# Why Different Approaches To Naming Classes

CSS is fairly unique in the world

- Separates content from appearance
- Applies appearance based on structure

### **Different Needs**

Different pages/sites have different needs

- A newspaper wants a consistent appearance that mimics a newspaper
- A page may expect to have radically different layouts for mobile/desktop
- A site might have content areas from different sources they don't want to conflict
- A site might have general rules and specific overrides

### **CSS** by Structure

Categorization of rules (selectors that apply to elements in different parts of the structure) can cause or solve problems

- Pro: Added HTML that matches selector gets the styling with no effort
- Con: Sometimes that isn't intended or desired

### **Semantic CSS**

Approach: Use Cascading, use semantic class names

#### Pros:

- Original "intent"
- No conflicts between class names and visuals
  - keeps code maintainable
- easily expands to more HTML

#### Cons:

- Can expand past your desire
- "style all EXCEPT these" gets harder

### **Semantic CSS Example**

- Style headings, lists, paragraphs
- add specific classes for specific but common purposes (menus, callouts, etc)

See also: <a href="http://www.csszengarden.com/">http://www.csszengarden.com/</a>

### **Block\_\_Element--Modifier (BEM)**

Approach: Avoid wide rules, use semantic class names

#### Pros:

- Same benefits as Semantic
- Avoids unexpected side-effects

#### Cons:

- May have one-use classes
- What is a Block and Element may feel arbitrary

# **BEM Approach**

"Block": area of content that gets styled

```
• e.g. <nav class="menubar">
```

"Element": subsection of that content

- class name: BLOCK\_\_ELEMENT
- e.g.

"Modifier": If an element has multiple states

- class name: BLOCK\_\_ELEMENT--MODIFIER
- e.g.

### **BEM Benefits**

- Still get the reuse of semantics by having the same semantic structures in HTML
- Minimize complex structures by having a pattern to follow
- Minimize the specificity of rules (no required combined classes in selectors), making it easier to handle overrides

See HTML of: <a href="http://getbem.com/">http://getbem.com/</a> for example

See <a href="http://getbem.com/faq/">http://getbem.com/faq/</a> for good details

# **Utility First CSS**

Approach: No semantics, base on part of appearance

#### Pros:

- Once defined, easy to apply new content
- What you describe is what you get
- Less CSS

#### Cons:

- Needs library or upfront investment
- More class names in HTML
- Design changes = Many HTML changes

# **Utility First Examples**

### Many common libraries: Tailwind CSS, etc

# Utility First is hard for this course

Because utility first:

- involves an external library
- or a ton of work

and I deny external libraries in this course

# **Starting out**

#### I recommend Semantic CSS to start with

- Easy to shift to BEM
- Utility First avoids the concepts we are teaching
  - both the good and the bad
- Even if you want utility first, you WILL encounter Semantic
  - Need to understand it
- In future, all approaches valid depending on needs

# **Summary - Approaches**

- CSS are rules without a goal
- Approach is how you organize your use of the rules
- Three general common styles
  - Semantic
  - BEM
  - Utility First
- Nothing formal, these are rough labels

### **Summary - Semantic**

- Makes use of semantic class names
- Very reliant on structure
- Can easily have a rule apply in multiple places
  - this can be good or bad
- Prone to specificity issues
- Good introduction to CSS

### **Summary - BEM**

- A convention about naming semantic classes
- Goal is to "flatten" specificity
- Still can apply a rule to multiple places
  - More likely to be intended effect
- Fewer "broad" rules that apply multiple places
- An organized semantic approach

# **Summary - Utility First**

- Discards semantics entirely
- Repetitive
- Controls precise look
- Less switching between HTML/CSS files
- Requires upfront investment to define standards

#### NOT USED IN THIS COURSE