James Dishman

UX 605041

Evaluation Fundamentals

Heuristic Evaluation

Website: Learning Music

https://learningmusic.ableton.com/

I chose this website for multiple reasons. Most importantly, I dream of working for Ableton. I have worked with them in a volunteer capacity for over a decade. The way this organization communicates information shapes how I approach design and why I decided to go into UX. I chose this website for heuristic evaluation because the concept being communicated is vast: music theory. Musical knowledge must be communicated multimodally; it involves the written word, sound, and visual information. For this site to be effective, it needs to leverage these multiple modalities and be valuable and beneficial to users with varying levels of musical understanding. Due to the complexity and depth of the topic, music theory, this information must be presented in a structured way that builds understanding with the user.

For this evaluation, I will use Nielsen's Heuristics (Nielsen, 1994), with a scale of 1 to 4.

- 1 = No concern
- 2 = Minimal issue / can address later
- 3 = Significant impact to end user or business / address sooner
- 4 = Major issue / highest priority / address right away

Heuristic Evaluation Results

1: Visibility of System Status

Score: 1

Explanation: The controls and accompanying audio are well synced, and the functions are straightforward, making them easy to understand. Interactions with the various controls all provide valuable feedback indicating their state. The playhead offers feedback on what is happening as the elements play over time. Button functions adapt to their current state. These factors allow the user to understand what is happening and how it relates to other content.

2: Match Between System and the Real World

Score: 2

The site uses standard musical terminology (tempo, beats, kick, clap, hi-hat) that aligns with conventions in music instruction and production. The interfaces are similar to those used in digital audio workstations and equipment, but are not explicitly assigned to any one technology, making them universal for users of different technologies. Musical concepts are described using standard musical terminology, which is explained to the user as they progress through the material. Button behaviors follow universal conventions. While

terminology is industry-standard, complete beginners may find terms like "bars" or "tempo" unfamiliar, even though they're correct in real-world music language.

3: User Control and Freedom

Score: 2

Explanation: The "reset", "clear", and "fill in solution" buttons are always accessible, allowing the user to restart the exercise easily. The site appears to save information in each lesson as you navigate forward and backward. Unfortunately, there is no undo button, but given the simplicity of the exercises, this is a minor inconvenience. The lack of a volume control is problematic for an audio-based experience.

4: Consistency and Standards

Score: 1

Explanation: Consistency is excellent throughout the entire site. The tempo, playhead, grid-based, and piano-roll-style interfaces are consistent with conventions used throughout the audio industry in other digital audio workstations and hardware interfaces. Navigation patterns are uniform throughout the site. Color coding of interface elements is consistent throughout the site.

5: Error Prevention

Score: 1

Explanation: The constraints of this website make it remarkably difficult to introduce errors. While it is possible to make incorrect note or beat placements, a step-by-step guide shows users how to perform the correct actions. The actions illustrated by these exercises are simple enough that fully resetting the exercise is not a significant problem if the user's experiments are no longer needed.

6: Recognition rather than Recall

Score: 1

Explanation: The layout and interface eliminate the need for memorization; everything is labeled and consistently located, while new concepts are introduced and explained on the same page. If a user wants to revisit the topic, they simply need to navigate back to the topic, which is labeled and easy to find in the site's navigation. There are no keyboard shortcuts, and whenever numeric keys can be used for input, they are clearly labeled in the interface. Progress is visually indicated and easy to ascertain.

7: Flexibility and Efficiency of Use

Score: 2

Explanation: This site is limited; it lacks keyboard shortcuts or any customization, but the limitations are acceptable given its core audience: beginners. Overcomplicating the interface for more advanced users would make the site less efficient for new users just learning the absolute basics of music and music production.

8: Aesthetic and Minimalist Design

Score: 1

Explanation: This design is a strong example of minimalist design. Information and capabilities presented are essential for each segment. This minimalism strengthens the site as an educational tool by eliminating excess contextual noise and complexity, lowering cognitive overhead.

9: Help Users Recognize, Diagnose, and Recover from Errors

Score: 2

The constraints of this site make it hard to create serious technical errors. However, users can easily create musically ineffective patterns, and there is no feedback to show them

why or how to remedy them. The ability to recover from such situations is rudimentary at best. The best the user can do is reset the entire exercise or ask for the answer. There is no explanation of what they did wrong, and no guidance on what they should do to make it right. Users only receive feedback when they complete the exercise correctly.

10: Help and Documentation

Score: 3

The site lacks help documentation and support resources. There is no searchable help section, glossary of musical terms, FAQ, or troubleshooting guide. Navigation is limited to sequential chapters with no search functionality to locate specific topics. For an educational tool, this absence creates barriers when users need clarification or encounter confusion, forcing them to rely entirely on intuitive design.

Assessment

Learning Music demonstrates exceptional usability across several areas, including system status visibility, consistency, aesthetic design, and error prevention. The interface successfully leverages recognition over recall and maintains strong alignment with real-world musical concepts. These strengths create an accessible, intuitive learning environment that lowers barriers to entry for music education. The minimalist design

philosophy effectively supports the educational mission by reducing cognitive load and maintaining focus on learning objectives.

Nothing is 'on fire' requiring immediate attention, the site functions well for its intended purpose, and identified issues represent opportunities for enhancement rather than critical failures. The most significant area for improvement would be Help and Documentation, adding a help section with technical information, a glossary, and a support contact could significantly improve the experience for users who need additional guidance. The minor usability problems include limited undo functionality and sparse feedback on musical choices. These could be addressed in future iterations but are less critical than documentation and flexibility improvements.

Discussion

Heuristic evaluation is a "discount usability" (NNgroup, 2023) technique where a team of trained evaluators (generally 3-5) (Interaction Design Foundation - IxDF, n.d.) examines an interface and judges its content against a predefined set of principles. The advantage of this type of evaluation is that it is fast, cost-effective, and flexible. It does not require specialized equipment and can be applied at various stages of the product's development, from early development to post-deployment. One advantage of this approach is identifying issues before deployment, which can save significant time and money.

Problems with heuristic evaluation develop from the evaluators themselves and from the lack of actual user input. Evaluators may identify false positives that do not affect real users, and the method provides no data on actual user performance or task completion rates (Interaction Design Foundation - IxDF, n.d.). Heuristic evaluations are typically conducted by usability specialists or UX professionals with expertise in interaction design, ideally with three to five evaluators working independently to maximize issue detection.

References

Interaction Design Foundation - IxDF. (n.d.). Heuristic evaluation.

https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/topics/heuristic-evaluation

Nielsen, J. (1994). 10 usability heuristics for user interface design.

Nielsen Norman Group.

https://www.nngroup.com/articles/ten-usability-heuristics/

NNgroup. (2023, March 17). Discount usability revisited (Jakob Nielsen

keynote) [Video]. YouTube.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9rPbcCC1vM