UX DECISION AUDIT

Foyr Ideate

AI design exploration & selection flow · Cognitive load, trust gaps, decision friction

4	3	2
Critical Issues	High Issues	Medium Issues

Core Finding

⚡ The product generates outputs, not experiences — and users pay the cost

Foyr Ideate has optimized for AI generation speed while leaving the entire human side of the loop undesigned. There is no scaffolding for evaluation, no feedback mechanism that matches how taste actually works, and no visible reasoning from the AI — so users enter a paralysis loop: too much to look at, no way to react, no path forward that feels safe. The interaction model is a gallery, but users need a collaborator.

Issue Analysis

COGNITIVE LOAD ISSUES

CRITICAL	**Simultaneous multi-design display exceeds working memory capacity**
ISSUE Multiple AI-generated designs are shown at once with equal visual weight, no	

hierarchy, and no anchor point — forcing users to hold, compare, and evaluate everything simultaneously.

WHY

Miller's Law meets aesthetic complexity: working memory caps at ~4 items, but each design is not a discrete 'item' — it is a dense aesthetic system with dozens of variables. The display treats outputs as thumbnails when users experie

nce them as rooms. The cognitive load is not 4×, it is exponential.

FIXES

- **Sequential reveal — show 1, then let user request more**

re

- Anchor+compare: fix one result, overlay alternatives
- Dimno

n-focused cards on hover
- Limit initial view to 2 options max

CRITICAL	No evaluation framework — users don’t know what “better” means here

ISSUE

The interface presents competing designs without surfacing comparison dimensions — users have no axis (mood, light, style density, colour temperature) on which to anchor judgment, so they default to paralysis or arbitrary selection.

WHY

The system confuses visual legibility with evaluative legibility. Users can see the designs clearly — but

‘seeing’ a room and ‘evaluating’ a design decision are cognitively different tasks. Without a scaffolded evaluation model, users apply none, freeze, and blame themselves for not knowing what they want.

FIXES

- **Auto-generated comparison**

sontagsperdesign(“warmerpalette”,“moreopenplan”)

- Side-b

y-sidediffmodewithhighlightedddeltas

- Guidedevaluationpro

mpt: “Which feels more like you?”

- Dimensions slider that reflec

t c u r r e n t d e s i g n s t a t e

TRUST GAPS & UNCERTAINTY POINTS

CRITICAL	AI rationale is invisible — outputs feel arbitrary, not generated
ISSUE Designs appear with no trace of the inputs, logic, or style signals that produced them. Users cannot tell if the AI understood them, guessed randomly, or generated from defaults.	

WHY

The Gulf of Evaluation is total. Norman's principle states that users need feedback to understand whether their actions had the intended effect. Here, the 'action' (entering preferences) is disconnected from the 'effect' (designs generated) with zero visible trace — so users can't evaluate the AI's understanding, only its output. Trust is impossible to build

without a reasoning trail.

FIXES

- **“Why this design?” card under each result**
- **Input echo: “Ge**

nerated from: warmtones.openlayout.Nordicstyle”

- Highlight

which user inputs influenced which design elements

- Confidence

signal: “Strongmatch” vs “Creative interpretation”

HIGH	Input-to-output disconnect makes users feel like spectators, not authors
ISSUE Users feel like	

they are guessing when they interact with the AI — there is no visible mapping between what they specified and what was produced, destroying the sense of creative agency.

WHY

The Gulf of Execution is wide and unacknowledged. Users need to feel that their intent maps to system behavior. When the system acts like a black box, users experience it as a slot

machine — and slot machine interactions are engaging for gambling, not for high-investment design decisions where authorship matters.

FIXES

- **Live preview responses as users adjusti**

- **nputs Intent confirmation before generation (“Here’s what I’m**

designingforyou…“)

- Input-taggeddesignelements(tapelemen

t → see which input drove it)

DECISION-MAKING FRICTION

CRITICAL	**Feedback mechanism is absent — refinement requires language users don’t have**
ISSUE Users struggle to give feedback to refine designs. The only apparent path is re-entering text prompts — but design preference is pre-verbal and users can’t	

articulate what's wrong with a room, only that something is.

WHY

The feedback model is built for designers, deployed to homeowners. Expert critique requires vocabulary that most users have never developed. Asking them to type feedback is the equivalent of asking someone to describe the taste they want before they've tasted anything. The refinement loop

needs input modalities that match how non-expert taste actually works: visual, comparative, gestural.

FIXES

- **Bipolar sliders: warmer ↔ cooler, minimal ↔ l**

- **ayered, bright ↔ moody Tap-to-annotate: mark what you like/dis**

- **like on the image**
- **Swipe card rating: keep/lose/more like this**
- **Al**

- suggested refinements: “Want it cosier? Try this variation →”

CRITICAL	**Selection feels irreversible — fear of commitment triggers avoidance**
ISSUE Users hesitate to select a design because they fear making the wrong choice. There are no visible undo affordances, no save-for-later, no ‘shortlist’ model — selection signals finality. WHY Loss Aversion in a domain with no safety net. Interior design carries high real-world stakes in the user’s mind, even at the explorat	

ion phase. When an interface provides no reversibility signal, it amplifies that perceived risk. The UX should communicate “this is a canvas, not a contract” — but instead it reads like a checkout screen.

FIXES

- **Explicit reversibility a**

bel: “Youcanalwayschangeorregenerate”

- **Shortlist/boardmod**

- **el: savemultipleoptionswithoutcommitting Version history:**

- auto-save every design state
- CTA copy shift: “Explore this dire

c t i o n → ” n o t “ S e l e c t ”

USABILITY ISSUES

HIGH	**No progress model — users don’t know where they are in the design journey**
ISSUE The flow lacks a visible design journey model — users don’t know if they’re at the beginning of exploration, mid-refinement, or approaching a final decision. Sessions feel	

undirected.

WHY

Without a map, every action feels equally meaningless. Visibility of system status (Nielsen heuristic #1) applies not just to loading states but to process position. Users need to know: am I narrowing down or still exploring? That orientation changes how they make decisions.

FIXES

- **Journeys**

- **Stage indicator: Explore → Refine → Commit**
- **Session breadcrumb: s**

howhowdesignshaveevolved

- **Milestoneprompts: “You’veshortl**

isted 3 — ready to compare? ”

MEDIUM	**Design results lack hierarchy — everything demands equal attention**
ISSUE All generated designs are presented with identical visual weight — same size, same prominence, no AI-ranked ‘best match’ signal. Users have no starting point and no natural	

focus of attention.

WHY

Visual democracy in a results set is a UX abdication. When every result looks equally important, the UI delegates the entire evaluation burden to the user. A ranked or signalled hierarchy — even a ‘closest to your brief’ badge — gives users an anchor and dramatically reduces time-to-first-interaction.

FIXES

- **“B**

- **Primary + second estimate” badge on highest-confidence result**

arylayout:1hero+result+2alternatives

- **Sort options: by match**

%, by style, by mood

HIGH	No progress model — missing journey stage indicator
ISSUE Users don’t know whether they are in an early exploration phase, a refinement phase, or approaching commitment. Without stage clarity, every decision feels equally weighty. WHY Lack of wayfinding collapse	

s the mental model of the task. When users can’t locate themselves in a process, they treat every action as high-stakes, amplifying hesitation across the entire flow.

FIXES

- **Explicit Explore → Refine → Com**

- **mit progress indicator**
- **Stage-contextual prompts (“Still expl**

oring? Save a few favourites first”)

- Auto-advance stage when sh

ortlistthresholdismet

A/B Experiments

A/B TEST 1

Rationale card vs. no rationale on design outputs

CONTROL	VARIANT	METRICS
Designs shown with no explanation — current state	“Why this design?” card under each result showing input echoes and style tags	Selection rate · Time-to-first-click · Regeneration rate

A/B TEST 2

Sequential reveal (1 at a time) vs. grid display (all at once)

CONTROL	VARIANT	METRICS
Full grid of generated designs shown simultaneously	One design shown at a time with “Show another” and “Keep this” actions	Selection confidence score (post-task) · Session completion · Drop-off rate

A/B TEST 3

Structured micro-feedback (sliders) vs. freeform text refinement

CONTROL	VARIANT	METRICS
Text prompt input to refine design — current state	Bipolar sliders (warmer/cooler, minimal/layered) + “More like this” / “Less like this” tap	Refinement engagement rate · Iterations per session · Final selection rate

A/B TEST 4

“Explore this direction” CTA copy vs. “Select” CTA

CONTROL	VARIANT	METRICS
Primary CTA labeled “Select” or “Choose this design”	CTA labeled “Explore this direction →” with secondary “Save to shortlist” action	CTA click-through rate · Bounce from CTA · Downstream engagement depth

---

What to Fix First

1	**Fix Now** Surface AI rationale on every design output. This is a one-sprint intervention with outsized return: it directly addresses trust collapse, reduces the evaluation burden, and turns an opaque output into a legible design decision. Without it, every other improvement is built on a broken foundation.
2	**Next Sprint** Replace freeform text refinement with structured micro-feedback (sliders + tap interactions). The current feedback model is inaccessible for the vast majority of users. Non-verbal feedback mechanisms will unlock the refinement loop entirely and materially increase session depth, return visits, and selection rate.
3	**Strategic** Redesign the output presentation model from gallery to guided collaboration. Introduce sequential reveal, a shortlist board, reversibility signals, and a journey stage indicator. This is a systemic reframe of the product interaction model — from “AI generates, human picks” to “AI and user co-narrow toward a decision.”