roast with Mocha and Whip, then we'll:

- ① **Take a DarkRoast object**
- ② **Decorate it with a Mocha object**
- ③ **Decorate it with a Whip object**
- ④ **Call the cost() method and rely on delegation to add on the condiment costs**


Okay, but how do you "decorate" an object, and how does delegation come into this? A hint: think of decorator objects as "wrappers." Let's see how this works...

Okay, enough of the "Object Oriented Design Club." We have real problems here! Remember us? Starbuzz Coffee? Do you think you could use some of those design principles to actually help us?




Constructing a drink order with Decorators


- ① We start with our DarkRoast object.



- ② The customer wants Mocha, so we create a Mocha object and wrap it around the DarkRoast.**



- ③ The customer also wants Whip, so we create a Whip decorator and wrap Mocha with it.**




NOTE

So, a DarkRoast wrapped in Mocha and Whip is still a Beverage and we can do anything with it we can do with a DarkRoast, including call its cost() method.

- ④ Now it's time to compute the cost for the customer. We do this by**

calling `cost()` on the outermost decorator, Whip, and Whip is going to delegate computing the cost to the objects it decorates. Once it gets a cost, it will add on the cost of the Whip.



Okay, here's what we know so far...

- Decorators have the same supertype as the objects they decorate.
- You can use one or more decorators to wrap an object.
- Given that the decorator has the same supertype as the object it decorates, we can pass around a decorated object in place of the original (wrapped) object.
- The decorator adds its own behavior either before and/or after delegating to the object it decorates to do the rest of the job.

NOTE

Key point!

- Objects can be decorated at any time, so we can decorate objects dynamically at runtime with as many decorators as we like.

Now let's see how this all really works by looking at the **Decorator Pattern** definition and writing some code.


The Decorator Pattern defined

Let's first take a look at the Decorator Pattern description:

NOTE


The Decorator Pattern attaches additional responsibilities to an object dynamically. Decorators provide a flexible alternative to subclassing for extending functionality.

While that describes the *role* of the Decorator Pattern, it doesn't give us a lot of insight into how we'd *apply* the pattern to our own implementation. Let's take a look at the class diagram, which is a little more revealing (on the next page we'll look at the same structure applied to the beverage problem).



Decorating our Beverages

Okay, let's work our Starbuzz beverages into this framework...



BRAIN POWER

Before going further, think about how you'd implement the `cost()` method of the coffees and the condiments. Also think about how you'd implement the `get>Description()` method of the condiments.

Cubicle Conversation

Some confusion over Inheritance versus Composition



Sue: What do you mean?

Mary: Look at the class diagram. The CondimentDecorator is extending the Beverage class. That's inheritance, right?

Sue: True. I think the point is that it's vital that the decorators have the same type as the objects they are going to decorate. So here we're using inheritance to achieve the *type matching*, but we aren't using inheritance to get *behavior*.

Mary: Okay, I can see how decorators need the same "interface" as the components they wrap because they need to stand in place of the component. But where does the behavior come in?

Sue: When we compose a decorator with a component, we are adding new behavior. We are acquiring new behavior not by inheriting it from a superclass, but by composing objects together.

Mary: Okay, so we're subclassing the abstract class Beverage in order to have the correct type, not to inherit its behavior. The behavior comes in through the composition of decorators with the base components as well as

other decorators.

Sue: That's right.

Mary: Ooooh, I see. And because we are using object composition, we get a whole lot more flexibility about how to mix and match condiments and beverages. Very smooth.

Sue: Yes, if we rely on inheritance, then our behavior can only be determined statically at compile time. In other words, we get only whatever behavior the superclass gives us or that we override. With composition, we can mix and match decorators any way we like... *at runtime*.

Mary: And as I understand it, we can implement new decorators at any time to add new behavior. If we relied on inheritance, we'd have to go in and change existing code any time we wanted new behavior.


Sue: Exactly.

Mary: I just have one more question. If all we need to inherit is the type of the component, how come we didn't use an interface instead of an abstract class for the Beverage class?

Sue: Well, remember, when we got this code, Starbuzz already *had* an abstract Beverage class. Traditionally the Decorator Pattern does specify an abstract component, but in Java, obviously, we could use an interface. But we always try to avoid altering existing code, so don't "fix" it if the abstract class will work just fine.

New barista training

Make a picture for what happens when the order is for a "double mocha soy latte with whip" beverage. Use the menu to get the correct prices, and draw your picture using the same format we used earlier (from a few pages back):




Okay, I need for you to make me a double mocha, soy latte with whip.



Starbuzz Coffee	
Coffees	
House Blend	.89
Dark Roast	.99
Decaf	1.05
Espresso	1.99
Condiments	
Steamed Milk	.10
Mocha	.20
Soy	.15
Whip	.10

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Draw your picture here.



Writing the Starbuzz code

It's time to whip this design into some real code.

Let's start with the Beverage class, which doesn't need to change from Starbuzz's original design. Let's take a look:



```

public abstract class Beverage {
    String description = "Unknown Beverage";

    public String getDescription() {
        return description;
    }

    public abstract double cost();
}

```

Beverage is an abstract class with the two methods `getDescription()` and `cost()`.

`getDescription` is already implemented for us, but we need to implement `cost()` in the subclasses.

Beverage is simple enough. Let's implement the abstract class for the Condiments (Decorator) as well:

```

public abstract class CondimentDecorator extends Beverage {
    public abstract String getDescription();
}

```

First, we need to be interchangeable with a Beverage, so we extend the Beverage class.

We're also going to require that the condiment decorators all reimplement the `getDescription()` method. Again, we'll see why in a sec...

Coding beverages

Now that we've got our base classes out of the way, let's implement some beverages. We'll start with Espresso. Remember, we need to set a description for the specific beverage and also implement the `cost()` method.

```
public class Espresso extends Beverage {
```

```
    public Espresso() {
        description = "Espresso";
    }

    public double cost() {
        return 1.99;
    }
}
```

First we extend the Beverage class, since this is a beverage.

To take care of the description, we set this in the constructor for the class. Remember, the description instance variable is inherited from Beverage.

Finally, we need to compute the cost of an Espresso. We don't need to worry about adding in condiments in this class, we just need to return the price of an Espresso: \$1.99.

```
public class HouseBlend extends Beverage {
    public HouseBlend() {
        description = "House Blend Coffee";
    }

    public double cost() {
        return .89;
    }
}
```

Okay, here's another Beverage. All we do is set the appropriate description, "House Blend Coffee," and then return the correct cost: 89¢.

You can create the other two Beverage classes (DarkRoast and Decaf) in exactly the same way.

Starbuzz Coffee		
Coffees		.89
House Blend		.99
Dark Roast		.99
Decaf		1.05
Espresso		1.99
Condiments		
Steamed Milk		.10
Mocha		.20
Soy		.15
Whip		.10

Coding condiments

If you look back at the Decorator Pattern class diagram, you'll see we've now written our abstract component (Beverage), we have our concrete components (HouseBlend), and we have our abstract decorator (CondimentDecorator). Now it's time to implement the concrete

decorators. Here's Mocha:

```
Mocha is a decorator, so we
extend CondimentDecorator.  

↓  

public class Mocha extends CondimentDecorator {  

    Beverage beverage;  

    public Mocha(Beverage beverage) {  

        this.beverage = beverage;  

    }  

    public String getDescription() {  

        return beverage.getDescription() + ", Mocha";  

    }  

    public double cost() {  

        return beverage.cost() + .20;  

    }  

}  

Now we need to compute the cost of our beverage
with Mocha. First, we delegate the call to the
object we're decorating, so that it can compute the
cost; then, we add the cost of Mocha to the result.
```

Remember, CondimentDecorator
extends Beverage.

We're going to instantiate Mocha with a
reference to a Beverage using:
(1) An instance variable to hold the
beverage we are wrapping.
(2) A way to set this instance
variable to the object we are wrapping.
Here, we're going to pass the beverage
we're wrapping to the decorator's
constructor.

We want our description to not only
include the beverage – say "Dark
Roast" – but also to include each
item decorating the beverage (for
instance, "Dark Roast, Mocha"). So
we first delegate to the object we are
decorating to get its description, then
append ", Mocha" to that description.

On the next page we'll actually instantiate the beverage and wrap it with all its condiments (decorators), but first...

EXERCISE

Write and compile the code for the other Soy and Whip condiments. You'll need them to finish and test the application.

Serving some coffees

Congratulations. It's time to sit back, order a few coffees, and marvel at the flexible design you created with the Decorator Pattern.

Here's some test code*to make orders:

```

public class StarbuzzCoffee {

    public static void main(String args[]) {
        Beverage beverage = new Espresso();
        System.out.println(beverage.getDescription()
            + " $" + beverage.cost());
    }

    Beverage beverage2 = new DarkRoast();
    beverage2 = new Mocha(beverage2);
    beverage2 = new Mocha(beverage2);
    beverage2 = new Whip(beverage2);
    System.out.println(beverage2.getDescription()
        + " $" + beverage2.cost());

    Beverage beverage3 = new HouseBlend();
    beverage3 = new Soy(beverage3);
    beverage3 = new Mocha(beverage3);
    beverage3 = new Whip(beverage3);
    System.out.println(beverage3.getDescription()
        + " $" + beverage3.cost());
}
}

```

Order up an espresso, no condiments, and print its description and cost.

Make a DarkRoast object.

Wrap it with a Mocha.

Wrap it in a second Mocha.

Wrap it in a Whip.

Finally, give us a HouseBlend with Soy, Mocha, and Whip.

* We're going to see a much better way of creating decorated objects when we cover the Factory and Builder Design Patterns. Please note that the Builder Pattern is covered in the Appendix.

Now, let's get those orders in:

```

File Edit Window Help CloudsInMyCoffee
% java StarbuzzCoffee
Espresso $1.99
Dark Roast Coffee, Mocha, Mocha, Whip $1.49
House Blend Coffee, Soy, Mocha, Whip $1.34
%

```

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: I'm a little worried about code that might test for a specific concrete component — say, HouseBlend — and do something, like issue a discount. Once I've wrapped the HouseBlend with decorators, this isn't going to work anymore.

A: A: That is exactly right. If you have code that relies on the concrete component's type, decorators will break that

code. As long as you only write code against the abstract component type, the use of decorators will remain transparent to your code. However, once you start writing code against concrete components, you'll want to rethink your application design and your use of decorators.

Q: Q: Wouldn't it be easy for some client of a beverage to end up with a decorator that isn't the outermost decorator? Like if I had a DarkRoast with Mocha, Soy, and Whip, it would be easy to write code that somehow ended up with a reference to Soy instead of Whip, which means it would not include Whip in the order.

A: A: You could certainly argue that you have to manage more objects with the Decorator Pattern and so there is an increased chance that coding errors will introduce the kinds of problems you suggest. However, decorators are typically created by using other patterns like Factory and Builder. Once we've covered these patterns, you'll see that the creation of the concrete component with its decorator is "well encapsulated" and doesn't lead to these kinds of problems.

Q: Q: Can decorators know about the other decorations in the chain? Say I wanted my `getDescription()` method to print "Whip, Double Mocha" instead of "Mocha, Whip, Mocha." That would require that my outermost decorator know all the decorators it is wrapping.

A: A: Decorators are meant to add behavior to the object they wrap. When you need to peek at multiple layers into the decorator chain, you are starting to push the decorator beyond its true intent. Nevertheless, such things are possible. Imagine a CondimentPrettyPrint decorator that parses the final description and can print "Mocha, Whip, Mocha" as "Whip, Double Mocha." Note that `getDescription()` could return an `ArrayList` of descriptions to make this easier.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Our friends at Starbuzz have introduced sizes to their menu. You can now order a coffee in tall, grande, and venti sizes (translation: small, medium, and large). Starbuzz saw this as an intrinsic part of the coffee class, so they've added two methods to the Beverage class: `setSize()` and `getSize()`. They'd also like for the condiments to be charged according to size, so for instance, Soy costs 10¢, 15¢, and 20¢, respectively, for tall, grande, and venti coffees. The updated Beverage class is shown below.


How would you alter the decorator classes to handle this change in requirements?

```
public abstract class Beverage {
    public enum Size { TALL, GRANDE, VENTI };
    Size size = Size.TALL;
    String description = "Unknown Beverage";
    public String getDescription() {
        return description;
    }
    public void setSize(Size size) {
        this.size = size;
    }
    public Size getSize() {
        return this.size;
    }
    public abstract double cost();
}
```

Real World Decorators: Java I/O


The large number of classes in the `java.io` package is... *overwhelming*. Don't

feel alone if you said “whoa” the first (and second and third) time you looked at this API. But now that you know the Decorator Pattern, the I/O classes should make more sense since the `java.io` package is largely based on Decorator. Here’s a typical set of objects that use decorators to add functionality to reading data from a file:



BufferedInputStream and **LineNumberInputStream** both extend **FilterInputStream**, which acts as the abstract decorator class.

Decorating the `java.io` classes



You can see that this isn't so different from the Starbuzz design. You should now be in a good position to look over the java.io API docs and compose decorators on the various *input* streams.

You'll see that the *output* streams have the same design. And you've probably already found that the Reader/Writer streams (for character-based data) closely mirror the design of the streams classes (with a few differences and inconsistencies, but close enough to figure out what's going on).

Java I/O also points out one of the *downsides* of the Decorator Pattern: designs using this pattern often result in a large number of small classes that can be overwhelming to a developer trying to use the Decorator-based API. But now that you know how Decorator works, you can keep things in perspective and when you're using someone else's Decorator-heavy API, you can work through how their classes are organized so that you can easily use wrapping to get the behavior you're after.

Writing your own Java I/O Decorator

Okay, you know the Decorator Pattern, you've seen the I/O class diagram. You should be ready to write your own input decorator.

How about this: write a decorator that converts all uppercase characters to lowercase in the input stream. In other words, if we read in “I know the Decorator Pattern therefore I RULE!” then your decorator converts this to “i know the decorator pattern therefore i rule!”

Don't forget to import
java.io... (not shown).

First, extend the FilterInputStream, the
abstract decorator for all InputStreams.



```
public class LowerCaseInputStream extends FilterInputStream {  
  
    public LowerCaseInputStream(InputStream in) {  
        super(in);  
    }  
  
    public int read() throws IOException {  
        int c = in.read();  
        return (c == -1 ? c : Character.toLowerCase((char)c));  
    }  
  
    public int read(byte[] b, int offset, int len) throws IOException {  
        int result = in.read(b, offset, len);  
        for (int i = offset; i < offset+result; i++) {  
            b[i] = (byte)Character.toLowerCase((char)b[i]);  
        }  
        return result;  
    }  
}
```

Now we need to implement two
read methods. They take a
byte (or an array of bytes)
and convert each byte (that
represents a character) to
lowercase if it's an uppercase
character.



REMEMBER: we don't provide import and package statements in the code listings. Get the complete source code from <http://wickedlysmart.com/head-first-design-patterns/>.

Test out your new Java I/O Decorator

Write some quick code to test the I/O decorator:

```

public class InputTest {
    public static void main(String[] args) throws IOException {
        int c;
        try {
            InputStream in =
                new LowerCaseInputStream(
                    new BufferedInputStream(
                        new FileInputStream("test.txt")));
            while((c = in.read()) >= 0) {
                System.out.print((char)c);
            }
            in.close();
        } catch (IOException e) {
            e.printStackTrace();
        }
    }
}

```

Set up the FileInputStream and decorate it, first with a BufferedInputStream and then our brand new LowerCaseInputStream filter.

I know the Decorator Pattern therefore I RULE!

Just use the stream to read characters until the end of file and print as we go.

test.txt file

You need to make this file.

Give it a spin

```

File Edit Window Help DecoratorsRule
% java InputTest
i know the decorator pattern therefore i rule!
%

```

PATTERNS EXPOSED

This week's interview: Confessions of a Decorator

Head First: Welcome, Decorator Pattern. We've heard that you've been a bit down on yourself lately?

Decorator: Yes, I know the world sees me as the glamorous design pattern, but you know, I've got my share of problems just like everyone.

HeadFirst: Can you perhaps share some of your troubles with us?

Decorator: Sure. Well, you know I've got the power to add flexibility to designs, that much is for sure, but I also have a *dark side*. You see, I can sometimes add a lot of small

classes to a design and this occasionally results in a design that's less than straightforward for others to understand.

HeadFirst: Can you give us an example?

Decorator: Take the Java I/O libraries. These are notoriously difficult for people to understand at first. But if they just saw the classes as a set of wrappers around an `InputStream`, life would be much easier.

HeadFirst: That doesn't sound so bad. You're still a great pattern, and improving this is just a matter of public education, right?

Decorator: There's more, I'm afraid. I've got typing problems: you see, people sometimes take a piece of client code that relies on specific types and introduce decorators without thinking through everything. Now, one great thing about me is that *you can usually insert decorators transparently and the client never has to know it's dealing with a decorator*. But like I said, some code is dependent on specific types and when you start introducing decorators, boom! Bad things happen.

HeadFirst: Well, I think everyone understands that you have to be careful when inserting decorators. I don't think this is a reason to be too down on yourself.

Decorator: I know, I try not to be. I also have the problem that introducing decorators can increase the complexity of the code needed to instantiate the component. Once you've got decorators, you've got to not only instantiate the component, but also wrap it with who knows how many decorators.

HeadFirst: I'll be interviewing the Factory and Builder patterns next week — I hear they can be very helpful with this?

Decorator: That's true; I should talk to those guys more often.

HeadFirst: Well, we all think you're a great pattern for creating flexible designs and staying true to the Open-Closed Principle, so keep your chin up and think positively!

Decorator: I'll do my best, thank you.

Tools for your Design Toolbox

You've got another chapter under your belt and a new principle and pattern in the toolbox.

OO Basics

OO Principles

Encapsulate what varies.

Favor composition over inheritance.

Program to interfaces, not implementations.

Strive for loosely coupled designs between objects that interact.

Classes should be open for extension but closed for modification.

action
ulation
rphism
ance



We now have the Open-Closed Principle to guide us. We're going to strive to design our system so that the closed parts are isolated from our new extensions.

OO Patterns

Strategic
encapsulation
interface
variations
and

Decorator - Attach additional responsibilities to an object dynamically. Decorators provide a flexible alternative to subclassing for extending functionality.



And here's our first pattern for creating designs that satisfy the Open-Closed Principle. Or was it really the first? Is there another pattern we've used that follows this principle as well?

BULLET POINTS

- Inheritance is one form of extension, but not necessarily the best way to achieve flexibility in our designs.
- In our designs we should allow behavior to be extended without the need to modify existing code.
- Composition and delegation can often be used to add new behaviors at runtime.
- The Decorator Pattern provides an alternative to subclassing for extending behavior.
- The Decorator Pattern involves a set of decorator classes that are used to wrap concrete components.
- Decorator classes mirror the type of the components they decorate. (In fact, they are the same type as the components they decorate, either through inheritance or interface implementation.)
- Decorators change the behavior of their components by adding new functionality before and/or after (or even in place of) method calls to the component.
- You can wrap a component with any number of decorators.
- Decorators are typically transparent to the client of the component; that is, unless the client is relying on the component's concrete type.
- Decorators can result in many small objects in our design, and overuse can be complex.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Write the cost() methods for the following classes (pseudo-Java is okay). Here's our solution:

```
public class Beverage {  
  
    // declare instance variables for milkCost,  
    // soyCost, mochaCost, and whipCost, and  
    // getters and setters for milk, soy, mocha  
    // and whip.  
  
    public double cost() {  
  
        float condimentCost = 0.0;  
        if (hasMilk()) {  
            condimentCost += milkCost;  
        }  
        if (hasSoy()) {  
            condimentCost += soyCost;  
        }  
        if (hasMocha()) {  
            condimentCost += mochaCost;  
        }  
        if (hasWhip()) {  
            condimentCost += whipCost;  
        }  
        return condimentCost;  
    }  
}
```

```

}

public class DarkRoast extends Beverage {

    public DarkRoast() {
        description = "Most Excellent Dark Roast";
    }


    public double cost() {
        return 1.99 + super.cost();
    }
}

```

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

New barista training

“double mocha soy latte with whip”



SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Our friends at Starbuzz have introduced sizes to their menu. You can now order a coffee in tall, grande, and venti sizes (for us normal folk: small, medium, and large). Starbuzz saw this as an intrinsic part of the coffee class, so they've added two methods to the Beverage class: setSize() and getSize(). They'd also like for the condiments to be charged according to size, so for instance, Soy costs 10¢, 15¢, and 20¢, respectively, for tall, grande, and venti coffees.

How would you alter the decorator classes to handle this change in requirements? Here's

our solution.

```
public abstract class CondimentDecorator extends Beverage {  
    public Beverage beverage;  
    public abstract String getDescription();  
  
    public Size getSize() {  
        return beverage.getSize();  
    }  
}  
  
public class Soy extends CondimentDecorator {  
    public Soy(Beverage beverage) {  
        this.beverage = beverage;  
    }  
  
    public String getDescription() {  
        return beverage.getDescription() + ", Soy";  
    }  
  
    public double cost() {  
        double cost = beverage.cost();  
        if (beverage.getSize() == Size.TALL) {  
            cost += .10;  
        } else if (beverage.getSize() == Size.GRANDE) {  
            cost += .15;  
        } else if (beverage.getSize() == Size.VENTI) {  
            cost += .20;  
        }  
        return cost;  
    }  
}
```

We moved the Beverage instance variable into CondimentDecorator, and added a method, getSize() for the decorators that simply returns the size of the beverage.

Here we get the size (which propagates all the way to the concrete beverage) and then add the appropriate cost.

Chapter 4. The Factory Pattern: Baking with OO Goodness



Get ready to bake some loosely coupled OO designs. There is more to making objects than just using the **new** operator. You'll learn that instantiation is an activity that shouldn't always be done in public and can often lead to *coupling problems*. And you don't want *that*, do you? Find out how Factory Patterns can help save you from embarrassing dependencies.



When you see “new,” think “concrete.”

Yes, when you use `new` you are certainly instantiating a concrete class, so that's definitely an implementation, not an interface. And it's a good question; you've learned that tying your code to a concrete class can make it more fragile and less flexible.

`Duck duck = new MallardDuck();`

We want to use interfaces
to keep code flexible.

But we have to create an
instance of a concrete class!

When you have a whole set of related concrete classes, often you're forced to write code like this:

```
Duck duck;
```

```
if (picnic) {  
    duck = new MallardDuck();  
} else if (hunting) {  
    duck = new DecoyDuck();  
} else if (inBathTub) {  
    duck = new RubberDuck();  
}
```

We have a bunch of different duck classes, and we don't know until runtime which one we need to instantiate.

Here we've got several concrete classes being instantiated, and the decision of which to instantiate is made at runtime depending on some set of conditions.

When you see code like this, you know that when it comes time for changes or extensions, you'll have to reopen this code and examine what needs to be added (or deleted). Often this kind of code ends up in several parts of the application making maintenance and updates more difficult and error-prone.

But you have to create an object at some point and Java only gives us one way to create an object, right? So what gives?



What's wrong with “new”?

Technically there's nothing wrong with **new**. After all, it's a fundamental part of Java. The real culprit is our old friend CHANGE and how change impacts our use of **new**.

By coding to an interface, you know you can insulate yourself from a lot of changes that might happen to a system down the road. Why? If your code is written to an interface, then it will work with any new classes implementing that interface through polymorphism. However, when you have code that makes use of lots of concrete classes, you're looking for trouble because that code may have to be changed as new concrete classes are added. So, in other words, your code will not be "closed for modification." To extend it with new concrete types, you'll have to reopen it.

NOTE

Remember that designs should be "open for extension but closed for modification" - see [Chapter 3](#) for a review.

So what can you do? It's times like these that you can fall back on OO Design Principles to look for clues. Remember, our first principle deals with change and guides us to *identify the aspects that vary and separate them from what stays the same*.

BRAIN POWER

How might you take all the parts of your application that instantiate concrete classes and separate or encapsulate them from the rest of your application?

Identifying the aspects that vary



Let's say you have a pizza shop, and as a cutting-edge pizza store owner in Objectville you might end up writing some code like this:

```
Pizza orderPizza() {  
    Pizza pizza = new Pizza();  
  
    pizza.prepare();  
    pizza.bake();  
    pizza.cut();  
    pizza.box();  
  
    return pizza;  
}
```

For flexibility, we really want this to be an abstract class or interface, but we can't directly instantiate either of those.

But you need more than one type of pizza...

So then you'd add some code that *determines* the appropriate type of pizza and then goes about *making* the pizza:

```
Pizza orderPizza(String type) {  
    Pizza pizza;
```

We're now passing in the type of pizza to orderPizza.

```
if (type.equals("cheese")) {  
    pizza = new CheesePizza();  
} else if (type.equals("greek")) {  
    pizza = new GreekPizza();  
} else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {  
    pizza = new PepperoniPizza();  
}
```

Based on the type of pizza, we instantiate the correct concrete class and assign it to the pizza instance variable. Note that each pizza here has to implement the Pizza interface.

```
    pizza.prepare();  
    pizza.bake();  
    pizza.cut();  
    pizza.box();  
    return pizza;  
}
```

Once we have a Pizza, we prepare it (you know, roll the dough, put on the sauce and add the toppings & cheese), then we bake it, cut it and box it!

Each Pizza subtype (CheesePizza, VeggiePizza, etc.) knows how to prepare itself.

But the pressure is on to add more pizza types

You realize that all of your competitors have added a couple of trendy pizzas

to their menus: the Clam Pizza and the Veggie Pizza. Obviously you need to keep up with the competition, so you'll add these items to your menu. And you haven't been selling many Greek Pizzas lately, so you decide to take that off the menu:

```
Pizza orderPizza(String type) {
    Pizza pizza;

    if (type.equals("cheese")) {
        pizza = new CheesePizza();
    } else if (type.equals("greek")) {
        pizza = new GreekPizza();
    } else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {
        pizza = new PepperoniPizza();
    } else if (type.equals("clam")) {
        pizza = new ClamPizza();
    } else if (type.equals("veggie")) {
        pizza = new VeggiePizza();
    }

    pizza.prepare();
    pizza.bake();
    pizza.cut();
    pizza.box();
    return pizza;
}
```

This code is NOT closed for modification. If the Pizza Shop changes its pizza offerings, we have to get into this code and modify it.


This is what varies. As the pizza selection changes over time, you'll have to modify this code over and over.

This is what we expect to stay the same. For the most part, preparing, cooking, and packaging a pizza has remained the same for years and years. So, we don't expect this code to change, just the pizzas it operates on.

Clearly, dealing with *which* concrete class is instantiated is really messing up our `orderPizza()` method and preventing it from being closed for modification. But now that we know what is varying and what isn't, it's probably time to encapsulate it.

Encapsulating object creation

So now we know we'd be better off moving the object creation out of the `orderPizza()` method. But how? Well, what we're going to do is take the creation code and move it out into another object that is only going to be concerned with creating pizzas.



We've got a name for this new object: we call it a Factory.

Factories handle the details of object creation. Once we have a SimplePizzaFactory, our `orderPizza()` method just becomes a client of that object. Any time it needs a pizza it asks the pizza factory to make one. Gone are the days when the `orderPizza()` method needs to know about Greek versus Clam pizzas. Now the `orderPizza()` method just cares that it gets a pizza that implements the `Pizza` interface so that it can call `prepare()`, `bake()`, `cut()`, and `box()`.

We've still got a few details to fill in here; for instance, what does the `orderPizza()` method replace its creation code with? Let's implement a simple factory for the pizza store and find out...

Building a simple pizza factory

We'll start with the factory itself. What we're going to do is define a class that encapsulates the object creation for all pizzas. Here it is...

Here's our new class, the SimplePizzaFactory. It has one job in life: creating pizzas for its clients.

```
public class SimplePizzaFactory {  
    public Pizza createPizza(String type) {  
        Pizza pizza = null;  
  
        if (type.equals("cheese")) {  
            pizza = new CheesePizza();  
        } else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {  
            pizza = new PepperoniPizza();  
        } else if (type.equals("clam")) {  
            pizza = new ClamPizza();  
        } else if (type.equals("veggie")) {  
            pizza = new VeggiePizza();  
        }  
        return pizza;  
    }  
}
```

First we define a createPizza() method in the factory. This is the method all clients will use to instantiate new objects.

Here's the code we plucked out of the orderPizza() method.

This code is still parameterized by the type of the pizza, just like our original orderPizza() method was.

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: What's the advantage of this? It looks like we are just pushing the problem off to another object.

A: A: One thing to remember is that the SimplePizzaFactory may have many clients. We've only seen the orderPizza() method; however, there may be a PizzaShopMenu class that uses the factory to get pizzas for their current description and price. We might also have a HomeDelivery class that handles pizzas in a different way than our PizzaShop class but is also a client of the factory.

So, by encapsulating the pizza creating in one class, we now have only one place to make modifications when the implementation changes.

Don't forget, we are also just about to remove the concrete instantiations from our client code.

Q: Q: I've seen a similar design where a factory like this is defined as a static method. What is the difference?

A: A: Defining a simple factory as a static method is a common technique and is often called a static factory. Why use a static method? Because you don't need to instantiate an object to make use of the create method. But remember it also has the disadvantage that you can't subclass and change the behavior of the create method.

Reworking the PizzaStore class

Now it's time to fix up our client code. What we want to do is rely on the factory to create the pizzas for us. Here are the changes:

```
public class PizzaStore {  
    SimplePizzaFactory factory;  
  
    public PizzaStore(SimplePizzaFactory factory) {  
        this.factory = factory;  
    }  
  
    public Pizza orderPizza(String type) {  
        Pizza pizza;  
  
        pizza = factory.createPizza(type);  
  
        pizza.prepare();  
        pizza.bake();  
        pizza.cut();  
        pizza.box();  
  
        return pizza;  
    }  
  
    // other methods here  
}
```

Now we give `PizzaStore` a reference to a `SimplePizzaFactory`.

`PizzaStore` gets the factory passed to it in the constructor.

And the `orderPizza()` method uses the factory to create its pizzas by simply passing on the type of the order.

Notice that we've replaced the `new` operator with a `create` method on the factory object. No more concrete instantiations here!

BRAIN POWER

Q: We know that object composition allows us to change behavior dynamically at runtime (among other things) because we can swap in and out implementations. How might we be able to use that in the `PizzaStore`? What factory implementations might we be able to swap in and out?

A: We don't know about you, but we're thinking New York, Chicago, and California style pizza factories (let's not forget New Haven, too)


The Simple Factory defined



Pattern Honorable Mention

The Simple Factory isn't actually a Design Pattern; it's more of a programming idiom. But it is commonly used, so we'll give it a Head First Pattern Honorable Mention. Some developers do mistake this idiom for the "Factory Pattern," so the next time there is an awkward silence between you and another developer, you've got a nice topic to break the ice.

Just because Simple Factory isn't a REAL pattern doesn't mean we shouldn't check out how it's put together. Let's take a look at the class diagram of our new Pizza Store:



Think of Simple Factory as a warm up. Next, we'll explore two heavy-duty patterns that are both factories. But don't worry, there's more pizza to come!


NOTE

*Just another reminder: in design patterns, the phrase "implement an interface" does NOT always mean "write a class that implements a Java interface, by using the 'implements' keyword in the class declaration." In the general use of the phrase, a concrete class implementing a method from a supertype (which could be a class OR interface) is still considered to be "implementing the interface" of that supertype.

Franchising the pizza store

Your Objectville PizzaStore has done so well that you've trounced the competition and now everyone wants a PizzaStore in their own neighborhood. As the franchiser, you want to ensure the quality of the franchise operations and so you want them to use your time-tested code.

But what about regional differences? Each franchise might want to offer different styles of pizzas (New York, Chicago, and California, to name a few), depending on where the franchise store is located and the tastes of the local pizza connoisseurs.



We've seen one approach...

If we take out `SimplePizzaFactory` and create three different factories — `NYPizzaFactory`, `ChicagoPizzaFactory` and `CaliforniaPizzaFactory` — then we can just compose the `PizzaStore` with the appropriate factory and a

franchise is good to go. That's one approach.

Let's see what that would look like...

```
NYPizzaFactory nyFactory = new NYPizzaFactory();  
PizzaStore nyStore = new PizzaStore(nyFactory);  
nyStore.orderPizza("Veggie");
```

Here we create a factory for making NY style pizzas.

Then we create a PizzaStore and pass it a reference to the NY factory.

...and when we make pizzas, we get NY style pizzas.

```
ChicagoPizzaFactory chicagoFactory = new ChicagoPizzaFactory();  
PizzaStore chicagoStore = new PizzaStore(chicagoFactory);  
chicagoStore.orderPizza("Veggie");
```


Likewise for the Chicago pizza stores: we create a factory for Chicago pizzas and create a store that is composed with a Chicago factory. When we make pizzas, we get the Chicago style ones.

But you'd like a little more quality control...

So you test-marketed the SimpleFactory idea, and what you found was that the franchises were using your factory to create pizzas, but starting to employ their own home-grown procedures for the rest of the process: they'd bake things a little differently, they'd forget to cut the pizza and they'd use third-party boxes.

Rethinking the problem a bit, you see that what you'd really like to do is create a framework that ties the store and the pizza creation together, yet still allows things to remain flexible.

In our early code, before the SimplePizzaFactory, we had the pizza-making code tied to the PizzaStore, but it wasn't flexible. So, how can we have our pizza and eat it too?



A framework for the pizza store

There *is* a way to localize all the pizza-making activities to the `PizzaStore` class, and yet give the franchises freedom to have their own regional style.

What we're going to do is put the `createPizza()` method back into `PizzaStore`, but this time as an **abstract method**, and then create a `PizzaStore` subclass for each regional style.

First, let's look at the changes to the `PizzaStore`:

PizzaStore is now abstract (see why below).

```
public abstract class PizzaStore {
```

```
    public Pizza orderPizza(String type) {
```

```
        Pizza pizza;
```

```
        pizza = createPizza(type);
```

```
        pizza.prepare();
```

```
        pizza.bake();
```

```
        pizza.cut();
```

```
        pizza.box();
```

```
    return pizza;
```

```
}
```

```
    abstract Pizza createPizza(String type);
```

```
}
```

Now createPizza is back to being a call to a method in the PizzaStore rather than on a factory object.

All this looks just the same...

Now we've moved our factory object to this method.

Our "factory method" is now abstract in PizzaStore.


Now we've got a store waiting for subclasses; we're going to have a subclass for each regional type (NYPizzaStore, ChicagoPizzaStore, CaliforniaPizzaStore) and each subclass is going to make the decision about what makes up a pizza. Let's take a look at how this is going to work.

Allowing the subclasses to decide

Remember, the PizzaStore already has a well-honed order system in the orderPizza() method and you want to ensure that it's consistent across all franchises.

What varies among the regional PizzaStores is the style of pizzas they make — New York Pizza has thin crust, Chicago Pizza has thick, and so on — and we are going to push all these variations into the createPizza() method and


make it responsible for creating the right kind of pizza. The way we do this is by letting each subclass of PizzaStore define what the `createPizza()` method looks like. So, we will have a number of concrete subclasses of PizzaStore, each with its own pizza variations, all fitting within the PizzaStore framework and still making use of the well-tuned `orderPizza()` method.






I don't get it. The PizzaStore subclasses are just subclasses. How are they deciding anything? I don't see any logical decision-making code in NYStylePizzaStore....

Well, think about it from the point of view of the PizzaStore's `orderPizza()` method: it is defined in the abstract PizzaStore, but concrete types are only created in the subclasses.




orderPizza() is defined in the abstract PizzaStore, not the subclasses. So, the method has no idea which subclass is actually running the code and making the pizzas.

Now, to take this a little further, the `orderPizza()` method does a lot of things with a `Pizza` object (like `prepare`, `bake`, `cut`, `box`), but because `Pizza` is abstract, `orderPizza()` has no idea what real concrete classes are involved. In other words, it's decoupled!



orderPizza() calls createPizza() to actually get a pizza object. But which kind of pizza will it get? The orderPizza() method can't decide; it doesn't know how. So who does decide?

When orderPizza() calls createPizza(), one of your subclasses will be called into action to create a pizza. Which kind of pizza will be made? Well, that's decided by the choice of pizza store you order from, NYStylePizzaStore or ChicagoStylePizzaStore.



So, is there a real-time decision that subclasses make? No, but from the perspective of orderPizza(), if you chose a NYStylePizzaStore, that subclass gets to determine which pizza is made. So the subclasses aren't really "deciding" — it was *you* who decided by choosing which store you wanted — but they do determine which kind of pizza gets made.

Let's make a PizzaStore

Being a franchise has its benefits. You get all the PizzaStore functionality for free. All the regional stores need to do is subclass PizzaStore and supply a createPizza() method that implements their style of Pizza. We'll take care of the big three pizza styles for the franchisees.

Here's the New York regional style:

createPizza() returns a Pizza, and the subclass is fully responsible for which concrete Pizza it instantiates.

The NY PizzaStore extends PizzaStore, so it inherits the orderPizza() method (among others).

```
public class NYPizzaStore extends PizzaStore {  
  
    Pizza createPizza(String item) {  
        if (item.equals("cheese")) {  
            return new NYStyleCheesePizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("veggie")) {  
            return new NYStyleVeggiePizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("clam")) {  
            return new NYStyleClamPizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("pepperoni")) {  
            return new NYStylePepperoniPizza();  
        } else return null;  
    }  
}
```

We've got to implement createPizza(), since it is abstract in PizzaStore.

Here's where we create our concrete classes. For each type of Pizza we create the NY style.

NOTE

* Note that the orderPizza() method in the superclass has no clue which Pizza we are creating; it just knows it can prepare, bake, cut, and box it!

Once we've got our PizzaStore subclasses built, it will be time to see about ordering up a pizza or two. But before we do that, why don't you take a crack at building the Chicago Style and California Style pizza stores on the next page.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

We've knocked out the NY PizzaStore; just two more to go and we'll be ready to franchise! Write the Chicago and California PizzaStore implementations here:

Declaring a factory method

With just a couple of transformations to the PizzaStore we've gone from having an object handle the instantiation of our concrete classes to a set of subclasses that are now taking on that responsibility. Let's take a closer look:

```

public abstract class PizzaStore {
    public Pizza orderPizza(String type) {
        Pizza pizza;
        pizza = createPizza(type);
        pizza.prepare();
        pizza.bake();
        pizza.cut();
        pizza.box();
        return pizza;
    }
    protected abstract Pizza createPizza(String type);
    // other methods here
}

```

The subclasses of PizzaStore handle object instantiation for us in the createPizza() method.

NYStylePizzaStore

createPizza()

ChicagoStylePizzaStore

createPizza()

All the responsibility for instantiating Pizzas has been moved into a method that acts as a factory.

CODE UP CLOSE

A factory method handles object creation and encapsulates it in a subclass. This decouples the client code in the superclass from the object creation code in the subclass.

→ **abstract Product factoryMethod(String type)**

A factory method is abstract so the subclasses are counted on to handle object creation.

↑
A factory method returns a Product that is typically used within methods defined in the superclass.

↓
A factory method may be parameterized (or not) to select among several variations of a product.

↑
A factory method isolates the client (the code in the superclass, like orderPizza()) from knowing what kind of concrete Product is actually created.

Let's see how it works: ordering pizzas with the pizza factory method



So how do they order?

- ① First, Joel and Ethan need an instance of a PizzaStore. Joel needs to instantiate a ChicagoPizzaStore and Ethan needs a NYPizzaStore.
- ② With a PizzaStore in hand, both Ethan and Joel call the orderPizza() method and pass in the type of pizza they want (cheese, veggie, and so on).
- ③ To create the pizzas, the createPizza() method is called, which is defined in the two subclasses NYPizzaStore and ChicagoPizzaStore. As we defined them, the NYPizzaStore instantiates a NY style pizza, and the ChicagoPizzaStore instantiates a Chicago style pizza. In either case, the Pizza is returned to the orderPizza() method.
- ④ The orderPizza() method has no idea what kind of pizza was created, but it knows it is a pizza and it prepares, bakes, cuts, and boxes it for Ethan and Joel.

Let's check out how these pizzas are really made to order...




Behind the Scenes

1

Let's follow Ethan's order: first we need a NY PizzaStore:


```
PizzaStore nyPizzaStore = new NYPizzaStore();
```



2

Now that we have a store, we can take an order:

```
nyPizzaStore.orderPizza("cheese");
```



3

The `orderPizza()` method then calls the `createPizza()` method:

```
Pizza pizza = createPizza("cheese");
```

Remember, `createPizza()`, the factory method, is implemented in the subclass. In this case it returns a NY Cheese Pizza.



4

Finally, we have the unprepared pizza in hand and the `orderPizza()` method finishes preparing it:

```
pizza.prepare();  
pizza.bake();  
pizza.cut();  
pizza.box();
```

The `orderPizza()` method gets back a `Pizza`, without knowing exactly what concrete class it is.

All of these methods are defined in the specific pizza returned from the factory method `createPizza()`, defined in the `NYPizzaStore`.

We're just missing one thing: PIZZA!



Our PizzaStore isn't going to be very popular without some pizzas, so let's implement them

We'll start with an abstract Pizza class and all the concrete pizzas will derive from this.

```

public abstract class Pizza {
    String name;
    String dough;
    String sauce;
    ArrayList<String> toppings = new ArrayList<String>();

    void prepare() {
        System.out.println("Preparing " + name);
        System.out.println("Tossing dough...");
        System.out.println("Adding sauce...");
        System.out.println("Adding toppings: ");
        for (String topping : toppings) {
            System.out.println("    " + topping);
        }
    }

    void bake() {
        System.out.println("Bake for 25 minutes at 350");
    }

    void cut() {
        System.out.println("Cutting the pizza into diagonal slices");
    }

    void box() {
        System.out.println("Place pizza in official PizzaStore box");
    }

    public String getName() {
        return name;
    }
}

```

Each Pizza has a name, a type of dough, a type of sauce, and a set of toppings.

The abstract class provides some basic defaults for baking, cutting and boxing.

Preparation follows a number of steps in a particular sequence.

NOTE

REMEMBER: we don't provide import and package statements in the code listings. Get the complete source code from the wickedlysmart website. You'll find the URL on page xxxiii in the Intro.

Now we just need some concrete subclasses... how about defining New York and Chicago style cheese pizzas?

```

public class NYStyleCheesePizza extends Pizza {
    public NYStyleCheesePizza() {
        name = "NY Style Sauce and Cheese Pizza";
        dough = "Thin Crust Dough";
        sauce = "Marinara Sauce";

        toppings.add("Grated Reggiano Cheese");
    }
}

public class ChicagoStyleCheesePizza extends Pizza {
    public ChicagoStyleCheesePizza() {
        name = "Chicago Style Deep Dish Cheese Pizza";
        dough = "Extra Thick Crust Dough";
        sauce = "Plum Tomato Sauce";

        toppings.add("Shredded Mozzarella Cheese");
    }

    void cut() {
        System.out.println("Cutting the pizza into square slices");
    }
}

```

The NY Pizza has its own marinara style sauce and thin crust.

And one topping, reggiano cheese!

The Chicago Pizza uses plum tomatoes as a sauce along with extra-thick crust.

The Chicago style deep dish pizza has lots of mozzarella cheese!

The Chicago style pizza also overrides the cut() method so that the pieces are cut into squares.

You've waited long enough. Time for some pizzas!

```

public class PizzaTestDrive {

    public static void main(String[] args) {
        PizzaStore nyStore = new NYPizzaStore();
        PizzaStore chicagoStore = new ChicagoPizzaStore();

        Pizza pizza = nyStore.orderPizza("cheese");
        System.out.println("Ethan ordered a " + pizza.getName() + "\n");

        pizza = chicagoStore.orderPizza("cheese");
        System.out.println("Joel ordered a " + pizza.getName() + "\n");
    }
}

```

First we create two different stores.

Then use one store to make Ethan's order.

And the other for Joel's.

```

File Edit Window Help YouWantMootzOnThatPizza?
%java PizzaTestDrive

Preparing NY Style Sauce and Cheese Pizza
Tossing dough...
Adding sauce...
Adding toppings:
    Grated Reggiano cheese
Bake for 25 minutes at 350
Cutting the pizza into diagonal slices
Place pizza in official PizzaStore box
Ethan ordered a NY Style Sauce and Cheese Pizza

Preparing Chicago Style Deep Dish Cheese Pizza
Tossing dough...
Adding sauce...
Adding toppings:
    Shredded Mozzarella Cheese
Bake for 25 minutes at 350
Cutting the pizza into square slices
Place pizza in official PizzaStore box
Joel ordered a Chicago Style Deep Dish Cheese Pizza

```


Both pizzas get prepared, the toppings added, and the pizzas baked, cut and boxed. Our superclass never had to know the details, the subclass handled all that just by instantiating the right pizza.

It's finally time to meet the Factory Method Pattern


All factory patterns encapsulate object creation. The Factory Method Pattern encapsulates object creation by letting subclasses decide what objects to create. Let's check out these class diagrams to see who the players are in this

pattern:

The Creator classes




The Product classes



Another perspective: parallel class hierarchies

We've seen that the factory method provides a framework by supplying an `orderPizza()` method that is combined with a factory method. Another way to look at this pattern as a framework is in the way it encapsulates product knowledge into each creator.

Let's look at the two parallel class hierarchies and see how they relate:




NOTE

The factory method is the key to encapsulating this knowledge.

DESIGN PUZZLE

We need another kind of pizza for those crazy Californians (crazy in a *good* way, of course). Draw another parallel set of classes that you'd need to add a new California region to our PizzaStore.



Okay, now write the five *most bizarre* things you can think of to put on a pizza. Then, you'll be ready to go into business making pizza in California!

Factory Method Pattern defined

It's time to roll out the official definition of the Factory Method Pattern:

NOTE


The Factory Method Pattern defines an interface for creating an object, but lets subclasses decide which class to instantiate. Factory Method lets a class defer instantiation to subclasses.

As with every factory, the Factory Method Pattern gives us a way to encapsulate the instantiations of concrete types. Looking at the class diagram below, you can see that the abstract Creator gives you an interface with a method for creating objects, also known as the “factory method.” Any other methods implemented in the abstract Creator are written to operate on products produced by the factory method. Only subclasses actually implement the factory method and create products.

As in the official definition, you’ll often hear developers say that the Factory Method lets subclasses decide which class to instantiate. They say “decide” not because the pattern allows subclasses themselves to decide at runtime, but because the creator class is written without knowledge of the actual products that will be created, which is decided purely by the choice of the subclass that is used.

NOTE

You could ask them what “decides” means, but we bet you now understand this better than they do!



THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: What's the advantage of the Factory Method Pattern when you only have one ConcreteCreator?

A: A: The Factory Method Pattern is useful if you've only got one concrete creator because you are decoupling the implementation of the product from its use. If you add additional products or change a product's implementation, it will not affect your Creator (because the Creator is not tightly coupled to any ConcreteProduct).

Q: Q: Would it be correct to say that our NY and Chicago stores are implemented using Simple Factory? They look just like it.

A: A: They're similar, but used in different ways. Even though the implementation of each concrete store looks a lot like the SimplePizzaFactory, remember that the concrete stores are extending a class that has defined createPizza() as an abstract method. It is up to each store to define the behavior of the createPizza() method. In Simple Factory, the factory is another object that is composed with the PizzaStore.

Q: Q: Are the factory method and the Creator always abstract?

A: A: No, you can define a default factory method to produce some concrete product. Then you always have a means of creating products even if there are no subclasses of the Creator.

Q: Q: Each store can make four different kinds of pizzas based on the type passed in. Do all concrete creators make multiple products, or do they sometimes just make one?

A: A: We implemented what is known as the parameterized factory method. It can make more than one object based on a parameter passed in, as you noticed. Often, however, a factory just produces one object and is not parameterized. Both are valid forms of the pattern.

Q: Q: Your parameterized types don't seem "type-safe." I'm just passing in a String! What if I asked for a "CalmPizza"?

A: A: You are certainly correct and that would cause, what we call in the business, a "runtime error." There are several other more sophisticated techniques that can be used to make parameters more "type safe," or, in other words, to ensure errors in parameters can be caught at compile time. For instance, you can create objects that represent the parameter types, use static constants, or use enums.

Q: Q: I'm still a bit confused about the difference between Simple Factory and Factory Method. They look very similar, except that in Factory Method, the class that returns the pizza is a subclass. Can you explain?

A: A: You're right that the subclasses do look a lot like Simple Factory; however, think of Simple Factory as a one-shot deal, while with Factory Method you are creating a framework that lets the subclasses decide which implementation will be used. For example, the orderPizza() method in the Factory Method provides a general framework for creating pizzas that relies on a factory method to actually create the concrete classes that go into making a pizza. By subclassing the PizzaStore class, you decide what concrete products go into making the pizza that orderPizza() returns. Compare that with SimpleFactory, which gives you a way to encapsulate object creation, but doesn't give you the flexibility of the Factory Method because there is no way to vary the products you're creating.

MASTER AND STUDENT...

Master: Grasshopper, tell me how your training is going.

Student: Master, I have taken my study of "encapsulate what varies" further.

Master: Go on...

Student: I have learned that one can encapsulate the code that creates objects. When you have code that instantiates concrete classes, this is an area of frequent change. I've

learned a technique called “factories” that allows you to encapsulate this behavior of instantiation.

Master: And these “factories,” of what benefit are they?

Student: There are many. By placing all my creation code in one object or method, I avoid duplication in my code and provide one place to perform maintenance. That also means clients depend only upon interfaces rather than the concrete classes required to instantiate objects. As I have learned in my studies, this allows me to program to an interface, not an implementation, and that makes my code more flexible and extensible in the future.

Master: Yes Grasshopper, your OO instincts are growing. Do you have any questions for your master today?

Student: Master, I know that by encapsulating object creation I am coding to abstractions and decoupling my client code from actual implementations. But my factory code must still use concrete classes to instantiate real objects. Am I not pulling the wool over my own eyes?

Master: Grasshopper, object creation is a reality of life; we must create objects or we will never create a single Java program. But, with knowledge of this reality, we can design our code so that we have corralled this creation code like the sheep whose wool you would pull over your eyes. Once corralled, we can protect and care for the creation code. If we let our creation code run wild, then we will never collect its “wool.”

Student: Master, I see the truth in this.

Master: As I knew you would. Now, please go and meditate on object dependencies.

A very dependent PizzaStore

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Let’s pretend you’ve never heard of an OO factory. Here’s a version of the PizzaStore that doesn’t use a factory; make a count of the number of concrete pizza objects this class is dependent on. If you added California style pizzas to this PizzaStore, how many objects would it be dependent on then?

```

public class DependentPizzaStore {

    public Pizza createPizza(String style, String type) {
        Pizza pizza = null;
        if (style.equals("NY")) {
            if (type.equals("cheese")) {
                pizza = new NYStyleCheesePizza();
            } else if (type.equals("veggie")) {
                pizza = new NYStyleVeggiePizza();
            } else if (type.equals("clam")) {
                pizza = new NYStyleClamPizza();
            } else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {
                pizza = new NYStylePepperoniPizza();
            }
        } else if (style.equals("Chicago")) {
            if (type.equals("cheese")) {
                pizza = new ChicagoStyleCheesePizza();
            } else if (type.equals("veggie")) {
                pizza = new ChicagoStyleVeggiePizza();
            } else if (type.equals("clam")) {
                pizza = new ChicagoStyleClamPizza();
            } else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {
                pizza = new ChicagoStylePepperoniPizza();
            }
        } else {
            System.out.println("Error: invalid type of pizza");
            return null;
        }
        pizza.prepare();
        pizza.bake();
        pizza.cut();
        pizza.box();
        return pizza;
    }
}

```

You can write your answers here:

number _____

number with California too _____


Handles all the NY style pizzas

Handles all the Chicago style pizzas

Looking at object dependencies

When you directly instantiate an object, you are depending on its concrete class. Take a look at our very dependent PizzaStore one page back. It creates all the pizza objects right in the PizzaStore class instead of delegating to a factory.

If we draw a diagram representing that version of the PizzaStore and all the objects it depends on, here's what it looks like:



The Dependency Inversion Principle

It should be pretty clear that reducing dependencies to concrete classes in our code is a “good thing.” In fact, we’ve got an OO design principle that formalizes this notion; it even has a big, formal name: *Dependency Inversion Principle*.

NOTE

Yet another phrase you can use to impress the execs in the room! Your raise will more than offset the cost of this book, and you’ll gain the admiration of your fellow developers.

Here’s the general principle:

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Depend upon abstractions. Do not depend upon concrete classes.

At first, this principle sounds a lot like “Program to an interface, not an implementation,” right? It is similar; however, the Dependency Inversion Principle makes an even stronger statement about abstraction. It suggests that our high-level components should not depend on our low-level components; rather, they should *both* depend on abstractions.

NOTE

A “high-level” component is a class with behavior defined in terms of other, “low-level” components.

For example, PizzaStore is a high-level component because its behavior is defined in terms of pizzas - it creates all the different pizza objects, and prepares, bakes, cuts, and boxes them, while the pizzas it uses are low-level components.

But what the heck does that mean?

Well, let’s start by looking again at the pizza store diagram on the previous page. PizzaStore is our “high-level component” and the pizza implementations are our “low-level components,” and clearly the PizzaStore is dependent on the concrete pizza classes.

Now, this principle tells us we should instead write our code so that we are depending on abstractions, not concrete classes. That goes for both our high-level modules and our low-level modules.

But how do we do this? Let’s think about how we’d apply this principle to our Very Dependent PizzaStore implementation...


Applying the Principle

Now, the main problem with the Very Dependent PizzaStore is that it depends on every type of pizza because it actually instantiates concrete types in its `orderPizza()` method.

While we’ve created an abstraction, `Pizza`, we’re nevertheless creating concrete Pizzas in this code, so we don’t get a lot of leverage out of this abstraction.

How can we get those instantiations out of the `orderPizza()` method? Well, as we know, the Factory Method allows us to do just that.

So, after we've applied the Factory Method, our diagram looks like this:



After applying the Factory Method, you'll notice that our high-level component, the `PizzaStore`, and our low-level components, the pizzas, both depend on `Pizza`, the abstraction. Factory Method is not the only technique for adhering to the Dependency Inversion Principle, but it is one of the more powerful ones.



Where's the “inversion” in Dependency Inversion Principle?

The “inversion” in the name Dependency Inversion Principle is there because it inverts the way you typically might think about your OO design. Look at the diagram on the previous page. Notice that the low-level components now depend on a higher level abstraction. Likewise, the high-level component is also tied to the same abstraction. So, the top-to-bottom dependency chart we drew a couple of pages back has inverted itself, with both high-level and low-level modules now depending on the abstraction.

Let's also walk through the thinking behind the typical design process and see how introducing the principle can invert the way we think about the design...

Inverting your thinking...



	Okay, so you need to implement a PizzaStore. What's the first thought that pops into your head?
	<p>Right, you start at the top and follow things down to the concrete classes. But, as you've seen, you don't want your store to know about the concrete pizza types, because then it'll be dependent on all those concrete classes!</p> <p>Now, let's "invert" your thinking... instead of starting at the top, start at the Pizzas and think about what you can abstract.</p>
	<p>Right! You are thinking about the abstraction <i>Pizza</i>. So now, go back and think about the design of the Pizza Store again.</p> <p>Close. But to do that you'll have to rely on a factory to get those concrete classes out of your Pizza Store. Once you've done that, your different concrete pizza types depend only on an abstraction and so does your store. We've taken a design where the store depended on concrete classes and inverted those dependencies (along with your thinking).</p>

A few guidelines to help you follow the Principle...

The following guidelines can help you avoid OO designs that violate the Dependency Inversion Principle:

- No variable should hold a reference to a concrete class.

NOTE

If you use **new**, you'll be holding a reference to a concrete class. Use a factory to get around that!

- No class should derive from a concrete class.

NOTE

If you derive from a concrete class, you're depending on a concrete class. Derive from an abstraction, like an interface or an abstract class.

- No method should override an implemented method of any of its base classes.

NOTE

If you override an implemented method, then your base class wasn't really an

abstraction to start with. Those methods implemented in the base class are meant to be shared by all your subclasses.

You're exactly right! Like many of our principles, this is a guideline you should strive for, rather than a rule you should follow all the time. Clearly, every single Java program ever written violates these guidelines!

But, if you internalize these guidelines and have them in the back of your mind when you design, you'll know when you are violating the principle and you'll have a good reason for doing so. For instance, if you have a class that isn't likely to change, and you know it, then it's not the end of the world if you instantiate a concrete class in your code. Think about it; we instantiate String objects all the time without thinking twice. Does that violate the principle? Yes. Is that okay? Yes. Why? Because String is very unlikely to change.

If, on the other hand, a class you write is likely to change, you have some good techniques like Factory Method to encapsulate that change.



Meanwhile, back at the PizzaStore...

The design for the PizzaStore is really shaping up: it's got a flexible framework and it does a good job of adhering to design principles.

Now, the key to Objectville Pizza's success has always been fresh, quality ingredients, and what you've discovered is that with the new framework your franchises have been following your *procedures*, but a few franchises have been substituting inferior ingredients in their pies to lower costs and increase their margins. You know you've got to do something, because in the long term this is going to hurt the Objectville brand!



Ensuring consistency in your ingredients

So how are you going to ensure each franchise is using quality ingredients? You're going to build a factory that produces them and ships them to your franchises!

Now there is only one problem with this plan: the franchises are located in different regions and what is red sauce in New York is not red sauce in Chicago. So, you have one set of ingredients that needs to be shipped to New York and a *different* set that needs to be shipped to Chicago. Let's take a closer look:



Chicago Pizza Menu

Cheese Pizza

Plum Tomato Sauce, Mozzarella, Parmesan, Oregano

Veggie Pizza

Plum Tomato Sauce, Mozzarella, Parmesan, Eggplant, Spinach, Black Olives

Clam Pizza

Plum Tomato Sauce, Mozzarella, Parmesan, Clams

Pepperoni Pizza

Plum Tomato Sauce, Mozzarella, Parmesan, Eggplant, Spinach, Black Olives, Pepperoni

We've got the same product families (dough, sauce, cheese, veggies, meats) but different implementations based on region.



New York Pizza Menu

Cheese Pizza

Marinara Sauce, Reggiano, Garlic

Veggie Pizza

Marinara Sauce, Reggiano, Mushrooms, Onions, Red Peppers

Clam Pizza

Marinara Sauce, Reggiano, Fresh Clams


Pepperoni Pizza

Marinara Sauce, Reggiano, Mushrooms, Onions, Red Peppers, Pepperoni

Families of ingredients...

New York uses one set of ingredients and Chicago another. Given the popularity of Objectville Pizza, it won't be long before you also need to ship another set of regional ingredients to California, and what's next? Seattle?

For this to work, you are going to have to figure out how to handle families of ingredients.



Building the ingredient factories

Now we're going to build a factory to create our ingredients; the factory will be responsible for creating each ingredient in the ingredient family. In other words, the factory will need to create dough, sauce, cheese, and so on... You'll see how we are going to handle the regional differences shortly.

Let's start by defining an interface for the factory that is going to create all our ingredients:

```
public interface PizzaIngredientFactory {  
    public Dough createDough();  
    public Sauce createSauce();  
    public Cheese createCheese();  
    public Veggies[] createVeggies();  
    public Pepperoni createPepperoni();  
    public Clams createClam();  
}
```

Lots of new classes here,
one per ingredient.



For each ingredient we define a
create method in our interface.

NOTE

If we'd had some common "machinery" to implement in each instance of factory, we could have made this an abstract class instead...

Here's what we're going to do:

- ① Build a factory for each region. To do this, you'll create a subclass of `PizzaIngredientFactory` that implements each create method.
- ② Implement a set of ingredient classes to be used with the factory, like `ReggianoCheese`, `RedPeppers`, and `ThickCrustDough`. These classes can be shared among regions where appropriate.
- ③ Then we still need to hook all this up by working our new ingredient factories into our old `PizzaStore` code.

Building the New York ingredient factory

Okay, here's the implementation for the New York ingredient factory. This factory specializes in **Marinara Sauce, Reggiano Cheese, Fresh Clams...**

The NY ingredient factory implements the interface for all ingredient factories

```
public class NYPizzaIngredientFactory implements PizzaIngredientFactory {  
  
    public Dough createDough() {  
        return new ThinCrustDough();  
    }  
  
    public Sauce createSauce() {  
        return new MarinaraSauce();  
    }  
  
    public Cheese createCheese() {  
        return new ReggianoCheese();  
    }  
  
    public Veggies[] createVeggies() {  
        Veggies veggies[] = { new Garlic(), new Onion(), new Mushroom(), new RedPepper() };  
        return veggies;  
    }  
  
    public Pepperoni createPepperoni() {  
        return new SlicedPepperoni();  
    }  
  
    public Clams createClam() {  
        return new FreshClams();  
    }  
}
```

New York is on the coast; it gets fresh clams. Chicago has to settle for frozen.


For each ingredient in the ingredient family, we create the New York version.

For veggies, we return an array of Veggies. Here we've hardcoded the veggies. We could make this more sophisticated, but that doesn't really add anything to learning the factory pattern, so we'll keep it simple.

The best sliced pepperoni.
This is shared between New York and Chicago. Make sure you use it on the next page when you get to implement the Chicago factory yourself

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Write the ChicagoPizzaIngredientFactory. You can reference the classes below in your implementation:



Reworking the pizzas...

We've got our factories all fired up and ready to produce quality ingredients; now we just need to rework our Pizzas so they only use factory-produced ingredients. We'll start with our abstract Pizza class:

```

public abstract class Pizza {
    String name;

    Dough dough;
    Sauce sauce;
    Veggies veggies[];
    Cheese cheese;
    Pepperoni pepperoni;
    Clams clam;

    abstract void prepare();

    void bake() {
        System.out.println("Bake for 25 minutes at 350");
    }

    void cut() {
        System.out.println("Cutting the pizza into diagonal slices");
    }

    void box() {
        System.out.println("Place pizza in official PizzaStore box");
    }

    void setName(String name) {
        this.name = name;
    }

    String getName() {
        return name;
    }

    public String toString() {
        // code to print pizza here
    }
}

```

Each pizza holds a set of ingredients that are used in its preparation.

We've now made the prepare method abstract. This is where we are going to collect the ingredients needed for the pizza, which of course will come from the ingredient factory.

Our other methods remain the same, with the exception of the prepare method.

Reworking the pizzas, continued...

Now that you've got an abstract Pizza to work from, it's time to create the New York and Chicago style Pizzas — only this time around they will get their ingredients straight from the factory. The franchisees' days of skimping

on ingredients are over!

When we wrote the Factory Method code, we had a NYCheesePizza and a ChicagoCheesePizza class. If you look at the two classes, the only thing that differs is the use of regional ingredients. The pizzas are made just the same (dough + sauce + cheese). The same goes for the other pizzas: Veggie, Clam, and so on. They all follow the same preparation steps; they just have different ingredients.

So, what you'll see is that we really don't need two classes for each pizza; the ingredient factory is going to handle the regional differences for us. Here's the Cheese Pizza:

```
public class CheesePizza extends Pizza {  
    PizzaIngredientFactory ingredientFactory;  
  
    public CheesePizza(PizzaIngredientFactory ingredientFactory) {  
        this.ingredientFactory = ingredientFactory;  
    }  
  
    void prepare() {  
        System.out.println("Preparing " + name);  
        dough = ingredientFactory.createDough();  
        sauce = ingredientFactory.createSauce();  
        cheese = ingredientFactory.createCheese();  
    }  
}
```

To make a pizza now, we need a factory to provide the ingredients. So each Pizza class gets a factory passed into its constructor, and it's stored in an instance variable.

Here's where the magic happens!

The prepare() method steps through creating a cheese pizza, and each time it needs an ingredient, it asks the factory to produce it.

CODE UP CLOSE

The Pizza code uses the factory it has been composed with to produce the ingredients used in the pizza. The ingredients produced depend on which factory we're using. The Pizza class doesn't care; it knows how to make pizzas. Now, it's decoupled from the differences in regional ingredients and can be easily reused when there are factories for the Rockies, the Pacific Northwest, and beyond.

```
sauce = ingredientFactory.createSauce();
```

We're setting the Pizza instance variable to refer to the specific sauce used in this pizza.

This is our ingredient factory. The Pizza doesn't care which factory is used, as long as it is an ingredient factory.

The createSauce() method returns the sauce that is used in its region. If this is a NY ingredient factory, then we get marinara sauce.

Let's check out the ClamPizza as well:

```
public class ClamPizza extends Pizza {  
    PizzaIngredientFactory ingredientFactory;  
  
    public ClamPizza(PizzaIngredientFactory ingredientFactory) {  
        this.ingredientFactory = ingredientFactory;  
    }  
  
    void prepare() {  
        System.out.println("Preparing " + name);  
        dough = ingredientFactory.createDough();  
        sauce = ingredientFactory.createSauce();  
        cheese = ingredientFactory.createCheese();  
        clam = ingredientFactory.createClam();  
    }  
}
```

ClamPizza also stashes
an ingredient factory.

↑↑↑ To make a clam pizza, the prepare
method collects the right
ingredients from its local factory.

If it's a New York factory,
the clams will be fresh; if it's
Chicago, they'll be frozen.

Revisiting our pizza stores

We're almost there; we just need to make a quick trip to our franchise stores to make sure they are using the correct Pizzas. We also need to give them a reference to their local ingredient factories:

```

public class NYPizzaStore extends PizzaStore {

    protected Pizza createPizza(String item) {
        Pizza pizza = null;
        PizzaIngredientFactory ingredientFactory =
            new NYPizzaIngredientFactory();

        if (item.equals("cheese")) {
            pizza = new CheesePizza(ingredientFactory);
            pizza.setName("New York Style Cheese Pizza");
        } else if (item.equals("veggie")) {
            pizza = new VeggiePizza(ingredientFactory);
            pizza.setName("New York Style Veggie Pizza");
        } else if (item.equals("clam")) {
            pizza = new ClamPizza(ingredientFactory);
            pizza.setName("New York Style Clam Pizza");
        } else if (item.equals("pepperoni")) {
            pizza = new PepperoniPizza(ingredientFactory);
            pizza.setName("New York Style Pepperoni Pizza");
        }
        return pizza;
    }
}

```

The NY Store is composed with a NY pizza ingredient factory. This will be used to produce the ingredients for all NY style pizzas.

We now pass each pizza the factory that should be used to produce its ingredients.

Look back one page and make sure you understand how the pizza and the factory work together!

For each type of Pizza, we instantiate a new Pizza and give it the factory it needs to get its ingredients.

BRAIN POWER

Compare this version of the createPizza() method to the one in the Factory Method implementation earlier in the chapter.

What have we done?

That was quite a series of code changes; what exactly did we do?

We provided a means of creating a family of ingredients for pizzas by introducing a new type of factory called an Abstract Factory.

An Abstract Factory gives us an interface for creating a family of products. By writing code that uses this interface, we decouple our code


from the actual factory that creates the products. That allows us to implement a variety of factories that produce products meant for different contexts — such as different regions, different operating systems, or different look and feels.

Because our code is decoupled from the actual products, we can substitute different factories to get different behaviors (like getting marinara instead of plum tomatoes).

An Abstract Factory provides an interface for a family of products. What's a family? In our case, it's all the things we need to make a pizza: dough, sauce, cheese, meats, and veggies.


From the abstract factory, we derive one or more concrete factories that produce the same products, but with different implementations.

We then write our code so that it uses the factory to create products. By passing in a variety of factories, we get a variety of implementations of those products. But our client code stays the same.




Defines the interface.

Objectville Abstract IngredientFactory




Provides implementations for products.



New York

Chicago



More pizza for Ethan and Joel...

Ethan and Joel can't get enough Objectville Pizza! What they don't know is that now their orders are making use of the new ingredient factories. So now when they order...




Behind the Scenes



The first part of the order process hasn't changed at all. Let's follow Ethan's order again:

- ① First we need a NY PizzaStore:

```
PizzaStore nyPizzaStore = new NYPizzaStore();
```



② Now that we have a store, we can take an order:

```
nyPizzaStore.orderPizza("cheese");
```

The orderPizza() method is called
on the nyPizzaStore instance.

③ The orderPizza() method first calls the createPizza() method:


```
Pizza pizza = createPizza("cheese");
```

From here things change, because we are using an ingredient factory



Behind the Scenes

④ When the createPizza() method is called, that's when our ingredient factory gets involved:



⑤ Next we need to prepare the pizza. Once the `prepare()` method is called, the factory is asked to prepare ingredients:

```
void prepare() {
    dough = factory.createDough();
    sauce = factory.createSauce();
    cheese = factory.createCheese();
}
```

Thin crust →
Marinara →
Reggiano →

For Ethan's pizza the New York ingredient factory is used, and so we get the NY ingredients.

⑥ Finally, we have the prepared pizza in hand and the `orderPizza()` method bakes, cuts, and boxes the pizza.


Abstract Factory Pattern defined

We're adding yet another factory pattern to our pattern family, one that lets us create families of products. Let's check out the official definition for this pattern:

NOTE

The Abstract Factory Pattern provides an interface for creating families of related or dependent objects without specifying their concrete classes.


We've certainly seen that Abstract Factory allows a client to use an abstract interface to create a set of related products without knowing (or caring) about the concrete products that are actually produced. In this way, the client is decoupled from any of the specifics of the concrete products. Let's look at the class diagram to see how this all holds together:



That's a fairly complicated class diagram; let's look at it all in terms of our PizzaStore:

The clients of the Abstract Factory are the two instances of our PizzaStore, NYPizzaStore and ChicagoStylePizzaStore.

The abstract PizzalngredientFactory is the interface that defines how to make a family of related products – everything we need to make a pizza.





I noticed that each method in the Abstract Factory actually looks like a Factory Method (`createDough()`, `createSauce()`, etc.). Each method is declared abstract and the subclasses override it to create some object. Isn't that Factory Method?

Is that a Factory Method lurking inside the Abstract Factory?

Good catch! Yes, often the methods of an Abstract Factory are implemented as factory methods. It makes sense, right? The job of an Abstract Factory is to define an interface for creating a set of products. Each method in that interface is responsible for creating a concrete product, and we implement a subclass of the Abstract Factory to supply those implementations. So, factory methods are a natural way to implement your product methods in your abstract factories.

PATTERNS EXPOSED

This week's interview: Factory Method and Abstract Factory, on each other

HeadFirst: Wow, an interview with two patterns at once! This is a first for us.

Factory Method: Yeah, I'm not so sure I like being lumped in with Abstract Factory, you know. Just because we're both factory patterns doesn't mean we shouldn't get our own interviews.

HeadFirst: Don't be miffed, we wanted to interview you together so we could help clear up any confusion about who's who for the readers. You do have similarities, and I've heard that people sometimes get you confused.

Abstract Factory: It is true, there have been times I've been mistaken for Factory Method, and I know you've had similar issues, Factory Method. We're both really good at decoupling applications from specific implementations; we just do it in different ways. So I can see why people might sometimes get us confused.

Factory Method: Well, it still ticks me off. After all, I use classes to create and you use objects; that's totally different!

HeadFirst: Can you explain more about that, Factory Method?

Factory Method: Sure. Both Abstract Factory and I create objects — that's our jobs. But I do it through inheritance...

Abstract Factory: ...and I do it through object composition.

Factory Method: Right. So that means, to create objects using Factory Method, you need to extend a class and provide an implementation for a factory method.

HeadFirst: And that factory method does what?

Factory Method: It creates objects, of course! I mean, the whole point of the Factory Method Pattern is that you're using a subclass to do your creation for you. In that way, clients only need to know the abstract type they are using, the subclass worries about the concrete type. So, in other words, I keep clients decoupled from the concrete types.

Abstract Factory: And I do too, only I do it in a different way.

HeadFirst: Go on, Abstract Factory... you said something about object composition?

Abstract Factory: I provide an abstract type for creating a family of products. Subclasses of this type define how those products are produced. To use the factory, you instantiate one and pass it into some code that is written against the abstract type. So, like Factory Method, my clients are decoupled from the actual concrete products they use.

HeadFirst: Oh, I see, so another advantage is that you group together a set of related products.

Abstract Factory: That's right.

HeadFirst: What happens if you need to extend that set of related products to, say, add another one? Doesn't that require changing your interface?

Abstract Factory: That's true; my interface has to change if new products are added, which I know people don't like to do....

Factory Method: <snicker>

Abstract Factory: What are you snickering at, Factory Method?

Factory Method: Oh, come on, that's a big deal! Changing your interface means you have to go in and change the interface of every subclass! That sounds like a lot of work.

Abstract Factory: Yeah, but I need a big interface because I am used to creating entire families of products. You're only creating one product, so you don't really need a big interface, you just need one method.

HeadFirst: Abstract Factory, I heard that you often use factory methods to implement your concrete factories?

Abstract Factory: Yes, I'll admit it, my concrete factories often implement a factory method to create their products. In my case, they are used purely to create products...


Factory Method: ...while in my case I usually implement code in the abstract creator that makes use of the concrete types the subclasses create.


HeadFirst: It sounds like you both are good at what you do. I'm sure people like having a choice; after all, factories are so useful, they'll want to use them in all kinds of different situations. You both encapsulate object creation to keep applications loosely coupled and less dependent on implementations, which is really great, whether you're using Factory Method or Abstract Factory. May I allow you each a parting word?

Abstract Factory: Thanks. Remember me, Abstract Factory, and use me whenever you have families of products you need to create and you want to make sure your clients create products that belong together.

Factory Method: And I'm Factory Method; use me to decouple your client code from the concrete classes you need to instantiate, or if you don't know ahead of time all the concrete classes you are going to need. To use me, just subclass me and implement my factory method!

Factory Method and Abstract Factory compared





NOTE

The product subclasses create parallel sets of product families. Here we have a New York ingredient family and a Chicago family.

Tools for your Design Toolbox

In this chapter, we added two more tools to your toolbox: Factory Method and Abstract Factory. Both patterns encapsulate object creation and allow you to decouple your code from concrete types.

OO Basics

OO Principles

Encapsulate what varies.

Favor composition over inheritance.

Program to interfaces, not implementations.

Strive for loosely coupled designs between objects that interact.

Classes should be open for extension but closed for modification.

Depend on abstractions. Do not depend on concrete classes.

straction
apsulation
ymorphism
eritance

We have a new principle that guides us to keep things abstract whenever possible.

OO Patterns

S
C
I
n
v
c
a
f

Abstract Factory - Provides an interface for creating families of related or dependent objects without specifying their concrete classes.

Factory Method - Defines an interface for creating an object, but let subclasses decide which class to instantiate. Factory Method lets a class defer instantiation to the subclasses.


Both of these new patterns encapsulate object creation and lead to more decoupled, flexible designs.

BULLET POINTS

- All factories encapsulate object creation.
- Simple Factory, while not a bona fide design pattern, is a simple way to decouple your clients from concrete classes.
- Factory Method relies on inheritance: object creation is delegated to subclasses, which implement the factory method to create objects.
- Abstract Factory relies on object composition: object creation is implemented in methods exposed in the factory interface.
- All factory patterns promote loose coupling by reducing the dependency of your application on concrete classes.
- The intent of Factory Method is to allow a class to defer instantiation to its subclasses.
- The intent of Abstract Factory is to create families of related objects without having to depend on their concrete classes.
- The Dependency Inversion Principle guides us to avoid dependencies on concrete types and to strive for abstractions.
- Factories are a powerful technique for coding to abstractions, not concrete classes.

DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD

It's been a long chapter. Grab a slice of Pizza and relax while doing this crossword; all of the solution words are from this chapter.



Across	Down
<p>1. In Factory Method, each franchise is a _____.</p> <p>4. In Factory Method, who decides which class to instantiate?</p> <p>6. Role of PizzaStore in Factory Method Pattern.</p> <p>7. All New York style pizzas use this kind of cheese.</p> <p>8. In Abstract Factory, each ingredient factory is a _____.</p> <p>9. When you use new, you are programming to an _____.</p> <p>11. createPizza() is a _____ (two words).</p> <p>12. Joel likes this kind of pizza.</p> <p>13. In Factory Method, the PizzaStore and the concrete Pizzas all depend on this abstraction.</p> <p>14. When a class instantiates an object from a</p>	<p>2. We used _____ in Simple Factory and Abstract Factory, and inheritance in Factory Method.</p> <p>3. Abstract Factory creates a _____ of products.</p> <p>5. Not a REAL factory pattern, but handy nonetheless.</p> <p>10. Ethan likes this kind of pizza.</p>

concrete class, it's _____ on that object.

15. All factory patterns allow us to _____ object creation.

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

We've knocked out the NYPizzaStore; just two more to go and we'll be ready to franchise! Write the Chicago and California PizzaStore implementations here:

Both of these stores are almost exactly like the New York store... they just create different kinds of pizzas.

```
public class ChicagoPizzaStore extends PizzaStore {  
    protected Pizza createPizza(String item) {  
        if (item.equals("cheese")) {  
            return new ChicagoStyleCheesePizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("veggie")) {  
            return new ChicagoStyleVeggiePizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("clam")) {  
            return new ChicagoStyleClamPizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("pepperoni")) {  
            return new ChicagoStylePepperoniPizza();  
        } else return null;  
    }  
}
```


For the Chicago pizza store, we just have to make sure we create Chicago style pizzas...

```
public class CaliforniaPizzaStore extends PizzaStore {  
    protected Pizza createPizza(String item) {  
        if (item.equals("cheese")) {  
            return new CaliforniaStyleCheesePizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("veggie")) {  
            return new CaliforniaStyleVeggiePizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("clam")) {  
            return new CaliforniaStyleClamPizza();  
        } else if (item.equals("pepperoni")) {  
            return new CaliforniaStylePepperoniPizza();  
        } else return null;  
    }  
}
```

and for the California pizza store, we create California style pizzas.

DESIGN PUZZLE SOLUTION

We need another kind of pizza for those crazy Californians (crazy in a GOOD way, of course). Draw another parallel set of classes that you'd need to add a new California region to our PizzaStore.



Okay, now write the five silliest things you can think of to put on a pizza. Then, you'll be ready to go into business making pizza in California!

NOTE

Here are our suggestions...

Mashed Potatoes with Roasted Garlic

BBQ Sauce

Artichoke Hearts

M&M's

Peanuts

A very dependent PizzaStore

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Let's pretend you've never heard of an OO factory. Here's a version of the PizzaStore that doesn't use a factory; make a count of the number of concrete pizza objects this class is dependent on. If you added California style pizzas to this PizzaStore, how many objects would it be dependent on then?

```
public class DependentPizzaStore {  
  
    public Pizza createPizza(String style, String type) {  
        Pizza pizza = null;  
        if (style.equals("NY")) {  
            if (type.equals("cheese")) {  
                pizza = new NYStyleCheesePizza();  
            } else if (type.equals("veggie")) {  
                pizza = new NYStyleVeggiePizza();  
            } else if (type.equals("clam")) {  
                pizza = new NYStyleClamPizza();  
            } else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {  
                pizza = new NYStylePepperoniPizza();  
            }  
        } else if (style.equals("Chicago")) {  
            if (type.equals("cheese")) {  
                pizza = new ChicagoStyleCheesePizza();  
            } else if (type.equals("veggie")) {  
                pizza = new ChicagoStyleVeggiePizza();  
            } else if (type.equals("clam")) {  
                pizza = new ChicagoStyleClamPizza();  
            } else if (type.equals("pepperoni")) {  
                pizza = new ChicagoStylePepperoniPizza();  
            }  
        } else {  
            System.out.println("Error: invalid type of pizza");  
            return null;  
        }  
        pizza.prepare();  
        pizza.bake();  
        pizza.cut();  
        pizza.box();  
        return pizza;  
    }  
}
```

You can write your
answers here:

8 number

12

number with California too

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Go ahead and write the ChicagoPizzaIngredientFactory; you can reference the classes below in your implementation:

```
public class ChicagoPizzaIngredientFactory
```

```

    implements PizzaIngredientFactory
{

    public Dough createDough() {
        return new ThickCrustDough();
    }

    public Sauce createSauce() {
        return new PlumTomatoSauce();
    }


    public Cheese createCheese() {
        return new MozzarellaCheese();
    }

    public Veggies[] createVeggies() {
        Veggies veggies[] = { new BlackOlives(),
                             new Spinach(),
                             new Eggplant() };
        return veggies;
    }

    public Pepperoni createPepperoni() {
        return new SlicedPepperoni();
    }


    public Clams createClam() {
        return new FrozenClams();
    }
}

```



DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD SOLUTION


It's been a long chapter. Grab a slice of Pizza and relax while doing this crossword; all of the solution words are from this chapter. Here's the solution.



Chapter 5. The Singleton Pattern: One of a Kind Objects



Our next stop is the Singleton Pattern, our ticket to creating one-of-a-kind objects for which there is only one instance. You might be happy to know that of all patterns, the Singleton is the simplest in terms of its class diagram; in fact, the diagram holds just a single class! But don't get too comfortable; despite its simplicity from a class design perspective, we are going to encounter quite a few bumps and potholes in its implementation. So buckle up.



Developer: What use is that?

Guru: There are many objects we only need one of: thread pools, caches, dialog boxes, objects that handle preferences and registry settings, objects used for logging, and objects that act as device drivers to devices like printers and graphics cards. In fact, for many of these types of objects, if we were to instantiate more than one we'd run into all sorts of problems like incorrect program behavior, overuse of resources, or inconsistent results.

Developer: Okay, so maybe there are classes that should only be instantiated once, but do I need a whole chapter for this? Can't I just do this by convention or by global variables? You know, like in Java, I could do it with a static variable.

Guru: In many ways, the Singleton Pattern **is a convention** for ensuring one and only one object is instantiated for a given class. If you've got a better one, the world would like to hear about it; but remember, like all patterns, the Singleton Pattern is a time-tested method for ensuring only one object gets created. The Singleton Pattern also gives us a global point of access, just like a global variable, but without the downsides.

Developer: What downsides?

Guru: Well, here's one example: if you assign an object to a global variable, then that object might be created when your application begins. Right? What if this object is resource intensive and your application never ends up using it? As you will see, with the Singleton Pattern, we can create our objects only when they are needed.

Developer: This still doesn't seem like it should be so difficult.

Guru: If you've got a good handle on static class variables and methods as well as access modifiers, it's not. But, in either case, it is interesting to see how a Singleton works, and, as simple as it sounds, Singleton code is hard to get right. Just ask yourself: how do I prevent more than one object from being instantiated? It's not so obvious, is it?

The Little Singleton

A small Socratic exercise in the style of The Little Lisper

How would you create a single object?	<code>new MyObject();</code>
And, what if another object wanted to create a MyObject? Could it call new on MyObject again?	Yes, of course.
So as long as we have a class, can we always instantiate it one or more times?	Yes. Well, only if it's a public class.
And if not?	Well, if it's not a public class, only classes in the same package can instantiate it. But they can still instantiate it more than once.
Hmm, interesting. Did you know you could do this?	No, I'd never thought of it, but I guess it makes sense because it is a legal definition.

What does it mean?	I suppose it is a class that can't be instantiated because it has a private constructor.
Well, is there ANY object that could use the private constructor?	Hmm, I think the code in MyClass is the only code that could call it. But that doesn't make much sense.
Why not?	Because I'd have to have an instance of the class to call it, but I can't have an instance because no other class can instantiate it. It's a chicken-and-egg problem: I can use the constructor from an object of type MyClass, but I can never instantiate that object because no other object can use "new MyClass()".
Okay. It was just a thought. What does this mean? 	MyClass is a class with a static method. We can call the static method like this: <code>MyClass.getInstance();</code>
Why did you use MyClass, instead of some object name?	Well, getInstance() is a static method; in other words, it is a CLASS method. You need to use the class name to reference a static method.
Very interesting. What if we put things together. Now can I instantiate a MyClass? 	Wow, you sure can.
So, now can you think of a second way to instantiate an object?	<code>MyClass.getInstance();</code>
Can you finish the code so that only ONE instance of MyClass is ever created?	Yes, I think so... (You'll find the code on the next page.)

Dissecting the classic Singleton Pattern implementation

```
public class Singleton {  
    private static Singleton uniqueInstance;  
  
    // other useful instance variables here  
  
    private Singleton() {}  
  
    public static Singleton getInstance() {  
        if (uniqueInstance == null) {  
            uniqueInstance = new Singleton();  
        }  
        return uniqueInstance;  
    }  
  
    // other useful methods here  
}
```

Let's rename MyClass to Singleton.

We have a static variable to hold our one instance of the class Singleton.

Our constructor is declared private; only Singleton can instantiate this class!

The getInstance() method gives us a way to instantiate the class and also to return an instance of it.

Of course, Singleton is a normal class; it has other useful instance variables and methods.

WATCH IT!

If you're just flipping through the book, don't blindly type in this code; you'll see it has a few issues later in the chapter.

CODE UP CLOSE

```

uniqueInstance holds our ONE
instance; remember, it is a
static variable.

if (uniqueInstance == null) {
    uniqueInstance = new Singleton();
}

return uniqueInstance;

```

If uniqueInstance is null, then we haven't created the instance yet...
...and, if it doesn't exist, we instantiate Singleton through its private constructor and assign it to uniqueInstance. Note that if we never need the instance, it never gets created; this is lazy instantiation.

By the time we hit this code, we have an instance and we return it.
If uniqueInstance wasn't null, then it was previously created. We just fall through to the return statement.

PATTERNS EXPOSED

This week's interview: Confessions of a Singleton

HeadFirst: Today we are pleased to bring you an interview with a Singleton object. Why don't you begin by telling us a bit about yourself.

Singleton: Well, I'm totally unique; there is just one of me!

HeadFirst: One?

Singleton: Yes, one. I'm based on the Singleton Pattern, which assures that at any time there is only one instance of me.

HeadFirst: Isn't that sort of a waste? Someone took the time to develop a full-blown class and now all we can get is one object out of it?

Singleton: Not at all! There is power in ONE. Let's say you have an object that contains registry settings. You don't want multiple copies of that object and its values running around — that would lead to chaos. By using an object like me you can assure that every object in your application is making use of the same global resource.

HeadFirst: Tell us more...

Singleton: Oh, I'm good for all kinds of things. Being single sometimes has its advantages you know. I'm often used to manage pools of resources, like connection or thread pools.

HeadFirst: Still, only one of your kind? That sounds lonely.

Singleton: Because there's only one of me, I do keep busy, but it would be nice if more developers knew me — many developers run into bugs because they have multiple copies of objects floating around they're not even aware of.

HeadFirst: So, if we may ask, how do you know there is only one of you? Can't anyone with a new operator create a "new you"?

Singleton: Nope! I'm truly unique.

HeadFirst: Well, do developers swear an oath not to instantiate you more than once?

Singleton: Of course not. The truth be told... well, this is getting kind of personal but... I have no public constructor.

HeadFirst: NO PUBLIC CONSTRUCTOR! Oh, sorry, no public constructor?

Singleton: That's right. My constructor is declared private.

HeadFirst: How does that work? How do you EVER get instantiated?

Singleton: You see, to get a hold of a Singleton object, you don't instantiate one, you just ask for an instance. So my class has a static method called `getInstance()`. Call that, and I'll show up at once, ready to work. In fact, I may already be helping other objects when you request me.

HeadFirst: Well, Mr. Singleton, there seems to be a lot under your covers to make all this work. Thanks for revealing yourself and we hope to speak with you again soon!

The Chocolate Factory

Everyone knows that all modern chocolate factories have computer-controlled chocolate boilers. The job of the boiler is to take in chocolate and milk, bring them to a boil, and then pass them on to the next phase of making chocolate bars.

Here's the controller class for Choc-O-Holic, Inc.'s industrial strength Chocolate Boiler. Check out the code; you'll notice they've tried to be very careful to ensure that bad things don't happen, like draining 500 gallons of unboiled mixture, or filling the boiler when it's already full, or boiling an empty boiler!



```

public class ChocolateBoiler {
    private boolean empty;
    private boolean boiled;

    public ChocolateBoiler() {
        empty = true;
        boiled = false;
    }

    public void fill() {
        if (isEmpty()) {
            empty = false;
            boiled = false;
            // fill the boiler with a milk/chocolate mixture
        }
    }

    public void drain() {
        if (!isEmpty() && isBoiled()) {
            // drain the boiled milk and chocolate
            empty = true;
        }
    }

    public void boil() {
        if (!isEmpty() && !isBoiled()) {
            // bring the contents to a boil
            boiled = true;
        }
    }

    public boolean isEmpty() {
        return empty;
    }

    public boolean isBoiled() {
        return boiled;
    }
}

```

This code is only started when the boiler is empty!

To fill the boiler it must be empty, and, once it's full, we set the empty and boiled flags.

To drain the boiler, it must be full (non-empty) and also boiled. Once it is drained we set empty back to true.

To boil the mixture, the boiler has to be full and not already boiled. Once it's boiled we set the boiled flag to true.

BRAIN POWER

Choc-O-Holic has done a decent job of ensuring bad things don't happen, don't ya think? Then again, you probably suspect that if two ChocolateBoiler instances get loose, some very bad things can happen.

How might things go wrong if more than one instance of ChocolateBoiler is created in an application?

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Can you help Choc-O-Holic improve their ChocolateBoiler class by turning it into a

singleton?

```
public class ChocolateBoiler {  
    private boolean empty;  
    private boolean boiled;  
  
    ChocolateBoiler() {  
        empty = true;  
        boiled = false;  
    }  
  
    public void fill() {  
        if (isEmpty()) {  
            empty = false;  
            boiled = false;  
            // fill the boiler with a milk/chocolate mixture  
        }  
    }  
    // rest of ChocolateBoiler code...  
}
```

Singleton Pattern defined

Now that you've got the classic implementation of Singleton in your head, it's time to sit back, enjoy a bar of chocolate, and check out the finer points of the Singleton Pattern.

Let's start with the concise definition of the pattern:


NOTE

The **Singleton Pattern** ensures a class has only one instance, and provides a global point of access to it.

No big surprises there. But let's break it down a bit more:

- What's really going on here? We're taking a class and letting it manage a single instance of itself. We're also preventing any other class from creating a new instance on its own. To get an instance, you've got to go through the class itself.
- We're also providing a global access point to the instance: whenever you need an instance, just query the class and it will hand you back the single instance. As you've seen, we can implement this so that the Singleton is created in a lazy manner, which is especially important for resource-intensive objects.

Okay, let's check out the class diagram:



Houston, Hershey, PA we have a problem...

It looks like the Chocolate Boiler has let us down; despite the fact we improved the code using Classic Singleton, somehow the ChocolateBoiler's `fill()` method was able to start filling the boiler even though a batch of milk and chocolate was already boiling! That's 500 gallons of spilled milk (and chocolate)! What happened!?

We don't know what happened! The new Singleton code was running fine. The only thing we can think of is that we just added some optimizations to the Chocolate Boiler Controller that makes use of multiple threads.



Could the addition of threads have caused this? Isn't it the case that once we've set the `uniqueInstance` variable to the sole instance of `ChocolateBoiler`, all calls to `getInstance()` should return the same instance? Right?



BE THE JVM


We have two threads, each executing this code. Your job is to play the JVM and determine whether there is a case in which two threads might get ahold of different boiler objects. Hint: you really just need to look at the sequence of operations in the `getInstance()` method and the value of `uniqueInstance` to see how they might

overlap. Use the code magnets to help you study how the code might interleave to create two boiler objects.

```
ChocolateBoiler boiler =  
    ChocolateBoiler.getInstance();  
boiler.fill();  
boiler.boil();  
boiler.drain();
```

Make sure you check your answer in **BE the JVM Solution** before continuing!

```
public static ChocolateBoiler  
getInstance() {  
  
    if (uniqueInstance == null) {  
  
        uniqueInstance =  
            new ChocolateBoiler();  
    }  
  
    return uniqueInstance;  
}
```




Dealing with multithreading

Our multithreading woes are almost trivially fixed by making `getInstance()` a synchronized method:

```
public class Singleton {  
    private static Singleton uniqueInstance;  
  
    // other useful instance variables here  
  
    private Singleton() {}  
  
    public static synchronized Singleton getInstance() {  
        if (uniqueInstance == null) {  
            uniqueInstance = new Singleton();  
        }  
        return uniqueInstance;  
    }  
  
    // other useful methods here  
}
```

By adding the synchronized keyword to getInstance(), we force every thread to wait its turn before it can enter the method. That is, no two threads may enter the method at the same time.

Good point, and it's actually a little worse than you make out: the only time synchronization is relevant is the first time through this method. In other words, once we've set the uniqueInstance variable to an instance of Singleton, we have no further need to synchronize this method. After the first time through, synchronization is totally unneeded overhead!



Can we improve multithreading?

For most Java applications, we obviously need to ensure that the Singleton works in the presence of multiple threads. But, it is expensive to synchronize the getInstance() method, so what do we do?

Well, we have a few options...

1. Do nothing if the performance of getInstance() isn't critical to your application.

That's right; if calling the getInstance() method isn't causing substantial overhead for your application, forget about it. Synchronizing getInstance() is straightforward and effective. Just keep in mind that synchronizing a method can decrease performance by a factor of 100, so if a high-traffic part of your code begins using getInstance(), you may have to reconsider.

2. Move to an eagerly created instance rather than a lazily created one.

If your application always creates and uses an instance of the Singleton or the

overhead of creation and runtime aspects of the Singleton are not onerous, you may want to create your Singleton eagerly, like this:

```
public class Singleton {  
    private static Singleton uniqueInstance = new Singleton();  
  
    private Singleton() {}  
  
    public static Singleton getInstance() {  
        return uniqueInstance;  
    }  
}
```

Go ahead and create an instance of Singleton in a static initializer. This code is guaranteed to be thread safe!

We've already got an instance, so just return it

Using this approach, we rely on the JVM to create the unique instance of the Singleton when the class is loaded. The JVM guarantees that the instance will be created before any thread accesses the static uniqueInstance variable.

3. Use “double-checked locking” to reduce the use of synchronization in getInstance().

With double-checked locking, we first check to see if an instance is created, and if not, THEN we synchronize. This way, we only synchronize the first time through, just what we want.

Let's check out the code:

```
public class Singleton {  
    private volatile *static Singleton uniqueInstance;  
  
    private Singleton() {}  
  
    public static Singleton getInstance() {  
        if (uniqueInstance == null) {  
            synchronized (Singleton.class) {  
                if (uniqueInstance == null) {  
                    uniqueInstance = new Singleton();  
                }  
            }  
        }  
        return uniqueInstance;  
    }  
}
```

Check for an instance and if there isn't one, enter a synchronized block.

Note we only synchronize the first time through!

Once in the block, check again and if still null, create an instance.

*The volatile keyword ensures that multiple threads handle the uniqueInstance variable correctly when it is being initialized to the Singleton instance.

If performance is an issue in your use of the `getInstance()` method then this method of implementing the Singleton can drastically reduce the overhead.

WATCH IT!

Double-checked locking doesn't work in Java 1.4 or earlier!

Unfortunately, in Java version 1.4 and earlier, many JVMs contain implementations of the volatile keyword that allow improper synchronization for double-checked locking. If you must use a JVM earlier than Java 5, consider other methods of implementing your Singleton.

Meanwhile, back at the Chocolate Factory...

While we've been off diagnosing the multithreading problems, the chocolate boiler has been cleaned up and is ready to go. But first, we have to fix the multithreading problems. We have a few solutions at hand, each with different tradeoffs, so which solution are we going to employ?



SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

For each solution, describe its applicability to the problem of fixing the Chocolate Boiler code:

Synchronize the `getInstance()` method:

Use eager instantiation:

Double-checked locking:

Congratulations!

At this point, the Chocolate Factory is a happy customer and Choc-O-Holic was glad to have some expertise applied to their boiler code. No matter which multithreading solution you applied, the boiler should be in good shape with no more mishaps. Congratulations. You've not only managed to escape 500lbs of hot chocolate in this chapter, but you've been through all the potential problems of the Singleton.

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: For such a simple pattern consisting of only one class, Singletons sure seem to have some problems.

A: A: Well, we warned you up front! But don't let the problems discourage you; while implementing Singletons correctly can be tricky, after reading this chapter you are now well informed on the techniques for creating Singletons and should use them wherever you need to control the number of instances you are creating.

Q: Q: Can't I just create a class in which all methods and variables are defined as static? Wouldn't that be the same as a Singleton?

A: A: Yes, if your class is self-contained and doesn't depend on complex initialization. However, because of the way static initializations are handled in Java, this can get very messy, especially if multiple classes are involved. Often this scenario can result in subtle, hard-to-find bugs involving order of initialization. Unless there is a compelling need to implement your "singleton" this way, it is far better to stay in the object world.

Q: Q: What about class loaders? I heard there is a chance that two class loaders could each end up with their own instance of Singleton.

A: A: Yes, that is true as each class loader defines a namespace. If you have two or more class loaders, you can load the same class multiple times (once in each classloader). Now, if that class happens to be a Singleton, then since we have more than one version of the class, we also have more than one instance of the Singleton. So, if you are using multiple classloaders and Singletons, be careful. One way around this problem is to specify the classloader yourself.

RELAX

Rumors of Singletons being eaten by the garbage collectors are greatly exaggerated

Prior to Java 1.2, a bug in the garbage collector allowed Singletons to be prematurely collected if there was no global reference to them. In other words, you could create a Singleton and if the only reference to the Singleton was in the Singleton itself, it would be collected and destroyed by the garbage collector. This leads to confusing bugs because after the Singleton is "collected," the next call to getInstance() produces a shiny new Singleton. In many applications, this can cause confusing behavior as state is mysteriously reset to initial values or things like network connections are reset.

Since Java 1.2 this bug has been fixed and a global reference is no longer required. If you are, for some reason, still using a pre-Java 1.2 JVM, then be aware of this issue; otherwise, you can sleep well knowing your Singletons won't be prematurely collected.

THERE ARE NO DUMB QUESTIONS

Q: Q: I've always been taught that a class should do one thing and one thing only. For a class to do two things is considered bad OO design. Isn't a Singleton violating this?

A: A: You would be referring to the "One Class, One Responsibility" principle, and yes, you are correct, the Singleton is not only responsible for managing its one instance (and providing global access), it is also responsible for whatever its main role is in your application. So, certainly you could argue it is taking on two responsibilities. Nevertheless, it isn't hard to see that there is utility in a class managing its own instance; it certainly makes the overall design simpler. In addition, many developers are familiar with the Singleton pattern as it is in wide use. That said, some developers do feel the need to abstract out the Singleton functionality.

Q: Q: I wanted to subclass my Singleton code, but I ran into problems. Is it okay to subclass a Singleton?

A: A: One problem with subclassing a Singleton is that the constructor is private. You can't extend a class with a private constructor. So, the first thing you'll have to do is change your constructor so that it's public or protected. But then, it's not really a Singleton anymore, because other classes can instantiate it.

If you do change your constructor, there's another issue. The implementation of Singleton is based on a static variable, so if you do a straightforward subclass, all of your derived classes will share the same instance variable. This is probably not what you had in mind. So, for subclassing to work, implementing a registry of sorts is required in the base class.

Before implementing such a scheme, you should ask yourself what you are really gaining from subclassing a Singleton. Like most patterns, the Singleton is not necessarily meant to be a solution that can fit into a library. In addition, the Singleton code is trivial to add to any existing class. Last, if you are using a large number of Singletons in your application, you should take a hard look at your design. Singletons are meant to be used sparingly.

Q: Q: I still don't totally understand why global variables are worse than a Singleton.

A: A: In Java, global variables are basically static references to objects. There are a couple of disadvantages to using global variables in this manner. We've already mentioned one: the issue of lazy versus eager instantiation. But we need to keep in mind the intent of the pattern: to ensure only one instance of a class exists and to provide global access. A global variable can provide the latter, but not the former. Global variables also tend to encourage developers to pollute the namespace with lots of global references to small objects. Singletons don't encourage this in the same way, but can be abused nonetheless.

Tools for your Design Toolbox

You've now added another pattern to your toolbox. Singleton gives you another method of creating objects — in this case, unique objects.

OO Basics

OO Principles

Encapsulate what varies.

Favor composition over inheritance.

Program to interfaces, not implementations.

Strive for loosely coupled designs between objects that interact.

Classes should be open for extension but closed for modification.

Depend on abstractions. Do not depend on concrete classes.

straction
apsulation
ymorphism
eritance

OO Patterns

S C D A' F Factory Method Define an interface for creating an object, but let subclasses decide which class to instantiate. Factory Method lets a class defer instantiation to subclasses.

S C D in v e r i t y a l a f i n a l s p i n a s

A' F Factory Method Define an interface for creating an object, but let subclasses decide which class to instantiate. Factory Method lets a class defer instantiation to subclasses.

Singleton - Ensure a class only has one instance and provide a global point of access to it.

When you need to ensure you only have one instance of a class running around your application, turn to the Singleton.

NOTE

As you've seen, despite its apparent simplicity, there are a lot of details involved in the


Singleton's implementation. After reading this chapter, though, you are ready to go out and use Singleton in the wild.

BULLET POINTS

- The Singleton Pattern ensures you have at most one instance of a class in your application.
- The Singleton Pattern also provides a global access point to that instance.
- Java's implementation of the Singleton Pattern makes use of a private constructor, a static method combined with a static variable.
- Examine your performance and resource constraints and carefully choose an appropriate Singleton implementation for multithreaded applications (and we should consider all applications multithreaded!).
- Beware of the double-checked locking implementation; it is not thread-safe in versions before Java 2, version 5.
- Be careful if you are using multiple class loaders; this could defeat the Singleton implementation and result in multiple instances.
- If you are using a JVM earlier than 1.2, you'll need to create a registry of Singletons to defeat the garbage collector.


DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD

Sit back, open that case of chocolate that you were sent for solving the multithreading problem, and have some downtime working on this little crossword puzzle; all of the solution words are from this chapter.



Across	Down
<p>1. It was “one of a kind.”</p> <p>2. Added to chocolate in the boiler.</p> <p>8. An incorrect implementation caused this to overflow.</p> <p>10. Singleton provides a single instance and _____ (three words).</p> <p>12. Flawed multi-threading approach if not using Java 5 or later.</p> <p>13. Chocolate capital of the USA.</p> <p>14. One advantage over global variables: _____ creation.</p> <p>15. Company that produces boilers.</p> <p>16. To totally defeat the new constructor, we have to declare the constructor _____.</p>	<p>1. Multiple _____ can cause problems.</p> <p>3. A Singleton is a class that manages an instance of _____.</p> <p>4. If you don’t need to worry about lazy instantiation, you can create your instance _____.</p> <p>5. Prior to Java 1.2, this can eat your Singletons (two words).</p> <p>6. The Singleton was embarrassed it had no public _____.</p> <p>7. The classic implementation doesn’t handle this.</p> <p>9. Singleton ensures only one of these exists.</p> <p>11. The Singleton Pattern has one.</p>

BE THE JVM SOLUTION



SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

Can you help Choc-O-Holic improve their ChocolateBoiler class by turning it into a singleton?

```

public class ChocolateBoiler {

    private boolean empty;
    private boolean boiled;

    private static ChocolateBoiler uniqueInstance;

    private ChocolateBoiler() {
        empty = true;
        boiled = false;
    }

    public static ChocolateBoiler getInstance() {
        if (uniqueInstance == null) {
            uniqueInstance = new ChocolateBoiler();
        }
        return uniqueInstance;
    }

    public void fill() {
        if (isEmpty()) {
            empty = false;
            boiled = false;
            // fill the boiler with a milk/chocolate mixture
        }
    }
    // rest of ChocolateBoiler code...
}

```

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL SOLUTION

For each solution, describe its applicability to the problem of fixing the Chocolate Boiler code:

Synchronize the getInstance() method:

A straightforward technique that is guaranteed to work. We don't seem to

have _____

any performance concerns with the chocolate boiler, so this would be a good choice.

Use eager instantiation:

We are always going to instantiate the chocolate boiler in our code, so statically initializing _____


the instance would cause no concerns. This solution would work as well as the synchronized _____

method, although perhaps be less obvious to a developer familiar with the standard pattern.

Double-checked locking:

Given we have no performance concerns, double-checked locking seems like overkill. In addition, we'd have to ensure that we are running at least Java 5.

DESIGN PATTERNS CROSSWORD SOLUTION



Chapter 6. The Command Pattern: Encapsulating Invocation



In this chapter, we take encapsulation to a whole new level: we're going to encapsulate method invocation. That's right; by encapsulating method invocation, we can crystallize pieces of computation so that the object invoking the computation doesn't need to worry about how to do things, it just uses our crystallized method to get it done. We can also do some wickedly smart things with these encapsulated method invocations, like save them away for logging or reuse them to implement undo in our code.



**1221 Industrial Avenue, Suite 2000
Future City, IL 62914**

Greetings!

I recently received a demo and briefing from Johnny Hurricane, CEO of Weather-O-Rama, on their new expandable weather station. I have to say, I was so impressed with the software architecture that I'd like to ask you to design the API for our new Home Automation Remote Control. In return for your services we'd be happy to handsomely reward you with stock options in Home Automation or Bust, Inc.

I'm enclosing a prototype of our ground-breaking remote control for your perusal. The remote control features seven programmable slots (each can be assigned to a different household device) along with corresponding on/off buttons for each. The remote also has a global undo button.

I'm also enclosing a set of Java classes on CD-R that were created by various vendors to control home automation devices such as lights, fans, hot tubs, audio equipment, and other similar controllable appliances.

We'd like you to create an API for programming the remote so that each slot can be assigned to control a device or set of devices. Note that it is important that we be able to control the current devices on the disc, and also any future devices that the vendors may supply.

Given the work you did on the Weather-O-Rama weather station, we know you'll do a great job on our remote control! We look forward to seeing your design.


Sincerely,

Bill Thompson

Bill "X-10" Thompson, CEO




Free hardware! Let's check out the Remote Control...



Taking a look at the vendor classes

Check out the vendor classes on the CD-R. These should give you some idea of the interfaces of the objects we need to control from the remote.



It looks like we have quite a set of classes here, and not a lot of industry effort to come up with a set of common interfaces. Not only that, it sounds like we can expect more of these classes in the future. Designing a remote control API is going to be interesting. Let's get on to the design.

Cubicle Conversation

Your teammates are already discussing how to design the remote control API...



Mary: Yes, I thought we'd see a bunch of classes with on() and off() methods, but here we've got methods like dim(), setTemperature(), setVolume(), and setInputChannel().

Sue: Not only that, it sounds like we can expect more vendor classes in the future with just as diverse methods.

Mary: I think it's important we view this as a separation of concerns: the remote should know how to interpret button presses and make requests, but it shouldn't know a lot about home automation or how to turn on a hot tub.

Sue: Sounds like good design. But if the remote is dumb and just knows how to make generic requests, how do we design the remote so that it can invoke an action that, say, turns on a light or opens a garage door?

Mary: I'm not sure, but we don't want the remote to have to know the specifics of the vendor classes.

Sue: What do you mean?

Mary: We don't want the remote to consist of a set of if statements, like "if slot1 == Light, then light.on(), else if slot1 == Hottub then hottub.jetsOn()". We know that is a bad design.

Sue: I agree. Whenever a new vendor class comes out, we'd have to go in and modify the code, potentially creating bugs and more work for ourselves!



Mary: Yeah? Tell us more.

Joe: The Command Pattern allows you to decouple the requester of an action from the object that actually performs the action. So, here the requester would

be the remote control and the object that performs the action would be an instance of one of your vendor classes.

Sue: How is that possible? How can we decouple them? After all, when I press a button, the remote has to turn on a light.

Joe: You can do that by introducing “command objects” into your design. A command object encapsulates a request to do something (like turn on a light) on a specific object (say, the living room light object). So, if we store a command object for each button, when the button is pressed we ask the command object to do some work. The remote doesn’t have any idea what the work is, it just has a command object that knows how to talk to the right object to get the work done. So, you see, the remote is decoupled from the light object!

Sue: This certainly sounds like it’s going in the right direction.

Mary: Still, I’m having a hard time wrapping my head around the pattern.

Joe: Given that the objects are so decoupled, it’s a little difficult to picture how the pattern actually works.

Mary: Let me see if I at least have the right idea: using this pattern, we could create an API in which these command objects can be loaded into button slots, allowing the remote code to stay very simple. And, the command objects encapsulate how to do a home automation task along with the object that needs to do it.

Joe: Yes, I think so. I also think this pattern can help you with that undo button, but I haven’t studied that part yet.

Mary: This sounds really encouraging, but I think I have a bit of work to do to really “get” the pattern.

Sue: Me too.

Meanwhile, back at the Diner..., or, A brief introduction to the Command Pattern

As Joe said, it is a little hard to understand the Command Pattern by just hearing its description. But don’t fear, we have some friends ready to help: remember our friendly diner from [Chapter 1](#)? It’s been a while since we visited Alice, Flo, and the short-order cook, but we’ve got good reason for

returning (well, beyond the food and great conversation): the diner is going to help us understand the Command Pattern.



So, let's take a short detour back to the diner and study the interactions between the customers, the waitress, the orders and the short-order cook. Through these interactions, you're going to understand the objects involved in the Command Pattern and also get a feel for how the decoupling works. After that, we're going to knock out that remote control API.

Checking in at the Objectville Diner...

Okay, we all know how the Diner operates:



- ① You, the Customer, give the Waitress your Order.




- ② The Waitress takes the Order, places it on the order counter, and says "Order up!"

- ③ The Short-Order Cook prepares your meal from the Order.

Let's study the interaction in a little more detail...

...and given this Diner is in Objectville, let's think about the object and method calls involved, too!



The Objectville Diner roles and responsibilities

An Order Slip encapsulates a request to prepare a meal.

Think of the Order Slip as an object, an object that acts as a request to prepare a meal. Like any object, it can be passed around — from the Waitress to the order counter, or to the next Waitress taking over her shift. It has an interface that consists of only one method, `orderUp()`, that encapsulates the actions needed to prepare the meal. It also has a reference to

the object that needs to prepare it (in our case, the Cook). It's encapsulated in that the Waitress doesn't have to know what's in the order or even who prepares the meal; she only needs to pass the slip through the order window and call "Order up!"



NOTE

Okay, in real life a waitress would probably care what is on the Order Slip and who cooks it, but this is Objectville... work with us here!

The Waitress's job is to take Order Slips and invoke the orderUp() method on them.

The Waitress has it easy: take an order from the customer, continue helping customers until she makes it back to the order counter, then invoke the orderUp() method to have the meal prepared. As we've

already discussed, in Objectville, the Waitress really isn't worried about what's on the order or who is going to prepare it; she just knows Order Slips have an `orderUp()` method she can call to get the job done.

Now, throughout the day, the Waitress's `takeOrder()` method gets parameterized with different Order Slips from different customers, but that doesn't faze her; she knows all Order Slips support the `orderUp()` method and she can call `orderUp()` any time she needs a meal prepared.



The Short Order Cook has the knowledge required to prepare the meal.

The Short Order Cook is the object that really knows how to prepare meals. Once the Waitress has invoked the `orderUp()` method; the Short Order Cook takes over and implements all the methods that are needed to create meals. Notice the Waitress and the Cook are totally decoupled: the Waitress has Order Slips that encapsulate the details of the meal; she just calls a method on each order to get it prepared. Likewise, the Cook gets his instructions from the Order Slip; he never needs to directly communicate with the Waitress.



Patience, we're getting there...


Think of the Diner as a model for an OO design pattern that allows us to separate an object making a request from the objects that receive and execute those requests. For instance, in our remote control API, we need to separate

the code that gets invoked when we press a button from the objects of the vendor-specific classes that carry out those requests. What if each slot of the remote held an object like the Diner's Order Slip object? Then, when a button is pressed, we could just call the equivalent of the "orderUp()" method on this object and have the lights turn on without the remote knowing the details of how to make those things happen or what objects are making them happen.

Now, let's switch gears a bit and map all this Diner talk to the Command Pattern...


BRAIN POWER

Before we move on, spend some time studying the diagram two pages back along with Diner roles and responsibilities until you think you've got a handle on the Objectville Diner objects and relationships. Once you've done that, get ready to nail the Command Pattern!



From the Diner to the Command Pattern

Okay, we've spent enough time in the Objectville Diner that we know all the personalities and their responsibilities quite well. Now we're going to rework the Diner diagram to reflect the Command Pattern. You'll see that all the players are the same; only the names have changed.



LOADING THE INVOKER

- ① The client creates a command object.
- ② The client does a `setCommand()` to store the command object in the invoker.
- ③ **Later...** the client asks the invoker to execute the command. Note: as you'll see later in the chapter, once the command is loaded into the invoker, it may be used and discarded, or it may remain and be used many times.

WHO DOES WHAT?

Match the diner objects and methods with the corresponding names from the Command Pattern.

Diner	Command Pattern
Waitress	Command
Short Order Cook	execute()
orderUp()	Client
Order	Invoker
Customer	Receiver
takeOrder()	setCommand()

Our first command object

Isn't it about time we build our first command object? Let's go ahead and write some code for the remote control. While we haven't figured out how to design the remote control API yet, building a few things from the bottom up may help us...



Implementing the Command interface

First things first: all command objects implement the same interface, which consists of one method. In the Diner we called this method `orderUp()`; however, we typically just use the name `execute()`.


Here's the Command interface:

```
public interface Command {  
    public void execute();  
}
```

Simple. All we need is one method called execute().

Implementing a command to turn a light on

Now, let's say you want to implement a command for turning a light on. Referring to our set of vendor classes, the Light class has two methods: on() and off(). Here's how you can implement this as a command:



```
public class LightOnCommand implements Command {  
    Light light;  
  
    public LightOnCommand(Light light) {  
        this.light = light;  
    }  
  
    public void execute() {  
        light.on();  
    }  
}
```

This is a command, so we need to implement the Command interface.

The constructor is passed the specific light that this command is going to control – say the living room light – and stashes it in the light instance variable. When execute gets called, this is the light object that is going to be the Receiver of the request.

The execute method calls the on() method on the receiving object, which is the light we are controlling.

Now that you've got a LightOnCommand class, let's see if we can put it to use...

Using the command object

Okay, let's make things simple: say we've got a remote control with only one button and corresponding slot to hold a device to control:

```

public class SimpleRemoteControl {
    Command slot;
    public SimpleRemoteControl() {}

    public void setCommand(Command command) {
        slot = command;
    }

    public void buttonWasPressed() {
        slot.execute();
    }
}

```

We have one slot to hold our command, which will control one device.

We have a method for setting the command the slot is going to control. This could be called multiple times if the client of this code wanted to change the behavior of the remote button.

This method is called when the button is pressed. All we do is take the current command bound to the slot and call its execute() method.

Creating a simple test to use the Remote Control

Here's just a bit of code to test out the simple remote control. Let's take a look and we'll point out how the pieces match the Command Pattern diagram:

```

public class RemoteControlTest {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        SimpleRemoteControl remote = new SimpleRemoteControl();
        Light light = new Light();
        LightOnCommand lightOn = new LightOnCommand(light);

        remote.setCommand(lightOn);
        remote.buttonWasPressed();
    }
}

And then we simulate the button being pressed.

```

This is our Client in Command Pattern-speak.

The remote is our Invoker; it will be passed a command object that can be used to make requests.

Now we create a Light object. This will be the Receiver of the request.

Here, create a command and pass the Receiver to it.

Here, pass the command to the Invoker.

Here's the output of running this test code.


```

File Edit Window Help DinerFoodYum
%java RemoteControlTest
Light is On
%

```

SHARPEN YOUR PENCIL

Okay, it's time for you to implement the GarageDoorOpenCommand class. First, supply the code for the class below. You'll need the GarageDoor class diagram.



```

public class GarageDoorOpenCommand
    implements Command {

```

↖ Your code here

}

Now that you've got your class, what is the output of the following code? (Hint: the GarageDoor up() method prints out "Garage Door is Open" when it is complete.)

```

public class RemoteControlTest {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        SimpleRemoteControl remote = new SimpleRemoteControl();
        Light light = new Light();
        GarageDoor garageDoor = new GarageDoor();
        LightOnCommand lightOn = new LightOnCommand(light);
        GarageDoorOpenCommand garageOpen =
            new GarageDoorOpenCommand(garageDoor);

        remote.setCommand(lightOn);
        remote.buttonWasPressed();
        remote.setCommand(garageOpen);
        remote.buttonWasPressed();
    }
}

```

Your output here.



```

File Edit Window Help GreenEggs&Ham
%java RemoteControlTest

```


The Command Pattern defined

You've done your time in the Objectville Diner, you've partly implemented the remote control API, and in the process you've got a fairly good picture of how the classes and objects interact in the Command Pattern. Now we're going to define the Command Pattern and nail down all the details.

Let's start with its official definition:

NOTE

The Command Pattern encapsulates a request as an object, thereby letting you parameterize other objects with different requests, queue or log requests, and support undoable operations.




Let's step through this. We know that a command object *encapsulates a request* by binding together a set of actions on a specific receiver. To achieve this, it packages the actions and the receiver up into an object that exposes just one method, `execute()`. When called, `execute()` causes the actions to be invoked on the receiver. From the outside, no other objects really know what actions get performed on what receiver; they just know that if they call the `execute()` method, their request will be serviced.

We've also seen a couple examples of *parameterizing an object* with a command. Back at the diner, the Waitress was parameterized with multiple

orders throughout the day. In the simple remote control, we first loaded the button slot with a “light on” command and then later replaced it with a “garage door open” command. Like the Waitress, your remote slot didn’t care what command object it had, as long as it implemented the Command interface.

What we haven’t encountered yet is using commands to implement *queues and logs and support undo operations*. Don’t worry, those are pretty straightforward extensions of the basic Command Pattern and we will get to them soon. We can also easily support what’s known as the Meta Command Pattern once we have the basics in place. The Meta Command Pattern allows you to create macros of commands so that you can execute multiple commands at once.




An invoker – for instance, one slot of the remote – can be parameterized with different requests.

The Command Pattern defined: the class diagram

The Client is responsible for creating a ConcreteCommand and setting its Receiver.


The Invoker holds a command and at some point asks the command to carry out a request by calling its execute() method.

Command declares an interface for all commands. As you already know, a command is invoked through its execute() method, which asks a receiver to perform an action. You'll also notice this interface has an undo() method, which we'll cover a bit later in the chapter.



BRAIN POWER

How does the design of the Command Pattern support the decoupling of the invoker of a request and the receiver of the request?



Okay, I think I've got a good feel for the Command Pattern now. Great tip, Joe, I think we are going to look like superstars after finishing off the Remote Control API.

Mary: Me too. So where do we begin?

Sue: Like we did in the SimpleRemote, we need to provide a way to assign commands to slots. In our case we have seven slots, each with an “on” and “off” button. So we might assign commands to the remote something like this:

```
onCommands[0] = onCommand;  
offCommands[0] = offCommand;
```

and so on for each of the seven command slots.

Mary: That makes sense, except for the Light objects. How does the remote know the living room from the kitchen light?

Sue: Ah, that's just it, it doesn't! The remote doesn't know anything but how to call execute() on the corresponding command object when a button is pressed.

Mary: Yeah, I sorta got that, but in the implementation, how do we make sure the right objects are turning on and off the right devices?

Sue: When we create the commands to be loaded into the remote, we create one LightCommand that is bound to the living room light object and another that is bound to the kitchen light object. Remember, the receiver of the request gets bound to the command it's encapsulated in. So, by the time the button is pressed, no one cares which light is which; the right thing just happens when the execute() method is called.


Mary: I think I've got it. Let's implement the remote and I think this will get clearer!

Sue: Sounds good. Let's give it a shot...

Assigning Commands to slots

So we have a plan: we're going to assign each slot to a command in the remote control. This makes the remote control our *invoker*. When a button is pressed the execute() method is going to be called on the corresponding command, which results in actions being invoked on the receiver (like lights, ceiling fans, and stereos).

(1) Each slot gets a command.



Implementing the Remote Control

```

public class RemoteControl {
    Command[] onCommands;
    Command[] offCommands;
}

public RemoteControl() {
    onCommands = new Command[7];
    offCommands = new Command[7];
}

Command noCommand = new NoCommand();
for (int i = 0; i < 7; i++) {
    onCommands[i] = noCommand;
    offCommands[i] = noCommand;
}
}

public void setCommand(int slot, Command onCommand, Command offCommand) {
    onCommands[slot] = onCommand;
    offCommands[slot] = offCommand;
}

public void onButtonWasPushed(int slot) {
    onCommands[slot].execute();
}

public void offButtonWasPushed(int slot) {
    offCommands[slot].execute();
}

public String toString() {
    StringBuffer stringBuff = new StringBuffer();
    stringBuff.append("\n----- Remote Control ----- \n");
    for (int i = 0; i < onCommands.length; i++) {
        stringBuff.append("[slot " + i + "] " + onCommands[i].getClass().getName()
            + " " + offCommands[i].getClass().getName() + "\n");
    }
    return stringBuff.toString();
}

```

This time around the remote is going to handle seven On and Off commands, which we'll hold in corresponding arrays.

In the constructor all we need to do is instantiate and initialize the on and off arrays.

The setCommand() method takes a slot position and an On and Off command to be stored in that slot.

It puts these commands in the on and off arrays for later use.

When an On or Off button is pressed, the hardware takes care of calling the corresponding methods onButtonWasPushed() or offButtonWasPushed().

We've overwritten toString() to print out each slot and its corresponding command. You'll see us use this when we test the remote control.

Implementing the Commands

Well, we've already gotten our feet wet implementing the LightOnCommand for the SimpleRemoteControl. We can plug that same code in here and everything works beautifully. Off commands are no different; in fact, the

LightOffCommand looks like this:

```
public class LightOffCommand implements Command {  
    Light light;  
  
    public LightOffCommand(Light light) {  
        this.light = light;  
    }  
  
    public void execute() {  
        light.off();  
    }  
}
```

The LightOffCommand works exactly the same way as the LightOnCommand, except that we are binding the receiver to a different action: the off() method.

Let's try something a little more challenging; how about writing on and off commands for the Stereo? Okay, off is easy, we just bind the Stereo to the off() method in the StereoOffCommand. On is a little more complicated; let's say we want to write a StereoOnWithCDCommand...

Stereo
on()
off()
setCd()
setDvd()
setRadio()
setVolume()

```

public class StereoOnWithCDCommand implements Command {
    Stereo stereo;

    public StereoOnWithCDCommand(Stereo stereo) {
        this.stereo = stereo;
    }

    public void execute() {
        stereo.on(); ←
        stereo.setCD();
        stereo.setVolume(11);
    }
}

```

Just like the LightOnCommand, we get passed the instance of the stereo we are going to be controlling and we store it in a local instance variable.

To carry out this request, we need to call three methods on the stereo: first, turn it on, then set it to play the CD, and finally set the volume to 11. Why 11? Well, it's better than 10, right?

Not too bad. Take a look at the rest of the vendor classes; by now, you can definitely knock out the rest of the Command classes we need for those.

Putting the Remote Control through its paces

Our job with the remote is pretty much done; all we need to do is run some tests and get some documentation together to describe the API. Home Automation or Bust, Inc. sure is going to be impressed, don't ya think? We've managed to come up with a design that is going to allow them to produce a remote that is easy to maintain and they're going to have no trouble convincing the vendors to write some simple command classes in the future since they are so easy to write.

Let's get to testing this code!

```

public class RemoteLoader {

    public static void main(String[] args) {
        RemoteControl remoteControl = new RemoteControl();

        Light livingRoomLight = new Light("Living Room");
        Light kitchenLight = new Light("Kitchen");
        CeilingFan ceilingFan = new CeilingFan("Living Room");
        GarageDoor garageDoor = new GarageDoor("");
        Stereo stereo = new Stereo("Living Room");

        LightOnCommand livingRoomLightOn =
            new LightOnCommand(livingRoomLight);
        LightOffCommand livingRoomLightOff =
            new LightOffCommand(livingRoomLight);
        LightOnCommand kitchenLightOn =
            new LightOnCommand(kitchenLight);
        LightOffCommand kitchenLightOff =
            new LightOffCommand(kitchenLight);

        CeilingFanOnCommand ceilingFanOn =
            new CeilingFanOnCommand(ceilingFan);
        CeilingFanOffCommand ceilingFanOff =
            new CeilingFanOffCommand(ceilingFan);

        GarageDoorUpCommand garageDoorUp =
            new GarageDoorUpCommand(garageDoor);
        GarageDoorDownCommand garageDoorDown =
            new GarageDoorDownCommand(garageDoor);

        StereoOnWithCDCommand stereoOnWithCD =
            new StereoOnWithCDCommand(stereo);
        StereoOffCommand stereoOff =
            new StereoOffCommand(stereo);

        remoteControl.setCommand(0, livingRoomLightOn, livingRoomLightOff);
        remoteControl.setCommand(1, kitchenLightOn, kitchenLightOff);
        remoteControl.setCommand(2, ceilingFanOn, ceilingFanOff);
        remoteControl.setCommand(3, stereoOnWithCD, stereoOff);

        System.out.println(remoteControl);
    }
}

Create all the devices in their proper locations.

Create all the Light Command objects.

Create the On and Off for the ceiling fan.

Create the Up and Down commands for the Garage.

Create the stereo On and Off commands.

Now that we've got all our commands, we can load them into the remote slots.

Here's where we use our toString() method to print each remote slot and the command that it is assigned to.

All right, we are ready to roll! Now, we step through each slot and push its On and Off button.

```

Now, let's check out the execution of our remote control test...

```
File Edit Window Help CommandsGetThingsDone  
% java RemoteLoader  
----- Remote Control -----  
[slot 0] LightOnCommand      LightOffCommand  
[slot 1] LightOnCommand      LightOffCommand  
[slot 2] CeilingFanOnCommand CeilingFanOffCommand  
[slot 3] StereoOnWithCDCommand StereoOffCommand  
[slot 4] NoCommand           NoCommand  
[slot 5] NoCommand           NoCommand  
[slot 6] NoCommand           NoCommand  
    }   }  
  On slots  Off slots  
Living Room light is on  
Living Room light is off  
Kitchen light is on  
Kitchen light is off  
Living Room ceiling fan is on high  
Living Room ceiling fan is off  
Living Room stereo is on  
Living Room stereo is set for CD input  
Living Room Stereo volume set to 11  
Living Room stereo is off  
%  
  
← Our commands in action! Remember, the output from each device comes from the vendor classes. For instance, when a light object is turned on it prints "Living Room light is on."
```



Good catch. We did sneak a little something in there. In the remote control, we didn't want to check to see if a command was loaded every time we referenced a slot. For instance, in the `onButtonWasPushed()` method, we would need code like this:

```
public void onButtonWasPushed(int slot) {  
    if (onCommands[slot] != null) {  
        onCommands[slot].execute();  
    }  
}
```

So, how do we get around that? Implement a command that does nothing!

```
public class NoCommand implements Command {  
    public void execute() { }  
}
```

}

Then, in our RemoteControl constructor, we assign every slot a NoCommand object by default and we know we'll always have some command to call in each slot.

```
Command noCommand = new NoCommand();
for (int i = 0; i < 7; i++) {
    onCommands[i] = noCommand;
    offCommands[i] = noCommand;
}
```

So in the output of our test run, you are seeing only slots that have been assigned to a command other than the default NoCommand object, which we assigned when we created the RemoteControl.

PATTERN HONORABLE MENTION

The NoCommand object is an example of a *null object*. A null object is useful when you don't have a meaningful object to return, and yet you want to remove the responsibility for handling **null** from the client. For instance, in our remote control we didn't have a meaningful object to assign to each slot out of the box, so we provided a NoCommand object that acts as a surrogate and does nothing when its execute method is called.


You'll find uses for Null Objects in conjunction with many Design Patterns and sometimes you'll even see Null Object listed as a Design Pattern.

Time to write that documentation...

REMOTE CONTROL API DESIGN FOR HOME AUTOMATION OR BUST, INC.

We are pleased to present you with the following design and application programming interface for your Home Automation Remote Control. Our primary design goal was to keep the remote control code as simple as possible so that it doesn't require changes as new vendor classes are produced. To this end we have employed the Command Pattern to logically decouple the RemoteControl class from the Vendor Classes. We believe this will reduce the cost of producing the remote as well as drastically reduce your ongoing maintenance costs.

The following class diagram provides an overview of our design:





Whoops! We almost forgot... luckily, once we have our basic Command classes, undo is easy to add. Let's step through adding undo to our commands and to the remote control...

What are we doing?

Okay, we need to add functionality to support the undo button on the remote. It works like this: say the Living Room Light is off and you press the on button on the remote. Obviously the light turns on. Now if you press the undo button then the last action will be reversed — in this case, the light will turn off. Before we get into more complex examples, let's get the light working with the undo button:

- ① When commands support undo, they have an `undo()` method that mirrors the `execute()` method. Whatever `execute()` last did, `undo()` reverses. So, before we can add undo to our commands, we need to add an `undo()` method to the Command interface:

```
public interface Command {  
    public void execute();  
    public void undo(); } Here's the new undo() method.
```

That was simple enough.

Now, let's dive into the Light command and implement the `undo()`

method.

② Let's start with the LightOnCommand: if the LightOnCommand's execute() method was called, then the on() method was last called. We know that undo() needs to do the opposite of this by calling the off() method.

```
public class LightOnCommand implements Command {  
    Light light;  
  
    public LightOnCommand(Light light) {  
        this.light = light;  
    }  
  
    public void execute() {  
        light.on();  
    }  
  
    public void undo() {  
        light.off();  
    }  
}
```

execute() turns the light on, so undo() simply turns the light back off.

Piece of cake! Now for the LightOffCommand. Here the undo() method just needs to call the Light's on() method.

```
public class LightOffCommand implements Command {  
    Light light;  
  
    public LightOffCommand(Light light) {  
        this.light = light;  
    }  
  
    public void execute() {  
        light.off();  
    }  
  
    public void undo() {  
        light.on();  
    }  
}
```

And here, undo() turns the light back on.

Could this be any easier? Okay, we aren't done yet; we need to work a little support into the Remote Control to handle tracking the last button pressed and the undo button press.

③ To add support for the undo button we only have to make a few small changes to the Remote Control class. Here's how we're going to do it: we'll add a new instance variable to track the last command invoked; then, whenever the undo button is pressed, we retrieve that command and invoke its `undo()` method.

```

public class RemoteControlWithUndo {
    Command[] onCommands;
    Command[] offCommands;
    Command undoCommand;
}

public RemoteControlWithUndo() {
    onCommands = new Command[7];
    offCommands = new Command[7];

    Command noCommand = new NoCommand();
    for(int i=0;i<7;i++) {
        onCommands[i] = noCommand;
        offCommands[i] = noCommand;
    }
    undoCommand = noCommand;
}

public void setCommand(int slot, Command onCommand, Command offCommand) {
    onCommands[slot] = onCommand;
    offCommands[slot] = offCommand;
}

public void onButtonWasPushed(int slot) {
    onCommands[slot].execute();
    undoCommand = onCommands[slot];
}

public void offButtonWasPushed(int slot) {
    offCommands[slot].execute();
    undoCommand = offCommands[slot];
}

public void undoButtonWasPushed() {
    undoCommand.undo();
}

public String toString() {
    // toString code here...
}
}

```

This is where we'll stash the last command executed for the undo button.

Just like the other slots, undo starts off with a NoCommand, so pressing undo before any other button won't do anything at all.

When a button is pressed, we take the command and first execute it; then we save a reference to it in the undoCommand instance variable. We do this for both "on" commands and "off" commands.

When the undo button is pressed, we invoke the undo() method of the command stored in undoCommand. This reverses the operation of the last command executed.

Time to QA that Undo button!

Okay, let's rework the test harness a bit to test the undo button:

```

public class RemoteLoader {

    public static void main(String[] args) {
        RemoteControlWithUndo remoteControl = new RemoteControlWithUndo();

        Light livingRoomLight = new Light("Living Room"); ← Create a Light, and our new undo()
        RemoteControlWithUndo remoteControl = new RemoteControlWithUndo();

        LightOnCommand livingRoomLightOn =
            new LightOnCommand(livingRoomLight);
        LightOffCommand livingRoomLightOff =
            new LightOffCommand(livingRoomLight);

        remoteControl.setCommand(0, livingRoomLightOn, livingRoomLightOff);

        remoteControl.onButtonWasPushed(0);
        remoteControl.offButtonWasPushed(0);
        System.out.println(remoteControl);
        remoteControl.undoButtonWasPushed();
        remoteControl.offButtonWasPushed(0);
        remoteControl.onButtonWasPushed(0);
        System.out.println(remoteControl);
        remoteControl.undoButtonWasPushed();
    }
}

```

Annotations:

- `Light livingRoomLight = new Light("Living Room");` ← Create a Light, and our new undo()
- `LightOnCommand livingRoomLightOn = new LightOnCommand(livingRoomLight);` ← enabled Light On and Off Commands.
- `remoteControl.setCommand(0, livingRoomLightOn, livingRoomLightOff);` ← Add the light Commands to the remote in slot 0.
- `remoteControl.onButtonWasPushed(0);` ← Turn the light on, then off and then undo.
- `remoteControl.offButtonWasPushed(0);` ← Then, turn the light off, back on and undo.

And here are the test results...

```

File Edit Window Help UndoCommandsDefyEntropy
% java RemoteLoader
Light is on ← Turn the light on, then off.
Light is off

----- Remote Control -----
[slot 0] LightOnCommand      LightOffCommand ← Here are the Light commands.
[slot 1] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 2] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 3] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 4] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 5] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 6] NoCommand           NoCommand
[undo] LightOffCommand

Light is on ← Undo was pressed... the LightOffCommand
undo() turns the light back on.
Light is off ← Then we turn the light off then back on.

----- Remote Control -----
[slot 0] LightOnCommand      LightOffCommand
[slot 1] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 2] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 3] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 4] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 5] NoCommand           NoCommand
[slot 6] NoCommand           NoCommand
[undo] LightOnCommand

Light is off ← Undo was pressed, the light is back off. ← Now undo holds the
                                         LightOnCommand, the last
                                         command invoked.

```


Annotations:

- `Light is on` ← Turn the light on, then off.
- `Light is off`
- `----- Remote Control -----`
- `[slot 0] LightOnCommand`
- `[slot 1] NoCommand`
- `[slot 2] NoCommand`
- `[slot 3] NoCommand`
- `[slot 4] NoCommand`
- `[slot 5] NoCommand`
- `[slot 6] NoCommand`
- `[undo] LightOffCommand`
- `Light is on` ← Undo was pressed... the LightOffCommand
undo() turns the light back on.
- `Light is off` ← Then we turn the light off then back on.
- `----- Remote Control -----`
- `[slot 0] LightOnCommand`
- `[slot 1] NoCommand`
- `[slot 2] NoCommand`
- `[slot 3] NoCommand`
- `[slot 4] NoCommand`
- `[slot 5] NoCommand`
- `[slot 6] NoCommand`
- `[undo] LightOnCommand`
- `Light is off` ← Undo was pressed, the light is back off. ← Now undo holds the LightOnCommand, the last command invoked.

Using state to implement Undo

Okay, implementing undo on the Light was instructive but a little too easy.

Typically, we need to manage a bit of state to implement undo. Let's try something a little more interesting, like the CeilingFan from the vendor classes. The CeilingFan allows a number of speeds to be set along with an off method.



Here's the source code for the CeilingFan: