Web Evaluation

I have chosen two social networking websites to be compared which are Facebook and Friendster. The reason why I choose these two websites is that they are a lot of differences between these two in many areas. Although their function is the same which is to connect people all over the world, one of them has far better quality from another one. Which one is better? Let’s figure it out.

Firstly, let’s talk about Facebook. `Do you have Facebook account? Don’t forget to add me,ok!’. That’s a very familiar dialogue to us nowadays. Those who do not have Facebook account will be considered as obsolete. It is really obvious that it has become a phenomenon in the world today. But how about Friendster? Do people really care if we have its account or not? I will say no. Plus, we will be seen as outdated if we still use it. Is it because it is no longer relevant to us? What is so good about Facebook until everyone is crazy about it? That’s the questions that needed to be answered.

Obviously, Facebook is of better quality than Friendster in many aspects. The first aspect that we are going to look up is the content. We start with the name of both. There is no problem at all with the name for both sites. Facebook and Friendster is something easy to remember and pronounce. I think everyone will agree with me on that. The contents for both sites support the sites goal which is to connect people the sites. However, not all contents are appropriate for users. There are applications, advertisements or posts that are quite inappropriate. It is because both sites do not automatically filter what should be or should not be on their sites. However, Facebook give a choice for its users to filter the content that they think is not appropriate to them and they do not want it to appear on their page by blocking it or report it as spam. For Friendster, there’s no such thing. Besides, there will not be many problems for users to download multimedias from Facebook. The page is simple and not crowded with page background or music background. So, the internet connection will not be interrupted and it will take less time to download the file. For Friendster, a problem may occur and users need to wait much longer before they can finish downloading the files due to capacity of the page itself which is crowded with page background and music which will slower down the internet connection. Sometimes, the file format is not supported by some computer system as it requires higher one. Besides, the multimedia sometimes can be annoying rather than informative and appealing. For example, when we visit our friend’s page on Friendster, we will be annoyed with the music background which is not to our preferable. However, there’s nothing can be done because it is set like that by the owner. It will automatically appear on page once we visit it and there’s no button to stop the music. Facebook user will not face that kind of difficulty as there’s no music background in Facebook. With all the differences, there’s some similarities shared by these two sites. For both, the URL’s are really helpful in identifying the content as it follows order or flow. The page titles are also helpful in identifying the content. Regarding the text written, both sites use correct grammar with understandable language. The titles and headlines are written concisely and use the appropriate font size for easy online reading.

We move to another aspect which is the architecture aspect. For Facebook, the content is placed where it is supposed to be and can easily be found. However, for Friendster, it depends on users on how they set or organize their page. It means Friendster’s users are given more freedom to decide on how they want the content to appear. The bad thing about this is that it will be difficult for another user to search for the content on their friends’ pages because the location might be different from usual. The similarities between these two sites are that within three clicks, users can find important pieces of information from the home page. For example, when they want to see the photos, they can just click at the photo button, and the entire albums will appear. With another click, they can see the picture that they want to see. Plus, the content labels used to present the information architecture on the Web site are short, sweet and communicative. For example, a video camera label is used to represent videos button in Facebook.

The third aspect that we are going to look through is the navigation design aspect. For both Facebook and Friendster, the navigation designs fully support the information architecture. Besides, the aesthetics of the navigation design fully support its functionality. The navigation design provide site-wide context which will bring users to what they’re looking for in the sites. They will not lose and will find it easy to explore the sites. The screen design is appropriate for both the content and the users. Plus, the screen design fully supports the navigation design. There’s no problem with it. For Facebook, the navigation design does not really employ principles of graphic design and audio design as the page is quite simple and fixed with blue and white background and no audio background can be inserted. However, it really employs the interactivity design. The most obvious example is the chat button where users can chat with their friends all over the world and get respond from them immediately. If we compare Friendster with Facebook, Friendster is designed less interactive than Facebook. There’s no chat button in it and other application provided in Friendster also does not really employ interactivity design. However, it employs more on graphic design and audio design as it is not fixed and open to changes. It’s all depending on the users.

The last aspect that we want to discuss is the screen design. For both sites, the screen design is consistent throughout the site. Besides, all the vital information, including navigation, for each web page is visible without scrolling. For example, the photo button can be found on top of the page. The weakness of Friendster is that the screen design cannot be supported by all computer system. Sometimes, it requires high computer system to support the design. As the design is open to changes and depend on users to decide, a problem may occur if the users use the screen design which cannot be supported by computer system. This will not happen in Facebook as the screen design is already fixed. Lastly, Facebook screen are printable but not for Friendster.

Based on all evidences, it is undeniable that Facebook is much better than Friendster in many ways. No wonder it has become the most popular social networking site defeating Friendster and any other social networking sites like Myspace and Twitter. Go,go Facebook!