

Derik Keith

Thursday Sep 14 at 12:29am

[Manage Discussion Entry](#)

Summary of Websites

I am evaluating two different agricultural service websites and their functionality for farmers. The first site is GFG Ag Services and the second is MFA Inc. Both offer their service around my hometown of Trenton, and vary from buying grain to selling seed. I have had interactions in person with both companies, but had not considered their websites much until now. Each website includes contact information, services offered, weather, prices, and has multiple links and pictures.

Site 1: <http://www.hoffmanreed.com> (Links to an external site.)[Links to an external site.](#)

Site 2: <http://www.trentonmfa.com> (Links to an external site.)[Links to an external site.](#)

Design Similarities and Differences

Starting off, it is easy to notice both sites have a good organizational setup to them. At the top of each site you will find your standard navigation topics ranging from “weather” to “contact us”. You can also find information about each company on their sites via the “About Us” navigational tabs. GFG uses a green background with white writing in the navigational section, while MFA uses a gray background and blue navigational buttons with white writing. GFG added a navigation link to their logo to bring you back to the homepage while MFA did not incorporate this into theirs.

Each site uses pictures during each navigational tab, of which all seemed to open fast and clear. I did notice that GFG used a scrolling picture around the top of their body, close by the h1 title and offset to the right. MFA used this as well, however MFA made their picture larger stretching from each side of the page to the other. Though the approach was different, each looked appropriate given the setup of their individual sites. Upon getting to the body of each site, they both go with a white background and black writing, making each easy to read on my mobile device and computer.

Content Strengths and Weaknesses

Each site used the navigational tabs well, with drop down menu’s that were a secondary category into each main category. GFG seemed to pull this off slightly better, with no found overlaps in writing. However, MFA had a couple that did not transpose over the original texts, thus making it a little harder to read (i.e. white writing onto a white background). Both sites weather links allowed for quick and easy access to local weather. Not only was the current weather included, but that also of 5-day, etc. This makes sense for most farming operations to plan the week.

A noticeable strength with GFG was the contact page. Names, addresses, phone numbers, and email address were all easily accessible and the email’s included a clickable e-mail hyperlink. MFA included the address and phone number, but did not have the names on the contact page (though they were located on their “locations” section), and did not have an e-mail hyperlink or email address on the contact page. MFA did include a contact form, but I found it had issues loading the security text for the user to type, thus making it more difficult to contact them.

Something I found to be a negative on both sites was the inability to pay on account and the lack of a search bar. GFG had a non-functioning "pay on account" tab, and MFA did not have any options for online pay. Both sites seem to be credible, as they are a representation of their own company. It is also worth noting that MFA had no account settings within their site, thus all business must transact in person or mail. From what I found, information matched online as well as in phone books and personal knowledge. GFG and MFA both incorporated the <footer> element and had appropriate symbols and info for copyright.

Conclusion

GFG and MFA had a clean, organized look and seemed to navigate quite well for a small-town business website. In general, both sites operated as expected, but both could use some tweaking to get better. I would suggest checking that all navigational tabs are readable upon expansion and that contact information is easier to obtain with MFA. For GFG, I would suggest they get the "pay on account" navigational tab functional being as it was down at the time of review. All-in-all, both sites were functioning and user-friendly.

[Reply](#) [Reply to Comment](#)

•

Sam Hilke

Thursday Sep 14 at 6:05pm

[Manage Discussion Entry](#)

Derik,

I am very familiar with both of these companies and their websites, as I have done business with them both before. I agree with you completely when you in the fact that both pages have a good organizational pattern. When I went to MFA's website, the picture you were talking about didn't show up, I even tried opening it 3 times. I also agree with you in the fact that having the weather on both sites is very convenient and helpful for a lot of people. Finally, you are correct with the navigational tabs on the MFA site and how they need fixing, but when I opened the GFG site, all the tabs worked fine. Other than that, I really enjoyed your post and think you did a great job evaluating the two sites.