

## ACIT 2811 - Heuristic Evaluation - Crowdsourcing

### Visibility of system status

For both documents, you can see the login status which is nice to have because you can easily see if you are logged in from wherever you are on the site. If you are not signed in, then it shows you a generic profile icon and if you are signed in then it shows you the profile picture.

### Match between system and the real world

All the words in both documents are consistent with the real world. Everything makes sense with what it navigates to. However, we suggest that for the second document, you change it from “Discovery” to “Discover”. Discovery makes it unclear as to what it is whereas discover is more appropriate.

### User control and freedom

For both documents, navigating between different pages appears easy because the navigation bar contains the most used options like home, profile, support etc. We assume the hamburger menu in the navigation bar has the user’s requests and applications, which can be accessed from any page. Presence of these features allows user control and freedom to access any page from anywhere.

### Consistency and standards

For both documents, the symbols are consistent with what a user would generally think they are meant for. In the second documentation, we liked how you laid out the IT professionals and found requests because it makes it easy for the users.

### Error prevention

For both documents, we can't guess what errors can be presented from the static view. A suggestion is to have a popup message before accepting or declining an offer.

### Recognition rather than recall

For the second document, it does a good job of helping users recognize rather than recall. Users don't have to try hard to remember where certain functions are. The navigation bar shows the different views and the hamburger menu is always there to access different functions. For the first document, the navigation bar is easily recognizable but the hamburger menu is not. There is a dropdown arrow menu on the right side which we assume is the hamburger menu. We would suggest changing that to a typical hamburger menu so it is more recognizable. Apart from that, both documents make it clear to recognize different functions.

### Flexibility and efficiency of use

For both documents, the hamburger menu and navigation bar act as easy and efficient ways of accessing any page from anywhere (for the first document, we assumed the dropdown (arrow) menu to have the same functionality as a hamburger menu). Apart from these, we can't really tell if there are any keyboard shortcuts needed for efficient use.

### Aesthetic and minimalist design

For both of the documents, we liked how you kept the color scheme the same. For the first document, the colors are bolder and a little difficult to see the text at the bottom of the website template page. It contains unnecessary information about how to use the URL search feature. The font looks more trendy for this document, it's better to use a plain font, like the one used in the second document. For the second document, the style is minimalistic and easy on the eyes which makes the application more appealing. There's no crowded information and it looks aesthetically pleasing.

### Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors

Since the design is static, we can't tell what the error messages are. So in case a user runs into some error, we suggest displaying a clear error message describing the issue, instead of status codes, and instructions on resolving it and going back to normal view.

### Help and documentation

For both documents, it is clear where you can go if you need help navigating through the site. Both navigation bars show a Help button which is very helpful. Both document views provide the option for the necessary help documentation. One suggestion we would make is to add links or video tutorials to the help page so it makes it easier for the user.

### General comments:

In general, we noticed many inconsistencies with the two document views. Both the website layouts make it seem like there are two different app ideas. The first document is unclear because under the URL bar it says “The above bar will find the Website then copy its code to fix” which makes us think that it’s an app that fixes code. The second document clearly shows that it’s an app for crowdsourcing any tasks or jobs. We didn’t really understand what was happening with the first one and whether or not it was the same idea. Second one was really good at showing what the application’s purpose was. We prefer the second document’s view.