

TDD Nuggets

Test first or test last

Ideally test-first which challenges you to think about the class interface thoroughly
However in reality it's a mix. Sometimes you begin with design discussion, implement the basic skeleton first and move towards creating tests

Design Principles used most frequently

- YAGNI (You ain't gonna need it)
- DRY (Don't Repeat Yourself)
- SRP (Single Responsibility Principle)
- Less number of lines in a method, less methods and more classes

Testability and Design Evolution

Design

- Strategic Design**
 - High level design of any system. Defines major architecture components and the interaction between them.
 - Does not get into the details of the implementation
 - In TDD the strategic design can be done on a whiteboard or a piece of paper.
- Tactical Design**
 - * Defines how exactly the component is going to work.
 - * The tactical design contains each and every minute detail of that component.
 - happens while developing the application through tests
- TDD**
 - In reality it's difficult to evolve a design with just tests without considering the strategic design in mind.
 - If not done properly you may get into mess and create classes which may not make much in the bigger picture. You may reach to a situation where refactory also doesn't work anymore.
- Design Patterns**
 - Don't insert Design Pattern Forcefully
 - Create Simple Design At First Look for evolving design patterns in code
- Testability of the class**
 - Testing method also should follow SRP
 - Test method also should affirm the atomicity of a test
 - At most there should be 1-2 assertions in a test method
- Identify abstractions per class:** Write as if you are writing in English If something is not readable, refactor it create methods, classes

Test Smells

- > 200-300 lines of code for a test Problems in design probably
- test data within a test class
 - pollutes the test class itself
 - Instead use ObjectMother

Testing Challenges

- Testing of private methods**
 - If testing is an issue make them default scope
 - If reusable, refactor and put them as public methods
- Should we test setters or getters just for the heck of increasing the Testability**
 - Groovy doesn't care about private/protected part while testing. So you may not need to have setters or getters
 - You can create a simple class which just tests the setters getters mechanically
 - Why not public fields**
 - Pollutes the namespace
 - Increases Class Length
 - Lowers Code Coverage
 - Difficult to track who modified it and when
 - Difficult to provide setters later
 - Possible in Groovy
 - New Generation Languages thinking on lines of developer
- Testing for void method** Test for behavior change instead of returned value

Rule Book

Not Necessary To Follow All The Rule
Experience and Decide