**DM7908 Wireframes Presentation**

Transcript

In this presentation I'm going to talk a little bit about the transition between early sketches and wire framing for the project. I particularly want spend some time talking about the wireframing because it's one part of this project that so closely mimics what would happen in a real world context with the client. Each wireframe allows me to visualise and plan the user interface elements to scale, seeing where they might clash or where there are contradictions between the product page and the AR experience.

While developing these wireframes I would be in discussion with the client, showing them previews along with my early sketches, talking through feedback via Zoom and then actioning it.

Also, before I continue, please feel free to pause the presentation and to read my annotations on each of the wireframes.

The first set of wire frames that I produced were all based on the static elements of the product page, including: the website header/navigation bar, the ‘buy’ bar that features the price and purchase button, the URL bar, and the navigation bar. As you can see there are three possible combinations that I could've chosen from.

On the middle design I have drawn lines in pink to show the reachable zones of a typical user using a mobile device (Babu, 2019). The right – most design shows how I experimented by moving the buy button to the centre of the Bible so that it was in the most reachable area. However both of these designs didn't look aesthetically pleasing, whereas the first option felt visually balanced and kept the website functions at the top of the screen, separate from the operating system functions at the bottom. This made most logical sense, so I went with it.

Once the static page elements were decided upon, I moved to focus on the rest of the product page. At first, translating my sketches into wireframes seemed like it would be a quick process, however as it involved reviewing my designs and putting them into a scale, I quickly found potential problems with them. For example, I hadn't considered where the scroll bar would go. Although the scroll bar is arguably less important on mobile devices where we intuitively swipe up and down to scroll, and most mobile users understand and expect webpages to scroll vertically, it still serves a purpose to orientate users, confirm their expectations, and help those living with vision-based or cognitive impairments. In the above two wire frames you can see how I have added some padding around the page elements, which will allow for the scroll bar to fit without overlapping any of them. A safe area would also have prevented this issue, but until I start working on medium and high Fidelity prototypes, I would not have pre-existing design guidelines, such as Apple’s Human Interface Guidelines to assist with this yet.

Throughout my studies on the master degree program, and this wire framing process is a shiny example of this, having to review your previous designs in and iterative fashion has allowed me to recognise where I have left out Key user interface elements or functionality that would be necessary. In this example I didn't consider that the video on the webpage would have to be muted and provide subtitles if I wanted it to automatic reply. If I failed to do this I would break web content accessibility guidelines, which state that all autoplaying media must've muted because unexpected sound can disorientate users and interfere with screen readers; and I wouldn't have included a button to mute and on mute the video either. So I'm thankful that this iterative process requires me to review previous design decisions and continuously build upon them.

Just a note that I would like to make at this stage: some uncertainties had arisen surrounding the design selector, animation selector and the AR-mode launching button. Particularly, I was unsure whether the interface and the user would behave correctly together; for example, would the user intuitively know to press the AR-mode launching button to launch the AR mode? Or, would they understand that the design selector needs to be tapped and not swiped? For this reason I would need to undertake a process of paper prototyping and usability testing. Skipping this part of the process might result in a poorer experience for users, and wasted time when more iterations need to be made in the medium-fidelity and high-fidelity prototyping stages, both of which are lengthier processes that could prove financially expensive for the client in a real world environment.

We need to wire frames you can see that I spent a bit of time debating whether to include edge to edge video, or a Windows video on the product Page. The edge-to-edge option appeared much more aesthetically pleasing and appeared to break the alignment conventions of the body text and headers on the page, grabbing the users attention. But, that would cause the scroll bar to overlap with the video. Again I find myself in a situation where aesthetics are at odds with accessibility, and I can't help but wonder which option would be chosen by an e-retailer in real life. I assume that this might depend on the client’s knowledge of their user base.

However, in the interest of stretching my design abilities using prototyping software I intend to pick the edge-to-edge option. I can also justify this by stating that scroll bars are hidden by default on Apple's mobile operating system, only appearing when a webpage is loading or when a user is actively scrolling.

My final product page wireframes addressed the lower portions of the product page, including the footer. At this stage the wireframing process had proven that all the page elements that were taken from the blossom and easel product pages, which I listed as a content directory, they have fit alongside any new page elements that I chose to include in my early sketches.

I found designing the user interface for the augmented reality experience more difficult than initially expected.

My expectations were that I could simply transfer elements from the product page and move them over to the AR experience, similarly to how I have moved the purchase bar across (see top of each wireframe).

An accessibility issue that I would just like to point out is that opens the reality experiences require the user to have a fairly good level of dexterity with their hands and be able to hold the device steady for the entire time that they are using the experience. However, as I have found in a previous module, there are a large amount of motor impairments that users can be living with that will prevent them from achieving this. So it seems necessary to create a shutter button that would allow the user to take a picture of the experience, effectively pausing it, so they can review it in more comfort later. By including this feature I am borrowing from some research from an earlier module, however it felt like such an important accessibility issue to include, and this was the correct time to add it into my early plans.

However, as I continued to design this interface I realised that it requires a lot more interaction between the user and the experience than a product page, and unless the behaviour and layout of the interface elements adhered to the users’ expectations, users might become confused by the experience and it will fail to achieve its goals.

It was at this point that I researched the default camera application on the iPhone, realising that a large amount of the mobile and tablet market would have already encountered this application (or similar if using an android device). In theory, the user-base would already be acquainted with the layout and behaviour of the interface elements; if I could leverage this knowledge, then I should be able to prove in a usability test that the user could use the AR experience without requiring more of the cognitive load than necessary. I suppose my theory is very similar to Jakob’s law, stating that websites user’s spend most of their time on other people’s websites rather than your own, and so their expectations are set accordingly.

This did affect my decision making for certain aspects of the user interface. For example the design selector was changed from being vertically aligned to being horizontal line, and I then had to review the product page to ensure that it was consistent across both experiences, as this would create a high level of find ability for the user.

As a user experience designer, dependent on my particular role with the client and within a large UX design company, it would be at this point that I may handover the client-approved wireframes to a digital designer who would turn them into prototypes. However, as this process has raised a few questions over some of the interactive elements in the user interface, I would instead hand these designs to the usability testing team so that they can create some papers types and carry out usability testing.

Hopefully this presentation has given you a clear understanding of the wireframing process for the project. I feel that my wireframing skills have dramatically improved since my first UX project, especially in that the process of interpreting my sketches as wireframes is now far more purposeful because I can critique my design decisions from accessibility and functionality perspectives; for example when I'm wireframing I'm immediately considering how reachable or findable the user interface elements are, or perhaps how the layout might be interpreted by someone living with a motor impairment.

The next stage of my project is going to be the low fidelity prototyping stage. If I were a usability tester for example, I will be expecting to now receive wireframes like these and interpret those as paper prototype's that I can go out and test with a representative sample of the clients user base. That's what I'll be looking to do in the next stage of the project, but until then, see you soon.