

## E-7. WEBSITE EVALUATION MODELS AND ACCEPTABILITY FACTORS

Eugenijus Valavičius<sup>1</sup>, Kristina Vipartienė<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vilnius Business College, Kalvariju street 125, Vilnius, Lithuania  
email: eugvalav@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Vilnius College of Technologies and Design, Antakalnio 54, Vilnius, Lithuania  
email: kristinavipartiene@gmail.com

After reading scientific publications (year 2000-2012) about acceptability of websites for users 10 articles were selected for more detailed analysis. These were 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 quality model was reviewed by French author and is defined as model VPTCS [1]. This model includes such aspects as visibility (availability of website for wide public: links, ads, press reviews, ect.), perception (user comfort: short and accurate names of hyperlinks, clear current position of visitor, “less clicks is better”, alternative textual information for objects), techniques (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, archives, ...), services (interactive service is considered to be as qualitative if users are willing to use it and if creators provide all services in accordance with terms).

The second model [2] is oriented to public non-profit websites. This model includes such categories as: usability (site map, feedback and help, foreign languages support, navigation, search option and 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]. The main dimensions are: 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. This model is not tested empirically.

The fourth model presents questionnaire mixed from usability and user satisfaction for evaluating informational and public websites [4]. The main dimensions are: 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-to-use measuring scale [5]. It has three dimensions: simplicity of navigation, speed, interactivity. This model went through the 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 the 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 four-element combination for user satisfaction: quality of information, quality of system, perceived usefulness, social impact, the latter here is a new factor.

The second model [9] presents a four 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.** Several difficulties have occurred while comparing different models. The same quality elements in different models were assigned to different dimensions (categories). For example: speed can be assigned to navigation, user friendliness to technical quality. Some factors were treated as components of dimensions in one model and as a category in the other models (navigation). The same dimension in different models include different factors.

The results of analysis show that most authors are content with acceptability factors (dimensions) such as user friendliness, navigation, speed and 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: user's waiting time is approximately four seconds. A longer delay make users to leave the site.

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 misuse of them can disappoint visitors. For example: complexity of URL, compatibility with browsers and platforms, availability of website, quality of service, reliability and safety.

## References

1. Sloim, E., Gateau, E. Critères généraux d'évaluation de la qualité des services en ligne. < <http://www.temesis.com/ressources/articles/le-metier/criteres-generaux-d-evaluation-de.html> >. [retrieved 2013-01-12].
2. AbuAli, A. N., Abu-Addose, H. Y. A comparative study of techniques used for evaluating web page quality of the public organizations in Jordan Jordan–Amman. – *International journal of academic research* March 2011, Vol. 3, No. 2, Part III, pp. 655-672.
3. Rocha, A. Framework for a Global Quality Evaluation of a Website. – *Online Information Review* 2012, Vol. 36, Iss: 3, pp. 374 – 382.
4. Elling, S., Lentz, L., de Jong, M. Website Evaluation Questionnaire: Development of a Research-Based Tool for Evaluating Informational Websites. M. A. Wimmer, H. J. Scholl, and A. Grönlund (Eds.): EGOV, 2007, LNCS 4656, pp. 293–304.
5. Wang, J., Senecal, S. Measuring perceived website usability. – *Journal of Internet Commerce* 2008, Vol. 6, Iss: 4, pp. 97-112.
6. Islam, A., Tsuji, K. Evaluation of Usage of University Websites in Bangladesh. – *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* November 2011, Vol. 31, No. 6, pp. 469-479.
7. Nathan, R. J., Yeow, P. H. P. An empirical study of factors affecting the perceived usability of websites for student Internet users. – *Universal Access in the Information Society* 2009, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 165–184.
8. Schaupp, L. C. Web site success: antecedents of web site satisfaction and re-use. – *Journal of Internet Commerce* 2010, No. 9, pp. 42–64.
9. Muylle, S., Moenaert, R., Despontin, M. The conceptualization and empirical validation of web site user satisfaction. – *Information & Management* 2004, No. 41, pp. 543–560.
10. Marsico, De M., Levialdi, S. Evaluating web sites: exploiting user's expectations. – *Int. J. Human-Computer Studies* 2004, No. 60, pp. 381–416.