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“I've always been a old fashioned classic TDDer and thus far I don't see any reason to change. I don't see any compelling benefits for mockist TDD, and am concerned about the consequences of coupling tests to implementation.”
This is about as far from the fence as Martin ever gets!!

Mocking, BDD, Interaction based testing. The belief is that they inhibit refactoring because of the coupling they add between test and source. This is what we will be looking at today.
A Chronology of Testing

Isolating Functionality in State Based Tests Using Stubs

Managing Refactoring in an IBT World

The Affect IBT has on Refactoring

Interaction Based Testing
One

A Chronology
XP

- Introduced in late 1990’s
- Automated testing features heavily in the 12 key practices
- Designed to reduce the risk of change
- Practices that seem somewhat counterintuitive, but work

Test First

- Write tests before writing code
- Change in programming process
- Focuses intention on required functionality
**Test Driven**
- Evolution of Test First
- Work in a tight loop: Test-Code-Refactor
- Demarcate test areas with stubs: *So you break off no more than you can chew.*

**Interaction Based Testing**
- Characterised by the use of Mocking Frameworks
- Contrasting technique to State Based testing
- Interactions between collaborating classes are tested not the class’ final state.
Nomenclature

Mock:
Objects pre-programmed with expectations which form a specification of the calls they are expected to receive.

Stubs:
Provide canned answers to calls made during the test.

Dummy:
Objects are passed around but never actually used. Usually they are just used to fill parameter lists.
Isolating the Functionality Under Test
State Based Testing

Testing the CashTransfer object involves testing the whole dependency tree.
@Test void shouldMoveCashToNewAccount()
{
    Transfer tran = new CashTransfer(5, ...);
    tran.execute(newAcc);
    assertEqual(expected, newAcc.balance());
}
State Based Tests Often Overlap

- Save Button
- Save Action
- Validity Check
- ORM
- DB
Failure in the ORM causes all tests to fail

Save Button → Save Action → Validity Check → ORM → DB
Tests that do not ‘isolate’ the code being tested will likely overlap. This makes it hard to diagnose the source of a break.
Isolate the area under test with stubbed interfaces that provide fixed behaviour.

class StubValidityCheck{
    boolean valid()
        return true;
}

Stub n’ State approach
Tests now break in isolation
Stubs isolate sections of the Object Graph because they have no real behaviour. They provide pre-canned answers.

```java
o = new ruleComposite(new A(...), new B(...));
result = o.run(user);
assertEqual(Result.VALID, result);
```

```java
o = new ObjectUnderTest(stubA, stubB);
result = o.doSomething();
assertEqual(expected, result);
```
Each test is isolated from change in other classes
Key Point

To unit test properly you need to isolate the area of the code under test.
Conjunction of all tests are also tested End-to-End

… we need to make sure all the dots tie up!
(else our wrapped up units might start to diverge)
Three

Interaction Based Testing
A better model is the ‘Budding’ model

State based testing is ok here

Not so good here!
Problem: Classes that don’t change observable state

- Marshellers
- Proxies
- Caches
A Composite Object

Assert Here

No observable change in state

Composite

Behaviour is defined by forwarding calls to composed objects
Mocking frameworks automate the testing of the interactions between classes

Assert Here

Mock based test
Rather than testing changes in state, the interaction between objects are asserted.

```java
o = new RuleComposite(mockRuleA, mockRuleB);
check(new Expectation(){
    oneof(mockRuleA.run(user));
    oneof(mockRuleB.run(user)).throws(getExep());
});
o.run(obj);
```
Mocked objects add additional coupling between test and source as mocks assert how an object behaves towards its collaborators, not just how it changes state or what it returns.
How does this relate to the State based testing with Stubs?

Both allow us to isolate the code under test.

In practice Mocking leads to a very different development process largely because you tend to mock at a class by class level, teasing out roles for collaborating classes.
Mocks used here. No need to develop Classes yet!

Mocking facilitates a different development process.

Develop Class and Test in a tight loop

Collaborators do not need to be implemented for the test to pass. They are simply mocked.
The ‘Mockist’ approach is different

- If the class under test needs to collaborate with another class then a mock is used.
- This teases out roles a class requires from its collaborators (similar to Design by Contract).
- All classes are tested in complete isolation, demarcated by mocked objects.
- The interactions between classes form the primary driver for assertions rather than changes in state.
Four

Refactoring Interaction
Tested Code
Using Interaction Based Testing increases the coupling between test and source code.

Tests assert on whether a method is called, with what arguments and how many times.

This breaks encapsulation as the internals of how the class interacts with its collaborators is exposed.

Thus, if refactoring changes the way a class interacts with collaborators tests may fail.
Increased Coupling makes refactoring harder

Refactoring should not change the behavior of a class. Hence state based tests should not break.

Refactoring a class may change the way it communicates with collaborating classes, breaking interaction based tests.
Interaction Based Testing is harder. There is more metaphorical rope.

Most horror stories associated with Interaction Based Tests are a result of excessive coupling produced by poor implementation.
How Mocking Can Add Unnecessary Coupling?

Mocking Value Objects: An orange is always an orange
How Mocking Can Add Unnecessary Coupling

Complex Constructors: There’s a test trying to get out
If good OO principals are not rigorously applied mock driven tests will may become overly complex. The tests are very sensitive to the design.
Smaller classes / classes with little functionality increase the support burden needlessly.

Small classes or classes with low functional content → Increase ratio between tested interactions and functional content → Inhibit refactoring → Increase the cost of change.
For Example the Extract Class refactor increases the number of interaction points whilst holding the functional content constant.
Key Point

The Mockist’s needs to be maintain a balance between the number of interaction based tests and the corresponding functional content.
Five
Managing Refactoring in a Test Driven World
Best Practices for Interaction Based Testing

- Don’t mock behaviours that are not relevant to the test (stub them).
- Avoid complex constructors, static initialisers or other setup code that crosscuts multiple execution paths.
- Only mock classes under your control.
- Don’t mock value objects.
- You don’t need to mock everything.
You don’t need to mock everything!

A group of collaborating objects are isolated with mocks. Internally state based testing is used.

All interactions are mocked

Demarcating groups of objects with mocks and using state based testing internally good practice.
Unit tests require isolating the code under test to ensure we get accurate feedback on test failures => Mocks or Stubs.

Both mocks and stubs add a small maintenance burden to the project as they must be kept up to date.

IBT facilitates a different method of doing TDD. It allows you to drive out code for a class without developing its collaborators.

Interaction Based Testing with Mocking Frameworks introduces tighter couplings between test and source. This makes refactoring more difficult.
So What Do We Have?

...But most horror stories resulting from the use of IBTs arise from coupling introduced by poor implementation, not an intrinsic property of the process.

Some of these problems have been highlighted here (complex constructor, mocking value objects etc)

The Mockist approach of applying IBT at a class by class level magnifies poor design.

The Mockist approach encourages isolation at a class level but this is not mandatory. Mixing IBT and state based testing provides a balanced approach.
Finally, my personal thoughts...

Mockist TDD is a pleasant process to follow.

I like to start with the stub n’ state approach (using a mocking framework to create the stubs), then add expectations that relate to the particular test.

I also tend not to mock interactions between classes I consider to be closely coupled, I tend to favour state based tests with the demarcation of mocks surrounding the group.

To me the two approaches are not mutually exclusive, you have to have some demarcation. The trick is to know how much to test in isolation and when to assert expectations over stubs.