Subject: Re: n00bstories.com 2.0 goes live!
Posted by Crimson on Sat, 05 Sep 2009 06:54:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chuck Norris wrote on Fri, 04 September 2009 21:47Glock~ wrote on Fri, 04 September 2009 20:39FUD Forums ftw! Looks good.
Not really. Just about most other stuff out there tops it, although it is a very simple and stable forum software.

As for this change, there's good things and bad things.

First of all, Good job getting rid of the standard FUD Forum look on the forums. That's one of the biggest things I dislike about it (and this site). The main site also doesn't have the old fashioned look anymore either.

Now, for the bad. There's two things that strike me as obvious.

Despite the more modern approach with the style, I still do not like the new look, namely the color scheme (Grey, Grey, and more Grey, and there's even Grey text on a Grey backdrop). It's very monotonous, boring, and unoriginal (I'm referring to the look, not the site itself, of course). Overall, it's alot less recognizable and original, even if it doesn't look so old fashioned and has alot of new features.

Secondly, it appears it's not supportive of 1024x768? You need a 1280 width to see the whole page horizontally without scroll bars. While 1280x1024, 1680x1050, and countless others are becoming more modern, 1024x768 still has the largest amount of users. It's easy to think anything below 1280xwhatever doesn't exist when you've had a 1680x1050 screen for a few years, but the web is a different place. Also, many users with larger screens don't run their browser window full size (like me, which is how I noticed this about the site). I really question this move. Do sample the resolution of the visitors to your site, if you can, and use that to judge. You really won't even be able to judge that as it relies on Javascript to work, and not everyone has that/enabled that. If it's not in the low single digits (1024x768 views), you can't assume the use of it on your site is extinct, and should therefore make the site be supportive of it. From a design standpoint, this is a large mistake.

http://www.hobo-web.co.uk/tips/25.htm

P.S. I'm linking to that for the article itself, not the figures for the resolutions. Note that the figures there are for their site only. For others, 1024x768 use may even be ~50%, and for others, it may be even less than theirs.

Overall, I think the look is a letdown, and not supporting the single largest resolution in use is a bit of a surprise, but I can understand why the revamp was done, and outside those two things, everything else looks to be better.

Thanks to my Google Analytics I know that our visitors are less than 15% using a resolution lower than 1280 pixels wide.