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After reading scientific publications (year 2000-2012) about acceptability of websites for users 10 articles were selected for more detailed analysis. It was publications about public, informational, governmental and educational websites.

Acceptability models from various authors were divided into 3 groups: Quality, Usability and Satisfaction models. Our article tries to distinguish factors of acceptability using review and comparative analysis from models which are most suitable for college (educational) website evaluating.

Quality models

The first reviewed quality model was French author’s model VPTCS [1]. This model includes such aspects as Visibility (availability of website for wide public: links, ads, press reviews, …), Perception (user comfort: short and accurate names of hyperlinks, clear current position of visitor, “less clicks is better”, alternative textual information for objects), Technics (permanent website address, time of download, colour of links, time of response from server etc), Contents (reliability of information, relevance of information to the purpose of website, freshness of information, dates of content, interactive feedback, archive, …), Services (interactive service is considered as qualitative if users are willing to use it and if creators provides all services in accordance with terms).

The second model [2] is oriented to public non-profit websites. This model includes such categories: Usability (Site map, Feedback and Help, Foreign languages support, Navigation, Search option and Find information within page option.), Reliability (Browsers compatibility, Links quality), Performance (Download time, Quick access page) and Accessibility (Global site understandability, Readability, Simplicity, Fonts and Colours).

The third model was created to evaluate multidimensional websites [3]. Dimensions: contents (accuracy, completeness, consistency, updates, syntax etc.), services (security, reliability, privacy, functionality, effectiveness, accuracy, availability, time of response, empathy, reputation, personalization). Criteria of this model can be evaluated using 3/5 point Likert scale. Model is not tested empirically.

The fourth model presents questionnaire mixed from Usability and User satisfaction for evaluating informational and public websites [4]. Main dimensions: Layout, Content (relevance, completeness and accuracy, understandability and languages), Navigation (ease of use, quality of the first page, structure, links, speed, search ability).
Usability models

The first model presents easy-of-use measuring scale [5]. It has 3 dimensions: Simplicity of navigation, Speed, Interactivity. This model was tested with a small sample survey.

The second model analyses websites of Bangladesh universities [6]. It has 5 categories: Content, organisation, and readability, Navigation and links, User interface design, Performance and effectiveness, Educational information.

The third model [7] distinguishes 7 web usability factors which represent Overall Website Usability for users: Use of Colour and Font, Friendliness of Website, Trustworthiness of Website, Use of Graphics and Images, Interactivity of Website, Ease of Web Navigation, Download Speed of Website. Factors are proved statistically (only in Malaysia).

Satisfaction models

The first model [8] identifies 4 element combination for user satisfaction: Quality of information, Quality of system, Perceived usefulness, Social impact. New factor is Social impact. It represents user perceptions of the others tend to use the website.

The second model [9] presents a 4 dimension user satisfaction scheme: Layout, Information, Connection, Language customizations. This scheme was empirically tested with 837 internet users in Western Europe. Authors argue [10] that the evaluation of the design in respect to visitor expectations is a challenging task for developers and it depends on the category of the site and visitor characteristics.

Comparative analysis of acceptability models

There was several difficulties comparing different models. The same quality elements in different models were assigned to different dimensions (categories). For example: speed can be assigned to navigation, to ease-of-use, to technical quality. Some factors were treated as components of dimensions in one model and as a category in other models (navigation). The same dimension in different models include different factors.

Results of analysis show that most authors mentioned acceptability factors (dimensions) are content, ease of use and navigation, speed, user interface design.

Factors of contents evaluation: clarity of information, freshness, dates, consistency, accuracy, understandability and languages, appropriate format, degree of information adaptation to different user groups.

Factors of navigation: obvious links, good structure, current dislocation of visitor, site map, navigation path, clear start page, categorization of information.

Speed: in average user waits about 4 seconds for next page. After he goes out of website.
Factors of design: design Aesthetics, colours, fonts, pictures and graphics, appropriate layout of elements.

Other elements of acceptability are not as obvious as design or navigation but bad usage of them can disappoint visitors. For example: complexity of URL, compatibility with browsers and platforms, availability of website, quality of service, reliability and safety.
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