Posted by SlikRik on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 08:21:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So normally I woulda dropped it, the whole debate between FF and IE, but then my friend showed me this browser test. Did in FF, and then just had to test it in IE. To be fair, I actually had high hopes for IE.

This is the site of the test: http://acid3.acidtests.org.

I did the test using both Firefox 3 (just released today) and Internet Explorer 7, both without adjusting any settings beforehand.

First I'll post the reference picture, what the test is supposed to look like if the browser passed 100%:

Although I have it being displayed there in FF, it displays exactly the same in IE.

Now, here come the results:

FF3 Result

71/100, not too shabby. Yes, there's not color, and I'll admit that it wasn't 100% smooth in displaying either.

But now let's check out IE...

IE7 Result

Pretty good I'd say, if you're Picasso...

Even after that pic was taken, I let IE run the required ActiveX control, and still didn't get anything better than that.

My favorite is the little comment in the lower left "Error on page." As if you didn't already know.

Pfft...

And that's that, just thought I'd share.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Ghostshaw on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 08:44:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thought I would add Opera 9.5's performance as well:

Toggle Spoiler

And I know that there is actually an internal version of Opera that gets 100%.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Doitle on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 08:50:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Safari running in Windows XP got a 75.

Seamonkey got a 53.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Ryu on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 08:54:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm glad i use IE7. ftw!

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Veyrdite on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 10:41:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Lol TOR user
That's surprising. I wonder what browser rendering engine displays everything perfectly.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Ghostshaw on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 13:37:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

None.

Since there will always be pages made for IE/FF/Opera/Safari specifically and hacked in to work for the other browsers. That is untill very strict specs are defined and every browser actually abides to those.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Doitle on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 19:01:29 GMT

All of you insane W3C Standards people will literally kill the internet. I don't give a shit about the importance of standards when I am making a page... All I care about is that it works. I write a little HTML, I open it, oh it looks ok? Done. I don't want to have to write in catches for every possible retarded standard and case. If you had it your way pages that weren't W3C compatible wouldn't be allowed to be uploaded. The problem? There goes the possibility for just anyone to go and put something up and share on the internet. W3C is internet poison. This is just like how W3C pushed the HTML standard to eliminate the <font> tag and several other tags like it. Oh we're supposed to use CSS stylesheets? Yeah that makes so much more sense to someone who just wants to make a little home page than <FONT>, WHEN THEY WANT TO CHANGE THE FONT. RAGE RAGE RAGE...

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by StealthEye on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 22:06:33 GMT

Yeah, however, having browsers not conforming to the standards makes making less trivial pages WAY more hard. If you are just someone who wants to make a simple website, either use a WYSIWYG editor which actually supports the standards or just read error messages.

The font was perfectly standard, until it became deprecated due to CSS which offers way more poer and control. If you still wanted to use the old standard, then do so, it's no problem. The problem is that browsers do not interpret things correctly if you *do* follow the rules.

About the standard itself... I don't like it much. Yet having different nonstandards for every browser, so that you need to test it on every variant is horrible.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Crimson on Wed, 18 Jun 2008 23:37:51 GMT

The W3C standards aren't the problem. It's browsers NOT following them and making up their own interpretations that IS the problem.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 00:11:02 GMT

http://my.opera.com/desktopteam/blog/2008/03/26/opera-and-the-acid3-test

---

Subject: Re: The difference

Posted by a000clown on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 02:06:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

People who don't know enough html/css to follow standards have no place creating websites without a WYSIWYG editor... These are the same people who create those fuck ugly myspace layouts with absolutely no color coordination.

If standards weren't followed you would have websites that only work in one browser and no others. Maybe you don't see the big deal on websites so I'll try to show a similar example, take IRC since that's popular with gamers.
How would you like it if you had to scrap mIRC or whatever else you use and download a new IRC client JUST because one IRCd developer decided to not follow standards? Standards are made to be followed. mIRC will work the same on any IRC network you connect to because the developers respected and followed the standards set. Web browsers should display the same on any website you connect to but they don't because of everyones' lack of following the standards.

And it's not just about how it displays either, there are other things to consider.
Blind people rely on their computer reading the code from the website and relaying the appropriate information through voice/speakers. Websites without standards will relay a lot of useless information that doesn't make any sense.
Mobile devices are being used to view websites a lot more these days. They need very very very perfect coding if you have a lot on your site.
There's more things but are less important.

The link that Aircraftkiller posted is good news. The Opera developers are getting serious about following standards and the other browsers should start following their example.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by glyde51 on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 04:09:22 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Doitle wrote on Wed, 18 June 2008 15:01All of you insane W3C Standards people will literally kill the internet. I don't give a shit about the importance of standards when I am making a page... All I care about is that it works. I write a little HTML, I open it, oh it looks ok? Done. I don't want to have to write in catches for every possible retarded standard and case. If you had it your way pages that weren't W3C compatible wouldn't be allowed to be uploaded. The problem? There goes the possibility for just anyone to go and put something up and share on the internet. W3C is internet poison. This is just like how W3C pushed the HTML standard to eliminate the <font> tag and several other tags like it. Oh we're supposed to use CSS stylesheets? Yeah that makes so much more sense to someone who just wants to make a little home page than <FONT>, WHEN THEY WANT TO CHANGE THE FONT. RAGE RAGE RAGE...

WARNING: Sarcasm follows

Agreed. Standardization of web standards is the bane of the Internet. Who cares about being able to carry content cross-platform? Or accessibility? Fuck blind people. They should learn to read, assholes. I want everyone to be able to read the website I made about my pet hamster in

Dreamweaver 3, and here's the W3C making web standards that cause it to look God-awful, saying I can't use the blink tag wherever I please. Hey, got epilepsy? Stop doing drugs.

Man, next thing you know, stuff won't compile when I forget a curly brace or when I leave out a semicolon somewhere. That's ridiculous. Then how will the average Joe have their say? It's like Universities, only for elitists. Only the people who know how to spell, use grammar, and in-depth knowledge of the topic are allowed to speak. What if I don't want my doctor telling me I've got cancer when I think it's a cold? I don't get my say because they call me "unqualified," bunch of jerks.

End of the SARCASM STORM

Acid3 is meant to show how stringently a browser follows the standards, from markup to scripting. If you don't understand (X)HTML/CSS/Javascript, get a good, standards compliant WYSIWYG editor and move on.

If you do not understand why the <FONT> element (and other presentational elements/attributes) were phased out, use a transitional DOCTYPE or, better yet, learn.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by jonwil on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 08:16:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Blame WYSIWYG editors for a lot of the problem too since they often dont produce standards compliant code (the amount of "IE only" code out there that was created by FrontPage or Dreamweaver is huge)

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Goztow on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 10:19:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jonwil wrote on Thu, 19 June 2008 10:16Blame WYSIWYG editors for a lot of the problem too since they often dont produce standards compliant code (the amount of "IE only" code out there that was created by FrontPage or Dreamweaver is huge)

And even worse: MS Word :-S

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Ghostshaw on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 12:35:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thats the same engine as frontpage AFAIK.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Goztow on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 12:41:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

From my experience, Word is WAY worse.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by StealthEye on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 16:25:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, word is HORRIBLE, whereas frontpage is just horrible.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by SlikRik on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 18:59:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

StealthEye wrote on Thu, 19 June 2008 12:25Yeah, word is HORRIBLE, whereas frontpage is just horrible.
Can we agree that Microsoft on the whole is horrible?

To be honest, I've used Dreamweaver for most of my sites, but I've always checked the compatibility with both FF and IE, both work fine (maybe cuz I'm just using simple HTML lol).

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Ghostshaw on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 21:45:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh Please stop the MS is horrible bullshit. Your using their OS, and I dunno about you but XP always worked bloody fine for me.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Dave Anderson on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 01:18:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Microsoft is awesome and you all know it.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Starbuzzz on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 03:56:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dave Anderson wrote on Thu, 19 June 2008 20:18Microsoft is awesome and you all know it.

but won't admit it...

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by SlikRik on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 04:20:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ghostshaw wrote on Thu, 19 June 2008 17:45Oh Please stop the MS is horrible bullshit. Your using their OS, and I dunno about you but XP always worked bloody fine for me.
I'll admit, XP was one solid piece of software, although it did have a few weak points.

The reason I use Windows is simply this:

Does it look like I have a choice? As a gamer, my choice of OS's is limited to the compatibility with games, and I dunno about you, but I don't see the majority of games being made for Mac or Linux. Plus, seeing as 75% of the world's computers are running Windows, I'd rather not deal with the compatibility issues of having a Mac. Some people can use Mac or Linux machines just fine for their everyday use, but not me, therefore, I'm more or less forced to run Windows.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Starbuzzz on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 05:40:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

And let's not forget that games for the Mac are freaking expensive.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by a000clown on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 05:45:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

SlikRik wrote on Fri, 20 June 2008 00:20Does it look like I have a choice? As a gamer, my choice of OS's is limited to the compatibility with games, and I dunno about you, but I don't see the majority of games being made for Mac or Linux. Plus, seeing as 75% of the world's computers are running Windows, I'd rather not deal with the compatibility issues of having a Mac. Some people can use Mac or Linux machines just fine for their everyday use, but not me, therefore, I'm more or less forced to run Windows.
Pretty much the same. If it wasn't for my games I would be using only Linux flavors.
Macs I don't like at all, I find they limit what you can do and are designed for a very narrow audience.
Win XP I've never had any problems with, it's a very stable product. All the other versions I've used (95, 98, millennium) have been a crappy experience, and it sounds like MS has gone downhill again with Vista, although I have yet to try it.
I just noticed how off topic this has gone so I'm gonna stop typing now...

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by egoflux0 on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 05:54:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:This is just like how W3C pushed the HTML standard to eliminate the <font> tag and several other tags like it. Oh we're supposed to use CSS stylesheets? Yeah that makes so much more sense to someone who just wants to make a little home page than <FONT>, WHEN THEY WANT TO CHANGE THE FONT. RAGE RAGE RAGE...
This made me lol.

the <font> tag is still used ALL over the internet. The reason it is? Because it was a defined *STANDARD* that was superseded by a bunch of tech savvy geeks that decided on some major high level design for where they ultimately saw the way information should be shared (information itself versus layout of that information).

You try to define a pseudo-programming language that shares information in an aesthetically pleasing manner on the internet without using any sort of standard that is widely adopted, and you sir will be a genius.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Ghostshaw on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 07:45:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually <font> is only depreceated in XHTML not in HTML 4.0.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Doitle on Sat, 21 Jun 2008 09:17:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So I am up in bed right now and I can't sleep. I got the thought to try this test on my phone's browser. Amazingly it got a 15/100. Much higher than I expected. Just thought I would share that. The phone is a LG Voyager. Also if you didn't figure it out from the "I am in bed" bit, I am posting using it.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Zion on Sat, 21 Jun 2008 12:47:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Doitle wrote on Sat, 21 June 2008 10:17So I am up in bed right now and I can't sleep. I got the thought to try this test on my phone's browser. Amazingly it got a 15/100. Much higher than I expected. Just thought I would share that. The phone is a LG Voyager. Also if you didn't figure it out from the "I am in bed" bit, I am posting using it.

Just tried with the iPhones Safari browser and it got 40/100. Took about 10-15 seconds for the

page to load over Wifi however, but the signal was low.

I'll try it with software 2.0's Safari when i get the new iPhone.

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Sat, 21 Jun 2008 13:00:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Zion Fox wrote on Sat, 21 June 2008 14:47Doitle wrote on Sat, 21 June 2008 10:17So I am up in bed right now and I can't sleep. I got the thought to try this test on my phone's browser. Amazingly it got a 15/100. Much higher than I expected. Just thought I would share that. The phone is a LG Voyager. Also if you didn't figure it out from the "I am in bed" bit, I am posting using it.

Just tried with the iPhones Safari browser and it got 40/100. Took about 10-15 seconds for the page to load over Wifi however, but the signal was low.

I'll try it with software 2.0's Safari when i get the new iPhone.
Opera mobile gets 58 on a HTC TyTn || (in the USA htc sprint afaik)

Subject: Re: The difference
Posted by Yrr on Sat, 21 Jun 2008 13:31:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

IE8b1 @ 18/100