

Dating Website Interfaces

Joseph Crawley

September 18, 2012

Abstract

For this assignment, Terran Moore and I looked how Match.com, Eharmony.com, and ChristianMingle.com measured in the usability metrics of Learnability, Satisfaction, and Efficiency. For this assignment, we had 5 users create profiles and complete similar tasks in order to measure these metrics.

Contents

1	Learnability	3
1.1	E-harmony.com	3
1.2	Match.com	3
1.3	ChristianMingle.com	3
2	Efficiency	3
2.1	E-harmony.com	3
2.2	Match.com	3
2.3	ChristianMingle.com	3
3	Satisfaction	3
3.1	E-harmony.com	3
3.2	Match.com	3
3.3	ChristianMingle.com	4
4	Expectations of Dating Interfaces	4
4.1	"Designers should make every attempt to reduce the users workload by taking advantage of the computers capabilities."	4
4.1.1	Test	4

1 Learnability

1.1 E-harmony.com

Users were able to fill out profiles almost instantly. Searching was hard to understand and users became frustrated with the searching of the system.

1.2 Match.com

Menus were easy to understand and users could fill out profiles almost instantly. The searching function was easy to pick up on for users, and users could navigate the site with ease.

1.3 ChristianMingle.com

The site was very simple and easy to understand. Menus were clearly marked, and everything was labeled very quickly.

2 Efficiency

2.1 E-harmony.com

E-harmony was efficient on every test except for search ability, which it tested very poorly in. Its search ability was foreign to users who were familiar with networking sites and caused users to be frustrated.

2.2 Match.com

Match.com was very intuitive to users for all aspects. Users felt that they could navigate the site quickly and efficiently with little errors and with a low learning curve.

2.3 ChristianMingle.com

Users liked how simple ChristianMingle.com was. They felt that the simplicity helped them navigate the site easily. The only thing that was not simple was updating profile information, which took users a few more clicks than necessary.

3 Satisfaction

3.1 E-harmony.com

Users felt this site was very good for something, but bad for dating itself. Users felt that it was next to impossible and very timely to connect with matches. Users had low satisfaction with the site.

3.2 Match.com

Users felt that this was the preferred choice in dating websites. It combined the comprehensiveness of E-harmony with the comprehensiveness of Match.com. Users were happy with how quick they picked up the site and how natural the interface was.




Figure 1: E-Harmony personality questions

3.3 ChristianMingle.com

Users felt Christian Mingle was easy to use, but too simple. Users did not feel that the creating a profile interface was comprehensive enough. Although the menus were simple, they felt that the actions they wanted to take were not always available in the menus.

4 Expectations of Dating Interfaces

For our report, we could not find any specific reference or guide specific to dating websites, so we used the government usability guidelines. The below sections will contain excerpts from usability.gov, and how they are seen on the dating websites.

4.1 "Designers should make every attempt to reduce the users workload by taking advantage of the computers capabilities."

Since dating websites often require a lot of input when making a profile, dating websites should have efficient ways to enter data and also vary in data entry style so that the user does not become bored.

4.1.1 E-harmony.com