

Theory: Generics and Object

🕒 12 minutes

0 / 5 problems solved

Skip this topic

Start practicing

3281 users solved this topic. Latest completion was about 4 hours ago.

As you know, **generics** enable types to be parameters when defining classes (or interfaces) and methods. Parameterized types make it possible to re-use the same code while processing different concrete types.

§1. Reusing code with generics

Let's consider a generic class named `GenericType` that stores a value of "some type".

```
1 class GenericType<T> {
2
3     private T t;
4
5     public GenericType(T t) {
6         this.t = t;
7     }
8
9     public T get() {
10
11         return t;
12     }
13 }
```

It is possible to create an object with a concrete type (e.g., `String`):

```
1 GenericType<String> instance1 = new GenericType<>("abc");
2 String str = instance1.get();
```

You can also create instances with other types (`Integer`, `Character`) and then invoke the `get` method to take the internal field. So, generics allow you to use the same class and methods for processing different types.

§2. Reusing code with Object

But there is another way to reuse code. If we declare the class field as `Object`, we can assign a value of any reference type to it. This approach has been widely used before Java 5.

The class `NonGenericClass` demonstrates it.

```
1 class NonGenericClass {
2
3     private Object val;
4
5     public NonGenericClass(Object val) {
6         this.val = val;
7     }
8
9     public Object get() {
10
11         return val;
12     }
13 }
```

Now we can create an instance of this type with the same string as in the previous example (see `GenericType`).

```
1 NonGenericClass instance2 = new NonGenericClass("abc");
```

Current topic:

[Generics and Object](#) ...

Topic depends on:

✗ [The Object class](#) ...

✗ [Generic programming](#) ...

Topic is required for:

[Type Bounds](#) ...

[Wildcards](#) ...

[Dynamic array in Java](#) ...

[Doubly linked list in Java](#) ...

[The Collections Framework overview](#) ...

[Trees in Java](#) ...

[Hash table in Java](#) ...

Table of contents:

[1 Generics and Object](#)

[§1. Reusing code with generics](#)

[§2. Reusing code with Object](#)

[§3. The advantage of generics: from run-time to compile-time](#)

[§4. Generics without specifying a type argument](#)

[§5. Conclusion](#)

[Feedback & Comments](#)

It is also possible to create an instance passing a value of type `Integer` or `Character`.

That is how you can reuse the same class with an `Object` field to store different types in the same way.

§3. The advantage of generics: from run-time to compile-time

After an invocation of the method `get()` we obtain an `Object`, not a `String` or an `Integer`. We cannot get a string directly from the method.

```
1 NonGenericClass instance2 = new NonGenericClass("abc");
2 String str = instance2.get(); // Compile-time error: Incompatible types
```

To get the string back, we should perform an explicit type-casting to the `String` class.

```
1 String str = (String) instance2.get(); // "abc"
```

Of course, it works, but what if the instance does not store a string at all? Since it is declared as an `Object`, the field value can keep any type. If this is the case, the code throws an exception. Here is an example:

```
1 NonGenericClass instance3 = new NonGenericClass(123);
2
String str = (String) instance3.get(); // throws java.lang.ClassCastException
```

Now we can see the main advantage of generics over the class `Object` to reuse code. There is no need to perform an explicit type-casting and, as a consequence, we never get the runtime exception. If we do something wrong, we can see it at the compile-time.

```
1 GenericType<String> instance4 = new GenericType<>("abc");
2
3 String str = instance4.get(); // There is no type-casting here
4 Integer num = instance4.get(); // It does not compile
```

A compile-time error is detected by the programmer, not a user of the program. This makes generics both flexible and safe. At the same time, working with `Object` that requires type-casting is error-prone. It's better to let the compiler take care of it.

§4. Generics without specifying a type argument

When you create an instance of a generic class, you have a possibility not to specify an argument type at all.

```
1 GenericType instance5 = new GenericType("my-string");
```

In this case, the field of the class is `Object`, and the method `get` returns an `Object` as well.

It is the same as the following line:

```
1 GenericType<Object> instance5 = new GenericType<>
("abc"); // it is parameterized with Object
```

Usually, you will not use generics parameterized by `Object` because it has the same problems as presented above. Just remember that this possibility exists.

§5. Conclusion

Both generics and `Object` allows you to write a generalized code. Using `Object`, however, may need explicit type-casting that is error-prone. Generics provide type-safety by shifting more type checking responsibilities to the

Java compiler.

 Report a typo

308 users liked this theory. 3 didn't like it. What about you?



Start practicing

- [Comments \(4\)](#)
- [Hints \(0\)](#)
- [Useful links \(0\)](#)
- [Show discussion](#)