

Object-Oriented Analysis and Design CSCI 6448 - Spring Semester, 2003

Credit where Credit is Due

 Some material presented in this lecture is taken from section 4 of Maciaszek's "Requirements Analysis and System Design". © Addison Wesley, 2000

February 18, 2003

© University of Colorado, 2003

2

Goals for this Lecture

- Cover the material presented in Section 4 of the textbook
 - Introduce Requirements Specification
 - Provides more insight into OO Analysis
 - This chapter provides many examples

Requirements Specification

- Produces three types of models
 - State Models (This Lecture)
 - Use Cases (some actors become classes)
 - Class Diagrams
 - Behavior Models (Lecture 12)
 - Activity Diagrams
 - Interaction Diagrams
 - State Change Models (Lecture 12)
 - State Chart Diagrams

3

4

Requirements Specification

- Models are developed iteratively
 - Taking into account use cases and constraints (developed during requirements elicitation)
- Each model, or diagram, represents a view into the system; the models, taken together, allow developers and customers to view the system from multiple perspectives
- We now examine each type of model in more detail

© University of Colorado, 2003

State specifications

- The state of an object is determined by the values of its attributes and associations
 - A BankAccount may be "overdrawn" when its balance is negative
- Since object states are determined from data structures, the models of the data structures (e.g. classes) are called **state specifications**

February	18,	2003
----------	-----	------

February 18, 2003

```
© University of Colorado, 2003
```

```
6
```

State Specifications

- State specifications provide a static view of the system
 - The attributes and associations of classes do not change dynamically
- The main task is to specify the classes of an application domain
 - only attributes and associations; operations are derived from the behavior specification

State Specification

- Define entity classes
 - Persistent classes in the app. domain
 aka business objects
- How to do this? The process is highly dependent on the analyst's
 - knowledge of class modeling
 - understanding of the application domain
 - experience with similar and successful designs
 - ability to think forward and predict consequences
 - willingness to revise the model iteratively

February 18, 2003

7

5

Discovering Classes

Four Approaches

February 18, 2003

- Noun Phrase Approach
- Common Class Patterns
- Use Case Driven (already covered)

© University of Colorado, 2003

- Maciaszek's Guidelines
- CRC (Class-Responsibility-Collaboration)
 - I will be providing expanded coverage of this technique (as compared to the information presented by your textbook)

Noun Phrase Approach

Examine the requirements and underline each noun

Each noun is a candidate class

Divide list of candidate classes into

Relevant Classes
Part of the application domain; occur frequently in reqs.
Irrelevant Classes
Outside of application domain

Fuzzy Classes

Unable to be declared relevant with confidence; require additional analysis

Experience will eventually enable designers to avoid generating irrelevant classes

Noun Phrase Approach, continued

- This technique now considered naïve
 - While it may help in identifying domain objects, it is not good at identifying objects that live in the application domain
 - Thus, it can help at the beginning of analysis, but you will not return to it as you move into design
 - Finding good objects during design means identifying abstractions that are part of your application domain and its execution machinery
 - Objects that are part of your application domain will have a tenuous connection, at best, to real-world things
 - e.g. what's the correspondence of a scrollbar to the realworld

Common Class Patterns

- Derive classes from the generic classification theory of objects
 - Concept class a notion shared by a large community
 - Events class captures an event that demarks intervals within a system
 - Organization class a collection or group within the domain
 - People class roles people can play
 - Places class a physical location relevant to the system

9

February 18, 2003

Common Class Patterns	Maciaszek's Guidelines			
 Rumbaugh proposes a different scheme Physical Class (Airplane) Business Class (Reservation) Logical Class (FlightTimeTable) Application Class (ReservationTransaction) Computer Class (Index) Behavioral Class (ReservationCancellation) These taxonomies are meant to help a designer think of classes, however it is difficult to be systematic. (This technique is probably only useful during early analysis as well) 	 Each class must have a statement of purpose in the system Each class is a template for a set of objects avoid singleton classes Each class must house a set of attributes Each class should be distinguished from an attribute e.g. Color may be an attribute of a Car class, but may be needed as a full class in a paint program Each class houses a set of operations that represents the interface of the class operations can be derived from the statement of purpose 			
February 18, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003 13	February 18, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003 14			
CRC Cards	Unlined Side of Card			
 CRC stands for Candidates, Responsibilities, Collaborators Meant primarily as a brainstorming tool for analysis and design Rather than use diagrams, use index cards Rather than record attributes and methods, record responsibilities Some material on CRC cards drawn from Object Design by Wirfs-Brock and McKean, © 2003 	 On the unlined side of the index card, we write an informal description of each candidate's purpose and role Document Purpose: A Document acts as a container for graphics and text Role: Container Pattern: Composite 			

Lined Side of Card

 On the unlined side of the index card, we write an informal description of each candidate's purpose and role

Document <i>candidate</i>	
Knows contents	TextFlow
Knows storage location	
Inserts and removes text,	
graphics, and other elements	

responsibilities

collaborators

February 18, 2003

© University of Colorado, 2003

Not Just Index Cards

Post-It Notes can be used for even less "structure"; might be easier when brainstorming

Document

Purpose: A document represents a container that holds text and/or graphics that the user can enter and visually arrange on pages

February 18, 2003

© University of Colorado, 2003

18

Why index cards?

- Forces you to be concise and clear
 - and focus on major responsibilities
 - since you must fit everything onto one index card
- Inherent Advantages
 - cheap, portable, readily available, and familiar
- Affords Spatial Semantics...
 - Close collaborators can be overlapped
 - Vertical dimension can be assigned meanings
 - Abstract classes and specializations can form piles
- ...which provides benefits
 - Beck and Cunningham report that they have seen designers talk about a new card by pointing at where it will be placed

Class Activity Section

- Let's try it!
- Pick one of four domains
 - Banking (checking & saving accounts, etc.)
 - Airline Reservations
 - Document Processor
 - Weblog Reader/Editor

17

Pages 112-133 work through four e				
of class specification in detail class discovery then specifying attributes associations aggregations/compositions inheritance We shall follow the University Enrollme	113 and 117 After reading the first set of requirements, candidate cla identified on page 114 We will delay creating a class we consider attributes	After reading the first set of requirements, candidate classes are identified on page 114 We will delay creating a class diagram unti		
February 18, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003	21 February 18, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003	22		
Specifying Attributes	Specifying Associatio	ns		
Specifying Attributes				
 Attributes are specified in parallel w classes initial set of attributes will be "obvious" important to initially select attributes th determine the states of the class additional attributes can be added in subse iterations Example cont.: After reading a second 	at help to quent quent quent quent at help to quent	the system en objects S		

Specifying Aggregation/Composition

- "Whole-part" relationships between composite and component classes
 - UML models aggregation as a constrained form of association
- Maciaszek suggests additional power
 - ExclusiveOwns and Owns
 - Has and Member
- Litmus test: "has" or "is-part-of" is needed to explain relationship

Example, continued

- Aggregations for the University example is shown in figure 4.6 on page 129
- Student and AcademicRecord participate in a composition relationship
- A Course aggregates its various CourseOfferings

February 18, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003	25	February 18, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	26
Specifying Generalizations		Summa	ry	
 Looking for common features among cla Move common features up a class hierarchy specialized features down Apart from inheritance, generalization hat two objectives substitutability and polymorphism Litmus test: "can be" and "is-a-kind-of" required to explain relationship Are there any generalizations that we can make in the University example? 	/ and as	 Involves change We look How do Looke We wi semes How do Assoc 	ed at state models today in de we find classes in the first plac d at CRC Cards in depth Il be returning to their use in design	epth ce? later this sociations
February 18, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003	27	February 18, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	28