Introduction

(see also section 8.1)

The core question dealt with here is: how does HCI affect of the programmer? Obviously HCI affects the design and therefore what is produced; however, the nature of user interfaces can make certain aspects of programming the application more difficult. That is, HCI also impacts how the design is put together.

One example is the separation between applications in a typical desktop environment. From a software engineering point of view it is important to keep them separate so that if the word processor crashes it does not bring down the web browser and vice versa. However, when the user looks at the screen it is all apparently available – just as in real life you may use your mug to hold open the page of a book, you don't think "mugs are functionally different from pages" you just do it. However, on the desktop even cut-and-paste or drag-and-drop between applications is effectively breaking the functional separation. Within a single application the same issue arises and users expect to be able to freely move between aspects of the user interface even if they belong to different modules of the underlying application.

One issue is that the user-interface developer does not normally want to think about the details of the electronics of the trackpad on a laptop computer or the optical sensors on a mouse. That is there is a need for levels of abstraction that lift the programming from the specific details of hardware to interaction techniques.

This greater level of abstraction is provided by a development tools and techniques:

- **windowing systems** – to provide basic independence from low-level devices and manage inter-application conflicts and
- **interaction toolkits** – to make it easier to use higher-level widgets such as menus and buttons
- **architecture styles and frameworks** – which help to structure the way one thinks about and constructs complex user interfaces
windowing systems

device independence

A computer may use many different kinds of pointing device (see also chapter 2): mouse, trackpad, joystick; it may even have a touchscreen such as an iPhone or iPad. Similarly there are various different kinds of keyboards from traditional QUERTY keyboards, to multi-tap phone keypads, and software-keyboards on touchscreens. Even 'standard' keyboards come in slightly different layouts in different countries and have more or less special keys such as cursor arrows, or function keys. Furthermore screens come in different resolutions from a few hundred pixels across on a phone to many thousands in a desktop 'cinema' display.

As an application developer you often want to ignore these details as much as is sensible for the nature of the interaction. This abstraction is provided by a number of layers of software. These differ slightly in different platforms, but the typical layers are:

operating system – This provides the basic hardware interface, and low-level device drivers.

windowing system – This has a number of functions, but one is to provide abstractions such as an abstract idea of a pointer/mouse and an abstract screen/display model. The display model is often based on pixels, but there are alternatives such as the use of Postscript or vector graphics (see box page 291).

toolkit (e.g. Java AWT/Swing) – These provide higher level abstractions such as components for menus, tabbed displays. Sometimes toolkits themselves come in several levels each adding more abstraction over the layer below.

The application will deal most with the highest level of toolkit, but typically can access the raw window manager or operating system when the toolkit does not provide everything that is needed. For example, the cut-and-paste
support in Java AWT is limited, so for specialised applications you need to create small modules of native code to access the underlying window system clipboard. However, the more applications access underlying windowing systems or operating systems, the more code needs to be re-written when porting between platforms.

Fig 1. the event-paint cycle

resource sharing
Often you have many applications on a computer, but typically one screen, one keyboard and one mouse. Furthermore, the user has a single pair of eyes and fingers, so that even if you had a screen huge enough to show every possible application the user would not be able to loom at them all at once! One job of the windowing system is to share these fixed interaction resources between applications. See section 8.2, p 291, for the notion of a virtual/abstract terminal so that each application for many purposes can think it has the computer with all its resources to itself.

The input devices are usually shared using the idea of input focus. By clicking on a window, or sometimes tabbing between them, the user can choose to use the keyboard to type into different applications, or the mouse
to select or point in different windows. Note this is effectively *time-based sharing* as at any point in time a single application 'owns' the keyboard and mouse.

For the screen there are several possibilities for window layout:

*tiled* (space shared) – Here each window/application is given a dedicated portion of the screen and can do what it likes there. This is often found in web sidebars, where widgets are stacked one above another. Note that this is a form of *space-based sharing* as each application has a part of the screen space. Of course, this has a natural limit when the screen is full. For web sidebars this is partly managed by the fact that the screen can scroll, however also each widget may be able to be hidden or expanded by clicking its title bar, thus giving the user more control over what is seen at any single moment.

![tiled sidebar with expandable widgets in Wordpress admin screen](image)

*single app* (time shared) – Some systems do the opposite and dedicate the whole screen to a single application or window, swopping which application gets the screen at any point in time. This was found in early versions of Windows, but is now more common in mobile devices such as phones as the screen is so small anyway that splitting it further would be silly. Note that this is a form of *time-based sharing* of the resource as at any moment precisely one application 'owns' the screen. The window system needs only have some means to swop between applications. For example, on the iPhone this is achieved by clicking the big button at the bottom and selecting an icon representing the intended application.

*overlapping* (time and space) – For desktop and laptop PCs, the most common layout is neither of the above, but instead the use of overlapping windows. In this case we have something that has elements of both time and space based sharing as some part of the screen have overlaps and are therefore time-shared (depending on...
which is on top) and other parts, where smaller windows sit side-by-side, are space shared.

Fig 2. window layout (i) tiled (ii) single app and (iii) overlapping

Of course it is not just the screen and keyboard that users care about; other aspects of the device are also shared, especially when thinking about a mobile device. There is one battery, so that power management is crucial. Some phone-based operating systems work very like desktop-based ones with applications running all the time and consequentially running down the battery! The iPhone is often criticised for being single-threaded, but this is almost certainly one of the reasons for relatively long battery life. The network is also a shared resource and if one application hogs it may slow down others ... furthermore it may cost the user in data charges!

application management

There are many applications! While they typically have control of what happens inside their windows, the window manager provides a consistent look-and-feel to the window 'decoration', the borders, resizing controls, title bar. As an application programmer you simply create a window and occasionally get events such as 'resized' or 'close', but otherwise the windowing system worries about what they look like and how they behave.

The window system also takes responsibility for many aspects of inter-application sharing such as cut & paste and drag & drop. As an application developer there are typically calls to the windowing systems to say "here is some data of this type for the clipboard", and the windowing system will provide events such as "data of this type has been dropped here". The window system also manages a degree of negotiation between the application providing data (where it was cut/copied or dragged from) and the application using it (paste or drop location). Some windowing systems also provide a level of scripting or automation between applications, for example the Mac Automator.

Finally, the windowing system has to provide some form of user interface to manage things like swopping between applications, closing windows, selecting
the keyboard focus, or arranging overlapping windows and setting various global user preferences (e.g. Mac Finder, Windows Explorer). As well as 'big applications', even desktop interfaces now often have additional micro-applications such as the Mac Dashboard, which also need means for activating, etc.

**architecture of window systems**
(see section 8.2.1)

**not just the PC**
Issues of application management and architecture are not just issues for PCs, but any platform where there are multiple applications:

*phone* - Faces similar issues to the PC sharing screen, keyboard, etc.. As noted the choice is usually to go for 'full screen' apps, not overlapping windows, however Vodafone 360 has semi-open apps, which take up several 'tile' locations in the screens showing application icons.

*web* - In web applications the browser in many ways takes to role of window manager. The browser may make use of he window system's ability to have several browser windows open, but within a window space is usually managed using tabs, which are effectively a form of space-based sharing.

*web micro-apps* - Various web platforms allow the user to add micro-applications such as Facebook apps and Google widgets. The platform may offer these access to shared data (e.g. Facebook...
friend's birthdays) and have to manage screen space, often using a combination of space-shared columns and time-shared tabs.

**dedicated devices** (e.g. microwave control panel) – These are mostly coded direct to hardware as they have very bespoke input and output. However, there are appliance-oriented variants of Java and Windows providing some higher-level abstractions.

**programming the application**

**toolkits**

(see section 8.4)

**paint models**

When you ant to put something on the screen it goes through all the layers referred to earlier. Your code interacts with a toolkit (say Jave AWT/Swing), which then passes this on to the window manager, which then manages things like overlaps with other application windows before interacting through the operating system and device drivers to actually paint pixels on the screen.
Systems and toolkits differ in what you actually draw to:

*direct to the screen* – The simplest is when the application are given direct access to screen pixels. This is clearly most efficient for high-throughput graphics, such as video replay, but has problems if the application misbehaves and starts to draw to areas of the screen that it shouldn’t such as other applications' space or the windowing system’s own UI elements.

*direct to screen via viewport* – The windowing system may exert a little more control by only allowing access through a 'viewport'. This means that when the application asks to draw pixels the output may be clipped if it is outside the allowed region, or if part of the window is currently covered by another window. This might also include coordinate transformations so that the application can effectively draw in a window with x and y coordinates 0-199, but have the window really positioned in the middle of the actual screen. For example, Java AWT works in this manner.

*separate buffer* – Sometimes instead of writing instantly to the screen the applications drawing operations are applied to a buffer in memory and only when this is finished is the whole buffer written to the screen. This may happen at the level of toolkit or and/or underlying window system and is normally called double buffering in a toolkit or retained bitmap in the windowing system. The latter we deal with later. The reason for double buffering at the toolkit level (whether or not the windowing system has a buffer), is to reduce flicker. Without double buffering it may be that the user sees a screen half-drawn, whereas double buffering means that the entire window instantly swaps from the old to the new buffer. This is an option in Java Swing.

*display list* – Instead of working with the screen as an array of pixels, some systems store a list of operations recording, say, that there should be a line, image or text at a particular location on the screen. The toolkit then worries about showing these on the screen. This means that the application can simply change the display list when screen elements need to be updated, rather than redraw the whole screen. Also it allows the toolkit or window system to perform optimisations and hence is used in some high-performance graphical toolkits including OpenGL.

Buffering may also be used by the window system to store parts of the application window in order to more quickly update the screen when the user is swopping between overlapping windows. For example Mac OSX offers applications the choice of three levels of buffering which differ largely in how they cope with overlapping or translucent windows:

*nonretained* – This is the simplest options, the window manager remembers nothing and whenever a part of the application window that was hidden is later exposed the application is asked to redraw the previously hidden portion. This works best if the contents of the
application window are changing very rapidly as any hidden parts will need to have fresh contents anyway.

*retained* – Where the window manager buffers just the hidden parts of overlapping windows. This means that when the window is later exposed the hidden part can be instantly drawn. Note that 'hidden' here includes being covered by a translucent overlay which may later move.

*buffered* – Here the window manager keeps a copy of the entire window, both hidden parts and non-hidden parts. This takes most memory, but gives the maximum responsiveness if, for example, the window is itself translucent and is dragged over other windows.

There are different reasons why the screen needs to be redrawn:

**internal events** – Sometimes it is an event inside the application which leads to the needs to update the screen. For example, in a clock the digits need to change, or if downloading a large data file the progress indicator may need to update. In the case of internal events the application ‘knows’ that the screen has changed, but may need to tell the toolkit and ultimately the window manager.

**external events** – Alternatively the event may be due to something the user did to the application. For example the user might have clicked the ‘bold’ icon and the currently selected word needs to be emboldened. In this case it is the window manager that first ‘knows’ that the user has clicked the mouse, then passes this to the toolkit, which may sometimes respond directly (e.g. during navigation of a menu) or pass it on to the application.

However, just because the screen needs to be updated does not mean the update happens at that moment. For example, if there were many updates within a few tens of milliseconds, it would not be worth updating the screen several times as this would all be within a single display frame.

**internal control** – This is probably the easiest option to understand. When the application wants the screen changed it simply tells the toolkit/window manager that something needs to be updated. This has the problem noted above of potentially wasted updates, or taking time redrawing the screen when maybe user input is queued up needing to be processed. However this method works fine if there is some sort of intermediate representation such as the display list or a retained bitmap as then the actual display is only updated once per frame.

**external control** – In this case the toolkit / window manager decides when it wants a part of the screen to be updated (for example, when a hidden part is exposed) and asks the application to draw it. In Java this is what happens in a 'paint()' method. However, while this works easily for externally generated events when the window system 'knows' that a change is required, there is of course a problem for internally generated change. This is the purpose of the 'repaint()' method in Java; the application is saying to the toolkit "please repaint my window sometime when you are ready". At some later point, often when the input event queue is empty, the toolkit calls the applications 'paint()' method and screen is updated.

**draw once per frame** – This is a variant of external control used principally in video-game engines where much of the screen updates in each frame (e.g. first person shooters, or car racing). Once per frame the application is asked to redraw the screen. If event happen between these calls the application usually just updates some internal state but does not update the screen itself. Then when it is asked to
redraw itself, the application takes the current state, maybe polls the state of joystick buttons, and generates the new screen.

**event models**
(see section 8.3 and notes "Events in Java: what happens when you click?")

**architecture and frameworks**

**separation and presentation abstraction: Seeheim**
(see section 8.5, page 307–309)
component models: MVC and PAC
(see section 8.5, page 308)

on the web – salami sliced Seeheim
The Seeheim. MVC and PAC architectures were all developed in the light of desktop GUI applications. In web applications we can see similar facets but often arranged differently, and in particular the components do not necessarily all sit together in one place.

Given the browser is the bit close to the user it is tempting to think that Seehem presentation layer would live entirely in the browser, with the deeper functionality/semantics at the server end and a separation somewhere in the dialogue component.

In fact, it is not this simple. Instead, we typically see bit of each layer spread between browser and server. At the presentation layer, the actual layout is clearly performed in the browser as is the application of CS style sheets, managing layout of screen areas depending on the window size
etc. However, the actual HTML that is delivered to the web page is usually generated in the server either with raw code, or with the help of template engines such as Smarty, or in XML-based web-stacks XSLT to transform XML to HTML.

The dialogue component is similarly split. Some things happen at the browser end. In an old HTML site this is limited to when the user selects links or interacts with web forms; however in a Javascript-rich or Flash-based site the level of interaction can be quite high. However, some of the dialogue is happening at the server side. When the user selects a link to a generated page or presses a form 'submit' button, the back-end server script needs to work out what to do next.

Finally the semantics is largely situated in back-end databases and business logic. However, in rich web applications including those based on AJAX and Web2.0 technology, data may be updated on the page. For example, Google docs spreadsheet is downloaded completely into the web browser and edited there with updates periodically sent to the backend server to keep the two in synchronisation.

Furthermore if one looks at the scripts generating individual application pages, we will typically see bits of presentation, dialogue and semantics in each. The problem then is that the interaction state becomes fragmented and often developers find it hard to keep track of state spread between server session variables, URL parameters, hidden fields in forms and cookies. There are some MVC-like frameworks for web development, which try to untangle the mess, but the picture is far from solved.