

Design principles

Michel Beaudouin-Lafon - mbl@lisn.fr

Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire des Sciences du Numérique (LISN)

Ex Situ - <http://ex-situ.lri.fr>

Outline

Qualities of an interactive system

“The design of everyday things” - Don Norman

Affordances & Signifiers

Metaphors

Design principles

Qualities of an interactive system

Useful

Addresses user needs
Collect, analyze, understand

Usable

Adapted to users's skills
Adapted to the context of use

Simple

Simple things must be simple
Making things simple is difficult!


Powerful

Complex things should be possible
Complex \neq complicated!


Transparent

The interface does not get in the way

Conceptual model vs. Mental model



Conceptual model



Objects:

What the user wants to manipulate

Operations:

What the user wants to do with the objects

Commands:

How the user can activate the operations

Mental model

Operational representation of the world in one's head

Example : instructions to get home

Provides a **structure to link causes and effects**

Supports **explanations**

What do I see? What does it mean?

What did just happen? Why?

What did I do that created this situation?

Supports **predictions**

What can I do now?

What happens if I do this?

Good design

Correspondence between conceptual model and mental model:

- improved by taking advantage of **affordances**
- improved by a proper use of **metaphors**
- improved by following proper **design guidelines**

In case of poor correspondence:

- Manipulation errors
- Frustration
- Lower productivity




Principled design

We understand physical objects

Objects persist

Objects have properties



We understand physical tools

Tools affect objects

Tools are objects



Create digital objects

Turn concepts into persistent, interactive objects



Create digital tools

Turn commands (e.g. scrolling) into tools (e.g. scrollbar)




The design of everyday things - Norman, 1990

Everyday objects reflect the problems
in user interface design

- Door handles
- Washing machines
- Telephones
- etc.

Introduces the notions of *affordance* (/signifier),
mapping, *metaphor*, and *conceptual model*

Provides a set of *design rules*



How to use these doors?



How to use these doors?



How to use these doors?



Affordances – James J. Gibson


The capabilities of an object for action

“... the affordances of the environment are what it offers the animal, what it provides or furnishes, either for good or ill...”

James Gibson



The affordance exists even if it is not perceived




Affordances

The shape, size, aspect of an object suggests what it can be used for

A button is meant to be pushed

A handle is meant to be turned



Button - Push

Switch - Flip

Knob - Rotate

<https://enginess.io/insights/whats-new-design-of-everyday-things>

Foundation of our knowledge of the world

“Much of our everyday knowledge resides in the world, not in the head”


Norman, 1988

Perceptual learning – Eleanor Gibson


Learning to recognize affordances

Visual cliff experiment

“We perceive to learn,
as well as we learn to perceive”
Eleanor Gibson



Perception of affordances





Perception of affordances

Perception

Not perceived

Perceived



Present

Absent

Affordance

Signifiers (not affordances) – Don Norman

Perceived affordance:

perception of the capabilities of an object for action
based on properties of the object that are **perceived directly**

A handle affords grasping because of its shape
and as we grasp it we perceive
the affordance for turning it



When the affordance is not perceivable,
or is misleading, we can add a **signifier**:
an indication (word, icon, arrow) of the action


Signifiers are often **separate from the object**,
and **not perceived directly**:
a sign needs to be interpreted




Affordances vs. Signifiers

Signifier	Absent	Hidden affordance	Correct rejection
	Present	Perceivable affordance	False affordance
		Present	Absent
		Affordance	

Affordances vs. Signifiers



Affordance vs. Signifier is often misunderstood




Signifier

- Sign to explain what to do (because the affordances are ~~confusing~~)

Affordance

- Handle to ~~physically grasp~~ push (but not pull)

Affordance vs. Signifier is often misunderstood



Signifier

- Sign to explain what to do (because the affordances are confusing)

Affordance

for pushing
but

False affordance
for pulling

In summary

Affordances are capabilities for action by the subject

They exist independently of whether or not they are perceived

The perception of affordances is learned

We recognized object properties (shape, size, color, ...)
that indicate capabilities for action: *direct perception*

But we can be fooled by perception

hidden affordance: present but not perceived

false affordance: perceived but not present

Signifiers are added signs to indicate the presence of an affordance


What it means for (graphical) interaction design

In a GUI the main actions are click, drag, and enter text

What is clickable?



What is draggable?

Where can text be entered?



These are signifiers: graphical conventions that we learn to recognize

But that we sometimes fail to recognize



What it means for (graphical) interaction design

Skeuomorphic design tries to build on direct perception of affordances



BUT: an image of an object is not the object



What it means for (graphical) interaction design


The advent of “flat” design hides affordances



2007




2012



2015

from <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/flat-design/>


Google’s “material design”
uses shading in misleading ways




What it means for (graphical) interaction design

Many interactions don't even have signifiers


Pull to refresh



Swipe to delete



Pinch to insert



...

Clear app

Metaphor

Figure of speech:

establishes a link between two words, without a comparative
(while comparison includes the comparative)

Example:

The moon is a golden sickle

Direct metaphor

A golden sickle lights the night

More generally:


Transfers a relationship from one set of objects to another set

To be efficient, the comparative (or the transfer)
must be immediately guessed or understood



Example: Desktop metaphor

Compares objects of the virtual desk
with objects of a real desk








Transfers properties from physical to on-line world:
Move, Open, put in trashcan, ...

The goal is not to simulate a real desk
but to take advantage of our knowledge of a real desk

Goal: Save learning
Capitalize on external knowledge
Takes advantages of affordances in the real world

MagicCap: metaphor gone wrong



BumpTop: good or bad?



3 principles from Norman (1990)

Recommendations to create « good » conceptual models

1- **Make things visible**

The user can know the state of the system
by observing the interface

2- **Mapping principle**

Help understand the correspondence between

- Actions and results
- Controls and their effects
- The state of the system and what is visible

3- **Feedback principle**


Inform the user

Mapping: which knob controls which burner?




Natural mappings (Norman)

Spatial similarity




Conceptual similarity



Behavioral similarity



Natural



Unnatural



8 design rules from Shneiderman (1998)

1. Consistency
2. Short-cuts for expert users
3. Informative feedback
4. Design dialogues with closures
5. Prevent errors and help repair them
6. Provide reversible operations
7. Give control to the user
8. Reduce short-term cognitive load


There are dozens of recommendations and hundreds of rules...

For every rule, there are exceptions...

Conclusion


The design funnel

- First generate alternatives
- Then select the best ones
- Then do it again



Explore/Refine

- Breadth-first exploration:
 - explore alternatives
- Depth-first refinement:
 - refine a design



Conclusion


“Most people make the mistake of thinking design is what it looks like.

People think it’s this veneer – that the designers are handed this box and told, ‘Make it look good!’ That’s not what we think design is.

Design is not just what it looks like and feels like. Design is how it works”

Steve Jobs

1955-2011



Conclusion

Making things simple is difficult

“A good design is better than you think!”

Dieter Rams: a good design...

1. Is innovative
2. Makes a product useful
3. Is aesthetic
4. Makes a product understandable
5. Is unobtrusive
6. Is honest
7. Is long-lasting
8. Is thorough down to the last detail
9. Is environmentally friendly
10. Involves as little design as possible

