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**Activity 2: Interaction Design**

**Hub Task Flow:**

1. URL: <https://github.com>
2. Pattern Description:   
     
   Hub task flow.   
     
   Given a navigation bar with a variety of options that lead to other pages with more information on GitHub in addition to links to the GitHub marketplace.
3. User goals accomplished by the flow:

* Easy sign-up portal
* Provide non-registered user information on GitHub
* Provide search functionality for non-registered user
* Access to GitHub repository explorer
* Web-application model allows for user to explore GitHub use-cases in a single, reactive webpage
* Intuitive user interface (easy to use with minimal instruction)
* Separated user/team/enterprise functions (progressive disclosure)

1. Critical analysis of whether flow is appropriate for user goals (2-4 sentences)

While the flow is appropriate for user goals as far as site navigation is concerned, it accomplishes more than it really needs to and doesn’t suitably point out various aspects of its functionality to a user. For example, on the main hub page, there’s no indication to scroll down to learn more about GitHub and its various use-cases, I had to stumble upon that experimentally. Also, the scaling and visibility of page items was not suitably tweaked for the 1080p monitor screen, and I found that things here and there would be cut off and needed to zoom out on the browser for them to be visible.

1. Suggested Improvements:

* Include clear user indicators of intended webpage function flow
* Possibly break the webpage down in such a way that scrolling is not necessary on the main hub page
* Tweak scaling on 1080p monitors so that manual browser-based zoom is not required

**Wizard Task Flow:**

1. URL: <https://www.adobe.com/acrobat/online/merge-pdf.html?mv=search&sdid=DZTGZX2P&ef_id=CjwKCAjwvNaYBhA3EiwACgndgh8rMhhcvVn_nRnNHUvXm7UhJ4_fVVtnMClcePriELGcXgzMegNn8BoCIrAQAvD_BwE:G:s&s_kwcid=AL!3085!3!559402382066!e!!g!!pdf%20combiner!13092672132!120630851645&cmpn=mobile-search&gclid=CjwKCAjwvNaYBhA3EiwACgndgh8rMhhcvVn_nRnNHUvXm7UhJ4_fVVtnMClcePriELGcXgzMegNn8BoCIrAQAvD_BwE>
2. Pattern Description:   
     
   Wizard task flow.  
     
   Provides select and upload option for pdf files. Then prompts user to select and order them. Then let’s user download them. There’s an added gate that forces the user to be logged in after using the wizard a couple times.
3. User goals accomplished by the flow:

* Select and upload pdfs to be merged
* Select and order pdfs (enable/disable if pdfs should not be included)
* Download merged pdf

1. Critical analysis of whether flow is appropriate for user goals (2-4 sentences)

The Wizard task flow is appropriate for the user goals. It is relatively straightforward to use, the process is only three steps so having to restart the process is not much of a hassle, and each step is necessary for completing the process. It doesn’t include more advanced customized controls, which is good because a simple base package that anyone should be able to use with minimal instruction should be like that. The only issue to be had with the wizard has to do with data privacy. Anything that gets uploaded to it will be entered into Adobe’s cloud server, which is not something that happens with other third-party solutions.

1. Suggest Improvements:

* Color scheme could be more visually and functionally appealing
* Remove force-login for additional use; there’s a large one-off use user group that will avoid the tool if they cannot use it without logging in
* Provide a means by which someone can still use the tool without providing Adobe data that it really should not have in the first place
* Make it so users can rename the downloaded file without logging in (this is something they will be able to do once it is downloaded anyway, so there’s 0 reason not to do this)
* Add a button to return to the beginning of the process if you have more pdfs you need to combine (there’s no way to go back besides manually using browser back button)

**Guided Task Flow:**

1. URL: <https://tuition.asu.edu/cost-calculator/tuition>
2. Pattern Description:   
     
   Guided task flow.   
     
   Provided with various options which weigh in on how an Arizona State University student’s tuition is calculated. Instructions are included in the guide, and steps can be skipped or included at the user’s leisure. Additional details appear as certain options are filled out.
3. User goals accomplished by the flow:

* Simple interface
* Provide instructions to fulfill input field requirements
* Include additional options to tune the calculator for more specific student types and statuses
* Breakdown cost for a specific number of credit hours

1. Critical analysis of whether flow is appropriate for user goals (2-4 sentences)  
     
   The guided task flow employed here provides enough flexibility that the student who does not know every piece of information in the form can still get a general estimate of what their tuition might be, which is nice. However, the reliability of the tool when fields are missing is questionable at best. A wizard that requires each field to be completed in turn might be better here to ensure that the form is properly completed for the most accurate results.
2. Suggested Improvements:

* Credit hour dropdown is occasionally bugged (sometimes goes up to only 7 credit hours, other times 12 credit hours); would be nice if credit number was capped at a larger number for students with overrides
* The credit hour dropdown instructions are behind an ( I ) information button unlike the rest of the fields to be entered, it would be more cohesive if each field just put the instructions above the field itself (or used the I… what’s important is unity and agreement)

**Progressive Disclosure:**

1. URL: <https://youtube.com/>
2. Pattern Description:  
     
   Hub task flow that uses progressive disclosure to button up application functionality.

Provides a home page with videos algorithmically tuned to appeal to a specific user. Has a hamburger menu for navigating between various modes of user and content criteria models (subscriptions, original, explore, etc.).

1. User goals accomplished by the flow:

* Search for video or music either by voice or text (accessibility)
* Simple, streamlined interface; not dissimilar from mobile interface
* Pages continue to deliver more media dynamically the more you scroll down – “feed-like” behavior
* Category filter provided based on user interest helps user find media that might interest them
* If there are advertisements, they are not pop-ups
* Fast/optimized content loading

1. Critical analysis of whether flow is appropriate for user goals (2-4 sentences)

YouTube has a decent design that would likely be a lot less successful if it wasn’t well-tailored to its purpose, however there are a few issues that hamper the flow of the page. There are redundant/repeated options that would probably make the page more cohesive if they were in a single place and easier to find. As it is, you either look in the hamburger menu (which Google planned to retire years ago and never did) or in the user submenu in the top right of the page, which I genuinely find annoying to use because on the mobile version of the site it is sometimes right next to the sign out button. Another issue is that in other Google Web applications, that settings button will bring up global google account settings, not the settings for that specific application. I would much prefer just a gear icon somewhere visible as it is in the desktop version of Gmail.

1. Suggest Improvements:

* Use metaphor to indicate settings in a more visible, easier to access location
* Perhaps make the search blend into the page better, as it is, the search bar is rather small and at the top on high resolution screens. It doesn’t scale with the interface very often either
* Ability to reposition mini-player on home page (and have the page respond to move elements around it)