SJSU | SCHOOL OF INFORMATION

ISDA131 - Information Architecture
Final Exam - Spring 2025

I hereby acknowledge that I am fully aware of the academic regulations that strictly prohibit the act of copying, sharing unauthorized information, or utilizing generative AI tools such as ChatGPT or similar platforms during examinations. I solemnly pledge to uphold these rules and maintain the highest standards of academic integrity.

I understand that my submissions may be subject to verification through AI detection tools and other monitoring technologies used to ensure compliance. I am fully cognizant that any violation, including the unauthorized use of AI tools, will be considered a breach of academic conduct and may result in serious disciplinary actions, which may include academic penalties, suspension, or dismissal.

By submitting my work, I affirm that it is entirely my own and complies with all institutional policies.

Antonio Seen
Signature (Type your Name)

Instruction- Please make sure your responses are brief consisting of 1-2 well-organized paragraphs. Please refer to the following chapters 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 of your textbook (IA4) for fundamental concepts. If you include information from external sources, remember to cite them accurately following the APA citation style.

1. Evolved Definition of IA
Critically evaluate how the evolving definition of Information Architecture (IA) reflects shifts in interdisciplinary theory and practice. In what ways have changes in cognitive psychology, ubiquitous computing, and adaptive systems influenced modern IA design in non-web contexts like IoT, VR, and wearables?

The true meaning of information architecture (IA) has changed over time to show the growing importance of interdisciplinary fields. Originally, it was focused on organizing and labeling content on certain websites; now, IA includes structuring information in complex systems like IoT, VR, and different types of wearable tech. This change shows new and improved developments in cognitive psychology, which focuses on just how people can process and recall information, pushing IA designers to create experiences that match real-world thinking patterns. For example, wearables like smartwatches need intuitive layouts because users often interact with them quickly and while in motion.

Modern IA also draws from ubiquitous (pervasive) computing and adaptive systems, where information has to flow across devices and adjust to context. In VR environments, IA is not just about menus, it is also about how users move, find, and understand content spatially (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015). As systems become more responsive and mobile, IA must support constant interaction across platforms, not just static navigation. The evolution shows how IA design has gone from arranging webpages to shaping experiences in physical-digital hybrids.

2. Card Sorting vs. Tree Testing
Evaluate the cognitive and contextual validity of card sorting and tree testing across culturally diverse user groups. How would cross-cultural variations in information categorization influence your choice of method and the interpretation of results?

Card sorting and tree testing are both very useful for fully understanding how users can think about and find information, but, realistically, cultural differences can affect their outcomes. Card sorting is much more open-ended and lets users group items based on their mental models, which can vary widely by culture. For example, people from “collectivist cultures” might group items based on relationships or social context, while others might group based on individual task goals. This means that what makes sense to one group might not make sense to another, so being able to interpret results across all cultures would need extra care (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015).

Tree testing, on the other hand, is much more structured and task-focused. This method asks users to find information in a hierarchy, which can help test the navigation without design elements getting in the way. Still, cultural differences in reading direction, decision-making speed, and/or familiarity with tech systems can affect performance (Nielsen, 2010). When designing for a global audience, the ideal combination would be to mix both methods and look at patterns across cultural groups instead of relying on just one test.

3. Metadata and UX
Analyze how metadata not only supports content retrieval but also shapes algorithmic decision-making and user trust. How should metadata governance be handled in systems where transparency and personalization intersect?

In general, Metadata helps users find content faster, but it can also play a big role in how algorithms make decisions, like what to recommend or filter. The tags, labels, and categories added to content tell the system how to sort and rank information. When metadata is one-sided or poorly structured/made, it can affect how results are shown and how users look at what's truly trustworthy or relevant. This can have a huge impact on user trust, especially when people don't know how or why certain results appear (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015). To handle this, metadata governance needs to try and balance personalization with transparency. Systems should give users some sense of how their data and preferences are used in recommendations, while also letting them adjust or back out when needed. Governance should also include regular reports to check for hidden biases or wrong labels in metadata, especially when algorithms are involved (Pomerantz, 2015). Overall, this would make the system more fair and keep users in the loop about how their experience is shaped.

4. Cross-Channel IA Pitfalls
In implementing a cross-channel IA strategy, how do conflicting platform constraints, user behavior patterns, and stakeholder objectives create systemic design tensions? What strategies resolve these tensions without compromising scalability?

Cross-channel IA tries to give users a smooth experience across different platforms, but it can run into certain problems when each platform has its own limits and user behaviors. For example, mobile users might expect fast, simple interactions, while desktop users are fine with more detailed options. At the same time, stakeholders might push for business goals like promoting certain features, which can go against what users actually want or need. These competing demands can create a system that feels disconnected or frustrating (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015). For strategies that help solve these issues, it would be helpful to focus on core user tasks that would stay the same across platforms and build flexible structures that adjust to each context. Using a modular design system and shared metadata can keep the experience consistent without copying the same layout everywhere. Regular feedback from both users and stakeholders also helps spot issues early and keep the design scalable over time (Resmini & Rosati, 2011).

5. Ethics in IA
Assess the limitations of existing ethical frameworks in guiding IA decisions amid data monetization, algorithmic opacity, and manipulative UI patterns. How should IA professionals navigate ethical ambiguity in high-stakes digital ecosystems?

Most current ethical frameworks in IA fall short when it comes to dealing with the real-world issues of data monetization, hidden algorithms, and "manipulative" designs such as dark patterns. They often focus on general principles like usability or transparency, but don't give enough guidance when designers feel pressured to increase profits at the cost of a happy/satisfied user. For instance, if a company uses metadata to track behavior and feed it into a black-box recommendation system, it's hard for users to even know what's happening, let alone trust it (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015).

IA professionals can handle this gray area by focusing on harm reduction and being as clear as possible about the structures they create. They should go for user-centered practices, even when business goals push in the opposite direction. Creating clear documentation, speaking up in design meetings, and supporting ethical audits are great steps that make a difference. Even though it can be hard, navigating these choices with honesty and integrity helps keep the digital space more fair and humane (Gray et al., 2018).

6. User Personas and IA Design

How can the over-reliance on static personas lead to design misalignment in fast-evolving digital ecosystems? Propose strategies for maintaining dynamic, inclusive, and data-informed personas over the IA project lifecycle.

Relying too much on static personas can cause IA designs to fall out of place/sync with real users, especially in digital spaces that can change quickly. Personas that stay the same over time could ignore shifts in user behavior, tech use, or accessibility needs. This can lead to designs that feel outdated, don't support diverse groups, or miss new and upcoming patterns in user goals and "pain points" (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015). To keep personas useful, they should be treated as living and changing documents, so that teams can update them with real-time user data, such as analytics, interviews, and feedback loops. It's also helpful to include edge cases and voices from lesser-represented groups to make the design more inclusive. Lastly, setting up regular checkpoints in the IA workflow to revisit and revise personas helps keep them relevant and grounded in actual user behavior (Cooper et al., 2014).

7. Cognitive Load Theory

Explore the application of intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load types in IA decisions. How can IA reduce cognitive strain in high-density information systems like health portals or legal research tools?

Cognitive Load Theory breaks down mental effort into three types: intrinsic (complexity of the task), extraneous (how info is presented), and germane (how users build understanding). In systems like health portals or legal databases, users often face high intrinsic loads because of complex content. If IA isn't carefully designed, then any unnecessary clicks, cluttered layouts, or unclear terms can add extraneous load, making it harder for users to process information (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015).

IA can reduce cognitive strain by using clear navigation, cutting down information into viewable/readable pieces, and finding a way to label content in user-friendly ways. Features like search filters, “progressive disclosure”, and guided paths can also support germane cognitive load by helping users connect the new information to what they already know. These things not only help users complete tasks faster but can also help lower frustrations/problems in high-stakes, “information-heavy” environments (Sweller, Ayres, & Kalyuga, 2011).

8. Accessibility and Inclusive IA

To what extent do universal design principles sufficiently address the intersectional needs of diverse users in IA? How should IA processes be restructured to accommodate assistive technologies, neurodiversity, and low-tech users?

Universal design principles give a strong foundation for accessibility, but they often miss the actual needs of users who would have to face multiple barriers, like someone who is both neurodivergent as well as someone who uses low-tech tools. IA needs to go beyond one-size-fits-all by somehow integrating feedback from users with different cognitive styles, languages, and tech access. This also means including screen reader testing early on, using flexible navigation paths, avoiding “overstimulation”, and offering simple ways to interact, as structuring IA to work with assistive tech and keeping content easily viewable/readable across all devices and bandwidths seems to help everyone, not just those with disabilities (Morville & Roseenfeld, 2015; Henry et al., 2014).

9. AI/ML and IA

Critically assess how integrating AI and ML into Information Architecture transforms traditional taxonomies and navigation structures. What governance, interpretability, and equity concerns arise, and how can they be mitigated?

AI and ML have reshaped traditional IA by enabling dynamic taxonomies that adjust based on user behavior, making navigation more personalized but also less predictable. This flexibility can improve user experience, but it can cause issues with transparency, especially when users do not understand why certain content is shown or hidden. Governance becomes harder when algorithms restrict or prioritize information in unfair or unclear ways, possibly excluding people who have no platform/voice. To handle this, IA professionals need to focus on clear labeling, make system logic explainable, and regularly include a report of training data for any biases. Building user trust means finding a balance between AI-driven personalization with clear and fair/ethical information structures (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015; Binns, 2018).

10. Collaboration in IA

Design a collaborative framework for an IA project involving conflicting priorities from product,

marketing, and engineering teams. How do you ensure epistemic alignment and shared mental models across disciplines?

A strong collaborative IA framework starts with early workshops where product, marketing, and engineering teams all come together with shared goals, vocabularies, and user journeys. Tools like journey maps and IA diagrams help bridge different ways of thinking by making unique/abstract ideas fully visible and testable. Regular check-ins, using plain language and visual mockups, help keep everyone aligned and reduce misinterpretations. Conflicts/issues can be managed by defining a common "source of truth" (like a shared content inventory or taxonomy) and setting clear priorities based on user needs, not just team agendas (Morville & Rosenfeld, 2015). This kind of shared mental model helps everyone move toward the same outcome, even when people have different goals.

References:

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287583

Cooper, A., Reimann, R., Cronin, D., Noessel, C., & Csizmadi, J. (2014). *About face: The essentials of interaction design* (4th ed.). Wiley.

Gray, C. M., Kou, Y., Battles, B., Hoggatt, J., & Toombs, A. L. (2018). The dark (patterns) side of UX design. *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174108

Henry, S. L., Abou-Zahra, S., & Brewer, J. (2014). The role of accessibility in a universal web. *Interactions*, 21(3), 38–41. https://doi.org/10.1145/2594473

Morville, P., & Rosenfeld, L. (2015). *Information architecture: For the web and beyond* (4th ed.). O'Reilly Media.

Nielsen, J. (2010). International usability testing. Nielsen Norman Group. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/international-usability-testing/

Resmini, A., & Rosati, L. (2011). *Pervasive information architecture: Designing cross-channel user experiences*. Morgan Kaufmann.

Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer.