Subject: Re: Interactive Objects, Was: Simple GUI question
Posted by R.Bauer on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 21:04:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

David Fanning wrote:

> Reimar Bauer (R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de) writes:
>
>> I like very much the I of idl it stands for interactive.
>> For my opinion objects can't be interactive they are always well planned.
>>
>> The people starting with idl are almost very different in learning and
>> working with idl. In most cases my feeling is if they can theireselfs
>> work a bit on a solution without reading many books or asking a lot of
>> people for help they like idl more.
>
> I'm not sure how this discussion got turned in the
> direction of objects. I'm pretty sure it started out
> as a discussion of how to write a modal dialog widget.
> But the fact that it did encourages me. I've learned
> in my programming therapy sessions that talking about
> something is the first step in the process of accepting it. :-)

Dear David,

you are right! I was inspired myself several times by the first big library
I found from Ray Sterner especially the idea of a common timeaxis.

It's absolut correct thats there is a gap between the existing objects and a
catalyst library. And it takes always more time to write library routines
useful for others too against a "closed application".

If you have a more detailed look at our library you find some routines which
are based on more than hundred library routines. For me and some others it
is extremly easy to build a very complex program dependend on the existing
libraries. During the programming there are always new simple
library-routines are created to solve the main problem. Some are small some
are large. But after you have done this once you save a lot of time and all
the others which understands what's the library did saves time too.
Sometimes I wonder how much routines really are depended to an easy or
simple program. (A while ago I have solved one of the live tools I don't
know at the moment which one it was but it has dependcies to more than two
thousands routines)

What is your estimation in teaching people never have programmed before.
At the moment my feeling is if we don't start with objects by beginners it
is more difficult to get them later to work on objects too.
But on the other hand if someone has only small time to solve his problems

by idl without a "catalyst object library" it would better for him to show him the "object free idl".

I think teaching objects will be always nearly the same as teaching of writing library routines. In objects there is quite no difference between this. But normally we try to teach people to use idl dependent on the idl commands because they work in very different places with several of different problems. We don't have libraries to solve all their problems. So I believe it is better to show them how to build routines to solve their own problems. (There is another yearly seminar for our people about the increasing icg library)

But I believe it is very hard to teach a beginner the clever usage of objects in idl with the momentanly existing objects.

I hope this discussion helps to form an opinion how we should proceed teaching the next classes.

best regards

Reimar

--
Forschungszentrum Juelich
email: R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de
http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg-i/
 == ======
a IDL library at ForschungsZentrum Juelich
 http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg-i/idl_icglib/idl_lib_intro. html