Interaction Analysis 6/7

I'll continue with the system I have used in my previous essays. The system I'm analyzing consists of two clearly separate parts. One part is a webstore that entails a user management system, and the second part is a virtual shopping cart system used in a warehouse. These are the two biggest segments that the system can be broken into. These segment probably don't translate to the user as part of the same system, but as two separate services provided by the b2b HVAC wholesale company. These systems have very different functions and look different and are meant for different devices. The webstore is more designed for desktop and the virtual shopping cart is for mobile phones and almost useless on desktop. But these parts are part of the same code so they can be considered apart of the same system. I'll be analyzing the webstore part as the virtual cart has only one function and can't be broken down much more.

The ideal situation with segmentation is that it is clear to the user what the segment entails and the is no overlap between the segments. In the best case one granule of information is contained within one segment. It can be frustrating for a user if the right granule is not easily found.

The system provides different options and function for different users. It's divided to non-logged users, customers, salespeople, and admins. Non-logged users being the least powerful and admins being the most powerful. The next paragraph provides an example of segmentation the system that can be viewed by all but non-logged users.

This system has a problem with its segmentation. Some segment and there for granules of information are hard to find. The user must open a site from the menu to see what segment it has with in. For example, 'Personal information' (suom. Omat tiedot) contains the user information as expected but also 'Own shopping carts' (suom. Omat ostoskorit), 'Order history' (suom. Tilaushistoria), and 'More information about products' (suom. Lisätietoa tuotteista). 'Personal information' is information like name, user id, email, billing address and delivery address. 'Own shopping cart' is a list of shopping carts the user has saved and can change and reorder. A link to this page is also in the main menu. It is an important feature, but better segmentation could have prevented the double occurrence of the link to

the page. ‘Order history’ has the main user’s previous orders, so all sub users see all other sub users’ previous orders. This is the way the feature is meant to be. The users need to see all the orders as they are in the same business and need to know these things. But the main segments name is misleading is this is not “personal” information.

From this explanation it should be clear that the site uses semantic segmentation the link names which also serve as titles clearly state what’s in them. ‘More information about products’ is the only one that is clearly not ‘personal information’. This part of the site list all the certificates and technical catalogues for the product that can’t be available for the non-logged users. The certificates and catalogues are only available for the product the user has bought. With the knowledge of the context the placement of this segment makes more sense. Another problem is that this segment has a lot of information that repeats itself. The certificates and catalogues are added every time the user buys a new product even if the users already have access to those certificates and catalogues from previous purchases. This segment can explode in size very fast, and it can be difficult to find the right files.

A solution for this whole segmentation problem would be to reconsider the segmentation and the semantics of the segmentation. Two solutions for: all the sub segments could be moved to the main menu, or the main menu link could display list of the sub segments it contains. Most modern websites do this and popular website builder like Wordpress have this feature build in them so that it’s always automatic. The ‘more information about products’ page need better logic in it make it more user friendly. The problem with adding this logic is appropriately about semantics: the file names are manually written so there can still be duplicates even with better logic due to human error and different peoples’ naming practices. The other problem is how to display the files for right product with out the product lists in themself exploding to huge hard to read lists.

This project is old and leaves lot to be desired. The segmentation is not bad but the semantics of the segmentation in relation to the positioning of the links that take the user to the location should be changed. The fact that the example case is behind login redeems the semantics a bit as the user has an idea of the context and what the sites might contain.

Self-Evaluation

Structure: 2. I have a beginning end and a middle clearly

Clarity: 2 My thought come across. I clearly state the example case and analyze it in their own paragraphs.

Content: 2 I stay very much within the assignment. I'm happy the big bulk of my text is clear analysis of the segmentation.

Evaluation/criticism: 2 I came up with good and doable ways to make the system better.

Big picture: 2 This analysis is very much rooted in the real life and project.

I feel happy with this essay. I especially satisfied with how much analysis there is in this essay. I also felt motivates to write and feel like the text came out clearer. So better in all the part I felt lacking the last time I wrote aa essay. All give myself full point 10!