Heuristic Evaluation

For each heuristic, you should cite one example in your wireframe either illustrating how the heuristic suggests an improvement, or pointing to a design decision you made that supports the heuristic.

1. **Fitt's Law**
   a. In order to navigate to a user's profile page, I decided to make the box around both the username and the profile picture clickable. As opposed to only making the profile picture clickable, this decision maximizes the area of the target, which lessens the difficulty of navigating to the profile page.
2. **Speak the User's Language**
   a. When a user deletes a Freet, any Refreets of that Freet are replaced with a placeholder Freet. I purposefully made the placeholder text succinct and simple in order to communicate to the user what they are seeing, and avoid implementation details or other unneeded information that would only be confusing.
3. **Consistent Naming & Icons**
   a. I mostly used icons that are widely recognized, especially because they are taken from Material Design, which many internet users are familiar with due to the widespread use of that library. I think some of the icons are not exactly aligned with what they are typically used for in the Google suite, which could be confusing, so that's an area of improvement.
4. **Information Scent**
   a. Bolding the usernames of the users helps indicate to the user that these are links, rather than static text. This hint helps the user understand how to find more information about a user.
5. **Follow Conventions**
   a. In terms of page structure, I followed a conventional "feed" structure, where posts are stacked vertically, and the most recent posts are at the top. This convention should help users understand the purpose of this application.
6. **Show Location & Structure**
   a. The "back" arrow on the user profile page helps show location and structure. The "back" icon helps the user understand the structure of the website is back and forth between profile pages and the main feed.
7. **Accelerators**
   a. I decided to include a feature where users can click outside of the modal to "cancel" the operation they're doing (e.g. deleting or Refreeting). This expedites the cancel operation for users who know this accelerator because "outside of the modal" is a much bigger area than the "cancel" button.
8. **Keep Paths Short**

a. I kept paths short by allowing inline editing, that is, a user is not sent to a separate page nor modal when they wish to edit their Freet. They simply edit the text where it is on the page, which reduces the number of steps/redirects to edit.

9. **Undo & Cancel**
   a. I decided to allow users to cancel their delete and Refreet operations, which allows them to change their mind as they perform the operation and reduces accidental deletions by enforcing two clicks.

10. **Perceptual Fusion**
    a. When a user clicks to like or unlike, the interface immediately updates to change the fill color of the heart icon and update the number of likes. This immediate update helps the user to understand the effect of the like/unlike actions.

11. **Gestalt Principle of Grouping**
    a. I designed the layout such that the parent Freet of a Refreet is nested fully within the Refreet. This layout helps the user visually, such that they understand the relationship between the two Freets and groups them together mentally.

12. **Recognition vs. Recall**
    a. When a user is Refreeting or deleting a Freet, the target Freet is displayed in the modal, which reduces the recall burden on the user. They can recognize the Freet they are operating on and do not have to remember its full contents as they reply or delete.

13. **Anticipation & Context**
    a. I designed the interface such that the "edit" and "delete" Freet operations only appear on Freets that belong to the user, i.e. only when those operations are possible on that Freet. Thus, the actions are made available based on the context.