

**How to Create a Lens Flare Effect in Adobe After Effect**  
**(Useability Report)**

Ethan Le

Montclair State University

WRIT 207: Technical Writing and Communication

Professor Martin

October 11, 2022

## **How to Create a Lens Flare Effect in Adobe After Effect**

### **(Useability Report)**

At the inception of the idea, the instructions were meant to be written for everyday users—anyone with a curiosity for amateur filmmaking. Mostly, the document was targeted toward more students and groups that are more technologically advanced. The “lens flare” effect was primarily reserved for filmmakers that just got into the field of editing. The demographic I was aiming for was college students and novice users of Adobe’s After Effect—a younger generation with the age gap between 16 and 40. For the instructions to become potent, the readers should have some background in video editing as well computer literacy. To most, the readers will likely be students that have a strong interest in filmmaking, or at least video editing. Without any technological background knowledge, the users would have a more stressful time dealing with the terminologies as well as the user interface of everything.

As the process of writing went on, I kept my goal of inclusion, and wrote the document as if anyone could follow it. I started with an introduction paragraph to nicely explain what is the “lens flare” effect. The language was thought out as plain and simple as possible, adding the component of accurate visual aids to help users follow the instructions. Action words in the steps were color-coded to easily spot out of the chunk of texts, so users would notice the immediate process. The biggest obstacle in the process was translating complex technological concepts into everyday language. The images side-by-side with the text did make an impact on gathering understanding, but nonetheless, the concept was extremely advanced for the general audience. My goal was trying to be as specific as possible without being verbose or overwhelming. Hence, I spaced out many steps so they would not seem like clusters, easing the frustration of performing complex tasks for some. I even stacked the images in different locations on the paper

to add dynamic elements to avoid boring repetitions. Unfortunately, the technological language still lingered throughout the document, making it very hard to comprehend if read by someone who never touched a computer.

Through the testing of the instructions, I received a lot of constructive critiques from the tester. Although the user was an expert in this trial—the intended audience was non-specialists and regular users, still, he remained professional and unbiased to the best of his ability. One of the most important things he brought up during the testing process was the clarity of the instructions. Some parts of the instruction were very questioning and confusing due to the lack of specific information to bridge between the steps. The user was also struggling in understanding the language I wrote; however, he praised the visual aids to be very helpful and useful during the process.

Most of the confusion was embedded in my inherited knowledge on the subject. In doing so, the user was having trouble with navigating the user interface of the application (from adjusting the scale of a video to searching for the videos' names in the panels). There were also some steps that were skipped, so the user was dumbfounded on how to do certain things in order to move on. Names and labels in the application could have been clearer for the tester to locate the necessary tools to perform the tasks at hand. Additionally, the tester also mentioned the importance of chronological order; the user had some confusions on the steps since things unfolded differently on the application compared to the instructions.

The most important issue the user brought up was the lack of accessibility. The instructions were missing a lot of color coding and referencing. The steps were written as if the audience knew the basic user interface of Adobe After Effect. The user got more confusing upon knowing where things were among the panels. There was not a lot of backtracking in the

instructions, so the tester had a frustrating time going back and forth on the process—to seek for the already-established steps to perform the same function for the new task. Some of the images could be more apprehensively labeled and more noticeable when reading. Plus, disclaimers were needed in some steps so that the next user (or whoever read the instruction next) can be prepared if things didn't go exactly like the steps. In the end, the tester made it through the process with the final result being nearly exact like the intended outcome. The language needed to be clearer, and there should be more disclaimers to explicitly explain if things didn't turn out like the given visual aids. Nevertheless, the user did congratulate me on translating such a complex task into a more simplistic understanding language, along with noticeable visual aids, for regular users.

After gathering all the feedback, I decided to craft the instruction to be more catered towards a more general audience. I added more details on the steps, especially the names and locations of the tools and panels. Some steps even have a specific icon to clearly point out what exactly needed to be clicked on as well as selected from. More color-coded words were added and altered so that the users can follow the steps more easily. Plus, the colors created better urgency and focus for the user to stay on task. Accessibility played a big part of the instructions, so by implementing a more direct focus, the users would have a better chance of narrowing their visions to the colorful text; the steps would be apparent to the audience. I even color-coded the locations of panels, tabs, and/or tools to let the audience have an easier navigational time.

More visual aids were added so that the users will have a better time following the steps that were given. Indications and correct terminologies were also implemented—in so, making the document become more credible and researched. The organization of the document was also rectified; the steps unfolded correctly as well as the pictures—whatever step the user followed, the images and directions should correspond with the whatever on screen. Additionally,

disclaimers were included in certain steps; they acted as notes (in purple) to raise attention to events that may happen if the steps were not performed correctly. I put this feature in to better clarify the uncommon errors or mishaps.

Furthermore, I computed a graphic background into the document to boost the overall quality of the instructions. By executing a “lens flare effect” background image, the document had a fitting theme to accompany the instructions.

Ultimately, based on the helpful criticisms, I cleared almost all of the confusion. With a better design and a simpler, more specificized language, the users can now navigate and follow the document with ease. The organization is more structured and more accommodating, so the document can be read easier and less troublesome compared to the testing trial. Accessibility is key to instructions since the document is targeted toward more non-specialists rather than experts. Along with exact visual aids and color-coding words, the document also features notes as a type of disclaimers for users to recognize the errors along the way—a precautionary way to save time. Conclusively, the feedback brought tremendous help into finalizing the document to be better than what it was. Better clarity, better writing, and better visual as well as accessibility transform the instructions to be of a more professional document that can be used by everyday users.