

**A CONSUMER PERSPECTIVE E-COMMERCE WEBSITE  
EVALUATION MODEL**

**OMAR HUSAIN TARAWNEH**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA  
2014**

## **Permission to Use**

In presenting this thesis in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the Universiti Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for the copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

UUM College of Arts and Sciences

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

## **Abstrak**

Kaedah penilaian laman web yang sedia ada mempunyai beberapa kelemahan seperti mengabaikan kriteria pengguna dalam membuat penilaian, tidak dapat berurusan dengan kriteria kualitatif, dan melibatkan timbangan dan pengiraan skor atau markah yang kompleks. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk membangunkan model hibrid penilaian laman web e-dagang yang berorientasikan pengguna berdasarkan Proses Hierarki Analisis Kabur (FAHP) dan Kaedah *Hardmard* (HM). Empat fasa telah terlibat dalam membangunkan model: pengenalpastian keperluan, kajian empirikal, pembinaan model, dan pengesahan model. Pengenalan keperluan dan kajian empirikal digunakan untuk mengenal pasti kriteria reka bentuk web kritikal dan mengumpul pilihan pengguna dalam talian. Data yang dikumpul daripada 152 pengguna di Malaysia dengan menggunakan soal selidik dalam talian, telah digunakan untuk mengenal pasti ciri kritikal dan skala kepentingan laman web e-dagang. Model penilaian yang baharu terdiri daripada tiga komponen. Pertama, kriteria penilaian pengguna yang terdiri daripada prinsip-prinsip penting yang dipertimbangkan oleh pengguna; kedua, mekanisme penilaian yang mengintegrasikan FAHP dan HM yang terdiri daripada pernyataan matematik yang menghuraikan tanggapan subjektif, formula baharu untuk mengira timbangan dan skor bagi setiap kriteria; dan ketiga, prosedur penilaian yang terdiri daripada aktiviti-aktiviti penubuhan matlamat, penyediaan dokumen, dan pengenalpastian prestasi laman web. Model ini telah diteliti oleh enam orang pakar dan digunakan dalam empat kajian kes. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa model baharu adalah praktikal, dan sesuai untuk menilai laman web e-dagang dari perspektif pengguna, dan mampu untuk mengira timbangan dan skor atau markah bagi kriteria kualitatif dengan cara yang mudah. Di samping itu, ia dapat membantu membuat keputusan untuk membuat keputusan dengan cara pengukuran yang objektif. Model ini juga menyumbang pengetahuan baharu dalam bidang penilaian perisian.

**Kata kunci:** Model penilaian laman web e-dagang, Proses Hierarki Analisis Kabur, Kaedah *Hardmard*.

## Abstract

Existing website evaluation methods have some weaknesses such as neglecting consumer criteria in their evaluation, being unable to deal with qualitative criteria, and involving complex weight and score calculations. This research aims to develop a hybrid consumer-oriented e-commerce website evaluation model based on the Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP) and the Hardmard Method (HM). Four phases were involved in developing the model: requirements identification, empirical study, model construction, and model confirmation. Requirements identification and empirical study were to identify critical web-design criteria and gather online consumers' preferences. Data, collected from 152 Malaysian consumers using online questionnaires, were used to identify critical e-commerce website features and scale of importance. The new evaluation model comprised of three components. First, the consumer evaluation criteria that consist of the important principles considered by consumers; second, the evaluation mechanisms that integrate FAHP and HM consisting of mathematical expressions that handle subjective judgments, new formulas to calculate the weight and score for each criterion; and third, the evaluation procedures consisting of activities that comprise of goal establishment, document preparation, and identification of website performance. The model was examined by six experts and applied to four case studies. The results show that the new model is practical, and appropriate to evaluate e-commerce websites from consumers' perspectives, and is able to calculate weights and scores for qualitative criteria in a simple way. In addition, it is able to assist decision-makers to make decisions in a measured objective way. The model also contributes new knowledge to the software evaluation field.

**Keywords:** E-commerce website evaluation model, Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process, Hardmard Method.

## **Acknowledgement**

By the name of ALLAH, The Most Gracious, and The Most Merciful, I would like to convey my gratitude to numerous people who provided me with exceptional support, encouragement and wisdom throughout my PhD journey. First and foremost, I am deeply grateful to my two supervisors Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fudziah Ahmad and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jamaiyah Yahaya for all their efforts in providing me fervent support, intelligent guidance and invaluable suggestions during this work.

On a more personal level, I want to thank my family for their unconditional love, understanding and support. My Father and Mother raised me to believe that I could achieve anything I set my mind to. My sisters, Layali and Eshraq, and my brothers, Dr. Amer, Dr. Malek, and Acc. Mounis, have been an endless source of great joy, love and assistance. I want to thank them all for their interest and assurance that the journey does have an end at times when it seems like no end was insight. I know I always have my family to count on when times are rough.

Many thanks go to my wonderful friends for their consistent support, encouragement, and real friendship that I needed in UUM and who were there for me all the time. Special thanks to Moath and Mejhem Tarawneh, Ali and Wa'el Naimat, Ahmad Saleh, Hamza Alba'ol, Asim khresheh, Ibraheem Al shamayleh, and many others. I will never forget the great times I spent with.

Thank You All Very Much

## Table of Contents

Permission to Use .....	iii
Abstrak.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Acknowledgement .....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables .....	xii
List of Figures.....	xv
List of Appendices .....	xvi
List of Abbreviations .....	xvii
List of Publications .....	xviii
<b>CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Research Problem .....	6
1.3 Research Motivation .....	9
1.4 Research Questions.....	10
1.5 Research Objectives.....	10
1.6 Research Scope .....	10
1.7 Research Methodology .....	11
1.8 Contributions.....	12
1.9 Thesis Organization .....	14
1.9.1 Chapter Two .....	14
1.9.2 Chapter Three .....	15
1.9.3 Chapter Four .....	15
1.9.4 Chapter Five.....	15
1.9.5 Chapter Six .....	15
1.9.6 Chapter Seven .....	16
1.10 Conclusion .....	16
<b>CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	17

2.2 Website Evaluation .....	17
2.3 Evaluation Criteria of E-commerce Websites.....	18
2.3.1 E-commerce Evaluation Criteria Domains .....	27
2.3.1.1 System Criteria Domain .....	27
2.3.1.2 Information Criteria Domain.....	29
2.3.1.3 Services Criteria Domain .....	30
2.4 The Methods Used in Evaluation of E-commerce Website.....	31
2.4.1 Summary and Discussion .....	41
2.5 Evaluation Techniques in Website Evaluation .....	42
2.6 Validation Methods of Websites Evaluation Models .....	46
2.7 Evaluation Theory.....	48
2.8 Fuzzy Set.....	50
2.9 Summary .....	52
<b>CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>55</b>
3.1 Phase One: Requirements Identification.....	55
3.1.1 Identifying Consumer Evaluation Criteria.....	55
3.1.2 Designing Questionnaire.....	61
3.1.2.1 Demographic Data.....	65
3.1.2.2 Consumer Satisfaction.....	65
3.1.2.3 Consumer Evaluation Criteria .....	66
3.1.3 Questionnaire Testing .....	68
3.1.3.1 Pilot Survey .....	68
3.1.4 Identifying the Evaluation Model Components.....	69
3.1.4.1 Consumer Evaluation Criteria .....	70
3.1.4.2 New Evaluation Mechanism .....	71
3.1.4.3 Evaluation Procedure .....	72
3.2 Phase Two: Empirical Study.....	74
3.2.1 Questionnaire Distribution.....	75
3.2.1.1 Population and Sample.....	76
3.2.2 Data Collection .....	77
3.2.3 Data Analysis.....	78

3.3 Phase Three: Model Construction.....	79
3.4 Phase Four: Model Confirmation.....	80
<b>CHAPTER FOUR EMPIRICAL STUDY.....</b>	<b>82</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	82
4.2 Data Analysis .....	82
4.2.1 Demography Results.....	82
4.2.2 Current Consumer Satisfaction .....	87
4.2.3 Consumer Evaluation Criteria .....	91
4.2.3.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis.....	94
4.3 Discussion and Conclusion .....	99
<b>CHAPTER FIVE MODEL CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>102</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	102
5.2 Proposed Model .....	102
5.3 Consumer Evaluation Criteria.....	103
5.3.1 E-usage.....	104
5.3.2 E-information.....	106
5.3.3 E-services.....	107
5.3.4 E-system.....	109
5.3.5 E-company .....	110
5.4 New Evaluation Mechanism .....	113
5.4.1 A New Mechanism to Calculate the Weight for Each Criterion .....	113
5.4.1.1 Mechanism to Scale the relative importance of the criteria .....	113
5.4.1.2 Mechanism to Construct the Fuzzy Pairwise Matrix .....	114
5.4.1.3 Mechanisms to Perform the Judgments of Pairwise Comparisons	117
5.4.1.4 Mechanism to Synthesis the Pairwise Comparison.....	120
5.4.1.5 Performing the Inconsistency Test .....	129
5.4.2 Mechanism to Identify the Total Score for each Criterion .....	130
5.4.2.1 Mechanism to Obtain the Score for Each Descriptive Question.	131
5.4.2.2 Mechanism to Identify the Average Score for Each Descriptive Question.....	133

5.4.2.3 Mechanism to Identify the Average Score for Each Criterion....	137
5.4.2.4 Mechanism to Defuzzify the Average Score for Each Criterion to Crisp Value.....	139
5.4.3 Mechanism to Identify the Current Situation for Each Criteria Using Weight Variance Analysis.....	142
5.5 Evaluation Procedure .....	144
5.5.1 Planning Phase .....	145
5.5.1.1 Establish the Goal of the Evaluation .....	146
5.5.1.2 Brief the Evaluation Team and Prepare Documents .....	147
5.5.2 Examination Phase.....	148
5.5.2.1 Conduct the Evaluation .....	148
5.5.2.2 Collect Data .....	148
5.5.3 Decision Making Phase .....	149
5.5.3.1 Identifying the Current Performance Situation for the Website Criteria.....	149
5.5.3.2 Result Analysis.....	149
5.5.3.3 Prepare Evaluation Report.....	149
5.6 The CREE Model Guideline .....	150
5.6.1 Preparing to Use the CREE Model .....	150
5.6.1.1 Setting the Aim and Objectives.....	151
5.6.1.2 Prepare Documents.....	152
5.6.1.3 Structure of the CREE Model .....	152
5.6.1.4 The CREE Model Evaluation Tools.....	153
5.6.1.5 Report Presenting .....	154
5.7 Discussion and Conclusion .....	155
<b>CHAPTER SIX MODEL CONFIRMATION.....</b>	<b>157</b>
6.1 Introduction.....	157
6.2 Verification by Expert Review .....	157
6.2.1 Identifying Experts Based On Experience.....	158
6.2.2 Contact Experts.....	158
6.2.3 Interview of Experts (Round One).....	159

6.2.4 Interview Expert (Round Two).....	164
6.2.5 Present Result (Round Three).....	166
6.3 Validation by Case Study.....	166
6.3.1 Company A Profile .....	167
6.3.1.1 Evaluation Process On Company A Website .....	168
6.3.2 Company B Profile .....	187
6.3.2.1 Evaluation Process on Company B Website .....	188
6.3.3 Company C Profile .....	199
6.3.3.1 Evaluation Process on Company C Website .....	200
6.3.4 Company D Profile .....	211
6.3.4.1 Evaluation Process on Company D Website .....	212
6.4 Consumer Evaluation Model Verification and Validation .....	223
6.5 Summary .....	228
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>229</b>
7.1 Introduction.....	229
7.2 Overview of Results.....	229
7.3 Research Contributions .....	240
7.4 Model Limitation .....	244
7.5 Future Work .....	245
7.6 Summary .....	246
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>248</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1 Criteria Used in Previous Evaluation Models.....	21
Table 2.2 Occurrences of Criteria on Past Researches .....	25
Table 2.3 Strength and Weaknesses of the Common Websites Evaluation Methods.....	38
Table 2.4 Criteria Measurement Sources.....	44
Table 2.5 Factors of Evaluating the Proposed Model (Adapted from Kunda, 2002; Kitchenham & Pickard, 1998) .....	47
Table 3.1 Criteria Synonyms and Relations.....	58
Table 3.2 Questionnaire Items Development.....	62
Table 3.3 User Satisfaction Question for Part B .....	66
Table 3.4 YES/NO Questions .....	66
Table 3.5 Importance of Criteria of E-commerce Websites .....	67
Table 3.6 Consumer Criteria after Filtering.....	70
Table 3.7 Percentage of Returned Questionnaires .....	78
Table 3.8 Population and Sample Needed .....	78
Table 4.1 Gender Distribution of Respondents.....	83
Table 4.2 Age Distribution of Respondents.....	84
Table 4.3 Distribution of Educational Level.....	84
Table 4.4 Distribution of Living State .....	85
Table 4.5 Websites Type Distribution .....	87
Table 4.6 Overall Satisfaction Degree .....	87
Table 4.7 Satisfaction Degree of the Services Provided by the Websites.....	88
Table 4.8 Websites Quality Importance Prior Selection.....	88
Table 4.9 Likely Degree to Buy and Visit the Websites Again .....	89
Table 4.10 Recommend Likely Degree .....	90
Table 4.11 Method Used to Meet the Consumer Needs .....	90
Table 4.12 Consumer Participation Degree .....	91
Table 4.13 Internal Presentation for the Degree of Consideration.....	92
Table 4.14 Consumer Evaluation Criteria: Means Score.....	93
Table 4.15 KMO and Bartlett's Test for CEC.....	95
Table 4.16 New Categorization of CEC .....	97
Table 5.1 E-usage Decomposed Criteria.....	104

Table 5.2 E-information Decomposed Criteria.....	106
Table 5.3 E-services Decomposed Criteria.....	108
Table 5.4 E-system Decomposed Criteria.....	109
Table 5.5 E-company Decomposed Criteria .....	111
Table 5.6 Decomposition of the Website Evaluation Criteria .....	112
Table 5.7 Triangular Fuzzy Numbers Scale for Pairwise Comparison.....	114
Table 5.8 The Pairwise Comparison Matrix for Level One in CEC (Level One).....	116
Table 5.9 The Pairwise Comparison Matrix of the E-usage Category (Level Two) .....	117
Table 5.10 The Pairwise Comparison Matrixes in CEC .....	117
Table 5.11 The Judgment of Primary Criteria With Respect to E-Commerce Websites.....	119
Table 5.12 Random Index.....	130
Table 5.13 Fuzzy rates of alternatives against criteria by linguistic variables.....	131
Table 5.14 An Example of Obtaining Scores for E-usage Category and Criteria .....	131
Table 5.15 An Example of Obtaining Scores for Criteria from Decision Makers A and B .	133
Table 5.16 Operational Laws of Triangular Fuzzy Numbers .....	134
Table 5.17 An Example of Calculating Description Question Average Score .....	134
Table 5.18 A Running Example of Calculating Descriptive Question Average Score.....	135
Table 5.19 An Example of Calculating Criteria Average Score.....	137
Table 5.20 A Running Example of Calculating Criteria Average Score .....	138
Table 5.21 An Example of Defuzzification .....	140
Table 5.22 A Running Example of Defuzzification .....	141
Table 5.23 The Evaluation Team Members.....	151
Table 5.24 Documents Needed for Conduct the Evaluation.....	152
Table 5.25 Triangular Fuzzy Numbers Scale for Pairwise Comparison.....	153
Table 5.26 The Judgment of Primary Criteria with Respect to E-commerce Websites.....	154
Table 5.27 Evaluation Result.....	155
Table 6.1 The Schedule Expert Reviewers Meetings .....	159
Table 6.2 Reviewers Answers and Suggestions.....	160
Table 6.3 Modification Needed .....	165
Table 6.4 Items Needed to Conduct the Evaluation.....	166
Table 6.5 Criteria Weights for Level One and Two (Company A) .....	172
Table 6.6 An Example of Obtaining Scores for Criteria from Consumers 1,2,3,4 and 5 ....	174
Table 6.7 An Example of Calculating DQAS (Company A).....	175
Table 6.8 An Example of Calculating CAS .....	177

Table 6.9 An Example of Calculating M (u) .....	178
Table 6.10 Score and Weight Obtained by Criteria's (Company A) .....	179
Table 6.11 Score and Weight Obtained by Level One (Company A) .....	181
Table 6.12 Evaluation Report (Company A) .....	186
Table 6.13 Criteria Weights for Level One and Two (Company B).....	191
Table 6.14 Score and Weight Obtained by criteria's (Company B) .....	192
Table 6.15 Score and Weight Obtained by Level One (Company B).....	194
Table 6.16 Evaluation Report (Company B) .....	198
Table 6.17 Criteria Weights for Level One and Two (Company C).....	203
Table 6.18 Score and Weight Obtained by criteria's (Company C) .....	205
Table 6.19 Score and Weight Obtained by Level One (Company C).....	206
Table 6.20 Evaluation Report (Company C) .....	210
Table 6.21 Criteria Weights for Level One and Two (Company D) .....	215
Table 6.22 Score and Weight Obtained by criteria's (Company D) .....	217
Table 6.23 Score and Weight Obtained by Level One (Company D) .....	218
Table 6.24 Evaluation Report (Company D) .....	222

## List of Figures

Figure 1.0. Macro view of the proposed model .....	11
Figure 2.1. The membership function of the triangular fuzzy number .....	52
Figure 3.2. Inputs, activities and deliverable of empirical study phase .....	77
Figure 3.3. Inputs, activities and deliverable of model construction phase .....	79
Figure 3.4. Inputs, activities and deliverable of model confirmation phase .....	81
Figure 4.1. Buying habits distribution .....	86
Figure 5.1. New hybrid consumer e-commerce website evaluation model (CREE) .....	103
Figure 5.2. CEC categories .....	104
Figure 5.3. CEC hierarchy structure .....	115
Figure 5.4. The pairwise matrix .....	116
Figure 5.5. Example of performing the judgments pairwise comparisons.....	120
Figure 5.6. The weight-variance map (adapted from Tsai et al., 2011).....	144
Figure 5.8. CREE model guideline .....	150
Figure 6.1. Verification process using delphi technique.....	157
Figure 6.2. Weights given by three experts for level one of the CEC (Company A). .....	171
Figure 6.10. Criteria weight variance map (Company D) .....	220

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A Past Researches on Website Evaluation .....	268
Appendix B Score List.....	288
Appendix C Questionnaire.....	296
Appendix D Factor Analysis.....	308
Appendix E Weight List .....	313
Appendix F Experts Profile .....	318
Appendix G Expert questionnaire.....	328
Appendix H Evaluation Report.....	335
Appendix I Model Validation Questionnaires .....	337

## List of Abbreviations

<b>DMs</b>	Decision Makers
<b>ACSI</b>	American Customer Satisfaction Index
<b>AHP</b>	Analytic Hierarchy Process
<b>ANP</b>	Analytical Network Process
<b>BNP</b>	Best Number Preference
<b>CAS</b>	Criteria Average Score
<b>CEC</b>	Consumer Evaluation Criteria
<b>CI</b>	Consistency Index
<b>COA</b>	Center of Area
<b>CR</b>	Consistency Ratio
<b>DQAS</b>	Descriptive Question Average Score
<b>FAHP</b>	Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process
<b>IEEE</b>	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
<b>ISO</b>	International Organization for Standardization
<b>KMO</b>	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
<b>MCDM</b>	Multi-Criteria Decision Making
<b>SPSS</b>	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
<b>TFN</b>	Triangular Fuzzy Number
<b>WAS</b>	Weight Average Sum

## **List of Publications**

Tarawneh, O., Ahmad, F. (2009). Investigating the characteristics used in quantitative analysis of websites evaluation. *Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Information Technology held on 3-5 June 2009, Al-Zaytoonah University, Jordan* (pp.69). Jordan: IEEE Computer Society

Husain, O., Ahmad, F., & Yahaya, J. (2009). Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Methods of E-commerce Websites Evaluation. *MASAUM Journal of Reviews and Surveys*, 1(1), 0. 20-26

Ahmad, F., Yahaya, J., Tarawneh, O., Baharom, F., & Abd Wahab, A. (2011). E-Commrece (B2C) Evaluation Practices: A Pilot Study on Jordanian Consumers' Perspectives. *In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Computing and Informatics, ICOCI held on 8-9 June 2011 at Bandung, Indonesia* (pp.413-418). Bandung, Indonesia: ICOCI

Tarawneh, O., Ahmad, F., & Yahaya, J. (2012). Business to Consumer Evaluation Practices, Obstacles, and Factors: A Pilot Study from Consumers Perspectives on Jordanian Firm. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 3(1). 1-7.

Tarawneh, O., Ahmad, F., & Yahaya, J. (2012). B2C Quality Evaluation Factors from Jordanian Consumer Perspective. *In Proceedings of Knowledge Management International Conference, KMICe held on 4-6 July 2012 at Johor Bahru, Malaysia* (pp.246-250). Johor Bahru, Malaysia: KMICe.

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Chapter One presents the background of the study, followed by the research problem, research motivation, research questions, research objectives, research scope, and research methodology.

### **1.1 Background**

The importance of companies' websites has been recognized by many. A website is defined as a collection of related web pages on a particular subject that includes a beginning file called a home page. According to Olsina et al., (2001), Sekaran (2006) and Zhang et al. (2008), websites are considered as applications on the World Wide Web, which in turn is considered as software (Dominic & Jati, 2010). According to Jinling (2005), the web plays a major role in diverse application domains, such as business, education, industry and entertainment.

Many companies are moving from the traditional way of doing business to the electronic way to cope with the evolution, to be competitive and remain sustainable (Liu et al., 2007; Miranda et al., 2006). As a result, companies have begun to focus on e-commerce website construction in their strategic planning activities (Liu & Hu, 2008). In general, e-commerce can be defined as a business process of selling and buying products, information, and services through online communications or via the internet medium (El-Aleem et al., 2005; Li et al., 2005). Indeed, e-commerce is considered as one of the best methods for buying and selling products, services, and information electronically. Therefore, a large number of e-commerce websites have

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only

## REFERENCES

- Adler, J. L., & McNally, M. G. (1994). In-laboratory experiments to investigate driver behavior under advanced traveler information systems. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 2(3), 149-164.
- Agarwal, R., & Venkatesh, V. (2002). Assessing a firm's web presence: a heuristic evaluation procedure for the measurement of usability. *Information Systems Research*, 13(2), 168-186.
- Ağırgün, B. (2012). Ranking B2C Web Sites with AHP and TOPSIS Under Fuzzy Environment. *Nevşehir Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(2), 65-78.
- Ahn, T., Ryu, S., & Han, I. (2007). The impact of Web quality and playfulness on user acceptance of online retailing. *Information & Management*, 44(3), 263-275.
- Al Khalil, M. I. (2002). Selecting the appropriate project delivery method using AHP. *International journal of project management*, 20(6), 469-474.
- Albadvi, A., Chaharsooghi, S. K., & Esfahanipour, A. (2007). Decision making in stock trading: An application of PROMETHEE. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 177(2), 673-683.
- Albuquerque, A. B., & Belchior, A. (2003). UNIFOR: E-Commerce Websites: a Qualitative Evaluation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 146(1), 374-387.
- Albuquerque, A., & Belchior, A. (2002). E-commerce websites: a qualitative evaluation. *In Proceedings of the 11th International World Wide Web Conference held on 7-11 May 2002 at Honolulu, Hawaii, US*.
- Albuquerque, A., & Belchior, A. (2002). E-commerce Website quality evaluation. *Proceedings. 28th Euromicro Conference held on 4 - 6 September 2002 at Dortmund, Germany*. USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Allahawiah, S., & Altarawne, H. (2009). Adaptable model for assessing the quality of e-commerce systems. Paper presented at the International 7th Knowledge, Economy & Management Congress Program held on 30 October – 1 November 2009 at Yalova University & Istanbul University, Yalova, Turkey.
- Al-Momani, K., & Noor, N. A. M. (2009). E-service quality, ease of use, usability and enjoyment as antecedents of e-CRM performance: an empirical investigation in

- Jordan mobile phone services. *The Asian Journal of Technology Management (AJTM)*, 2(2).
- al-Smadi, S. (2013). Consumers Attitudes Towards Online Shopping in Jordan: Opportunities and Challenges. The First Forum for Marketing in Arab countries, Sharjihah, UAE, 2002.
- Alvaro, A., Almeida, E., D., & Meira, S., R., L. (2010). A software component quality framework. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 35(1), 1-18.
- Alvaro, A., de Almeida, E., & Meira, S. (2007). Component quality assurance: towards a software component certification process. *Information Reuse and Integration, 2007.IRI 2007. IEEE International Conference on held on 13-15 August 2007at Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*: IEEE Computer Society.
- Asady, B., & Zendehnam, A. (2007). Ranking fuzzy numbers by distance minimization. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 31(11), 2589-2598.
- Bai, B., Law, R., & Wen, I. (2008). The impact of website quality on customer satisfaction and purchase intentions: Evidence from Chinese online visitors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 27(3), 391-402.
- Baloglu, S., & Pekcan, Y. A. (2006). The website design and Internet site marketing practices of upscale and luxury hotels in Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 27(1), 171-176.
- Barnes, S. J., & Vidgen, R. T. (2002). An Integrative Approach to the Assessment of E-Commerce Quality. *J. Electron. Commerce Res.*, 3(3), 114-127.
- Barnes, S., & Vidgen, R. (2001). An evaluation of cyber-bookshops: the WebQual method. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 6(1), 11-30.
- Behkamal, B., Akbari, M. K., & Kahani, M. (2006). Critical Success Factors for Success of B2B Electronic Commerce in SMEs. In *Proceedings of the IADIS International Conference e-Commerce held on 9-11 December 2006 at Barcelona, Spain: IADIS*.
- Behkamal, B., Kahani, M., & Akbari, M. K. (2009). Customizing ISO 9126 quality model for evaluation of B2B applications. *Information and software technology*, 51 (3).599-609.

- Behzadian, M., Kazemzadeh, R. B., Albadvi, A., & Aghdasi, M. (2010). PROMETHEE: A comprehensive literature review on methodologies and applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 200(1), 198-215.
- Bellman, R. E., & Zadeh, L. A. (1970). Decision-making in a fuzzy environment. *Management science*, 17(4), pp.141-164.
- Bertoa, M. F. & Vallecillo, A. (2002). Quality attributes for COTS components. *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM'02)*, 54-66.
- Bilsel, R. U., Büyüközkan, G., & Ruan, D. (2006). A fuzzy preference-ranking model for a quality evaluation of hospital web sites. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 21(11), 1181-1197.
- Black, T. R. (1999). *Doing quantitative research in the social sciences: An integrated approach to research design, measurement, and statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Blixrud, J. C. (2001). The Association of Research Libraries Statistics and Measurement Program: From Descriptive Data to Performance Measures.
- Bollen, K. A., & K. G. joreskog. 1985. Uniqueness Does Not Imply Identification. *Sociological methods and research* 14(2), 155-63.
- Boroushaki, S., & Malczewski, J. (2010). Using the fuzzy majority approach for GIS-based multicriteria group decision-making. *Computers & Geosciences*, 36(3), 302-312.
- Brans, J. P., 1982. Multiple criteria analysis: Operational methods, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 10(4), 414-415.
- Brito, A. J., & de Almeida, A. T. (2009). Multi-attribute risk assessment for risk ranking of natural gas pipelines. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 94(2), 187-198.
- Bueyuekoezkan, G., & Ruan, D. (2007). Evaluating government websites based on a fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making approach. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 15(3), 321-343.
- Büyüközkan, G., & Çifçi, G. (2012). A novel hybrid MCDM approach based on fuzzy DEMATEL, fuzzy ANP and fuzzy TOPSIS to evaluate green suppliers. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(3), 3000-3011.

- Cai, L., Card, J. A., & Cole, S. T. (2004). Content delivery performance of world wide web sites of US tour operators focusing on destinations in China. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 219-227.
- Cao, M., Zhang, Q., & Seydel, J. (2005). B2C e-commerce web site quality: an empirical examination. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 105(5), 645-661.
- Cao, X., Shen, B., Liu, Y., & Wang, M. (2009, May). Research on Evaluation of B to C E-commerce Website Based on AHP and Grey Evaluation. In *Electronic Commerce and Security, 2009.ISECS'09. Second International Symposium on*(Vol. 2, pp. 405-408). IEEE.
- Celik, M., Cebi, S., Kahraman, C., & Er, I. D. (2009). Application of axiomatic design and TOPSIS methodologies under fuzzy environment for proposing competitive strategies on Turkish container ports in maritime transportation network. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(3), 4541-4557.
- Chang, H. L., & Yang, C. H. (2008). Do airline self-service check-in kiosks meet the needs of passengers?. *Tourism Management*, 29(5), 980-993.
- Chang, T. H., & Wang, T. C. (2009). Using the fuzzy multi-criteria decision making approach for measuring the possibility of successful knowledge management. *Information Sciences*, 179(4), 355-370.
- Chang, Y. C., & Lee, N. (2010). A Multi-Objective Goal Programming airport selection model for low-cost carriers' networks. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 46(5), 709-718.
- Chang, Y. H., & Yeh, C. H. (2001). Evaluating airline competitiveness using multiattribute decision making. *Omega*, 29(5), 405-415.
- Chen, J., & Lu, B. (2008, October). Research on fuzzy comprehensive evaluation model of e-commerce enterprise image based on multi-granular. In *Management of e-Commerce and e-Government, 2008. ICMECG'08. International Conference on* (pp. 315-319). IEEE.
- Chen, M., Tang, B., & Cheng, S. (2005, August). An index system for quality synthesis evaluation of B to C business website. Paper presented at the *Proceedings of the 7th international conference on Electronic commerce* (75-77). ACM.
- Chen, S. J., & Hwang, C. L., (1992). *Fuzzy Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

- Cheung, C. M. K., Chan, G. W. W., & Limayem, M. (2005). A Critical Review of Online Consumer Behavior: Empirical Research. *Journal Of Electronic Commerce In Organizations*, 3(4), 1-19.
- Cheung, C., Zhu, L., Kwong, T., Chan, G., & Limayem, M. (2003). Online consumer behavior: a review and agenda for future research. *Proceedings of the 16th Bled eCommerce Conference* held on 9-11 June 2003 at Bled, Slovenia: Bled Electronic Commerce Conference.
- Chiou, W. C., Lin, C. C., & Perng, C. (2011). A strategic website evaluation of online travel agencies. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1463-1473.
- Chou, W. C., & Cheng, Y. P. (2012). A hybrid fuzzy MCDM approach for evaluating website quality of professional accounting firms. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(3), 2783-2793.
- Community Services Consultant & Trainer (2003). *The BNPCA Consumer participation resource & training kit for service providers*. Consumer/Carer Participation Project 2003.
- Csutora, R., & Buckley, J. J. (2001). Fuzzy hierarchical analysis: The Lambda-Max method. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 120(2), 181–195.
- Deng, H., Yeh, C. H., & Willis, R. J. (2000). Inter-company comparison using modified TOPSIS with objective weights. *Computers & Operations Research*, 27(10), 963-973.
- Deng, H., 2005. A Fuzzy Approach to Selecting Information Systems Projects, *International Journal of Computers and Information Sciences* 6(1), 13-21.
- Deraman, A., Yahaya, J., Baharom, F., & Hamdan, A. R. (2010). User-Centred Software Product Certification: Theory and Practices. *University of Northern Malaysia, National University of Terengganu, Malaysia*.
- Dragulanescu, N.-G. (2002). Website quality evaluations: criteria and tools. *The International Information & Library Review*, 34(3), 247-254.
- Edwards, W. (1977). How to use multi attribute utility measurement for social decision making. *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 7(5), 326-340.
- Edwards, W., & Barron, F. H. (1994). SMARTS and SMARTER: Improved simple methods for multi-attribute utility measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 60(3), 306-325.

- Elahi, S., & Hassanzadeh, A. (2009). A framework for evaluating electronic commerce adoption in Iranian companies. *International Journal of Information Management*, 29(1), 27-36.
- El-Aleem, A. A., El-Wahed, W. F. A., Ismail, N. A., & Torkey, F. A. (2005). Efficiency Evaluation of E-Commerce Websites. In *WEC* 22(2), 20-23.
- Ellatif, A., & Saleh, M. (2008). Measuring Critical Success Factors of E-Bank Portals Using Fuzzy AHP & VBA. Social Science Research Network. Retrieved 13 August, 2013, from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1130123>.
- Ellatif, M. M. A. (2006). A Proposed Questionnaire to Evaluate the Quality of E-Government Website and Test It. Social Science Research Network. Retrieved 8 August, 2012, from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1130123>.
- Elling, S., Lentz, L., & De Jong, M. (2007). Website evaluation questionnaire: development of a research-based tool for evaluating informational websites. In *Electronic Government*, 293-304. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Emery, J. C. (1971). *Cost/benefit analysis of information systems*. Society for Management Information Systems.
- Escobar-Rodríguez, T., & Carvajal-Trujillo, E. (2013). An evaluation of Spanish hotel websites: Informational vs. relational strategies. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, (33), 228-239.
- Fairley, R. E., & Willshire, M. J. (2003). Why the Vasa sank: 10 problems and some antidotes for software projects. *Software, IEEE*, 20(2), 18-25.
- Fasanghari, M., & Roudsari, F. H. (2008). The fuzzy evaluation of e-commerce customer satisfaction. *World Appl. Sci. J.*, 4(2), 164-168.
- Faulkner, L. L. (2006). *Structured software usability evaluation: an experiment in evaluation design*. PhD thesis, The University Of Texas, Austin.
- Fitzpatrick, R. (2000). Additional quality factors for the world wide web. In *proceedings of the Second World Congress for Software Quality*, Yokohama, Japan, Union of Japanese Scientists and Engineers (JUSE), Tokyo, Japan.
- Gabriel, S. A., Kumar, S., Ordonez, J., & Nasserian, A. (2006). A multiobjective optimization model for project selection with probabilistic considerations. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 40(4), 297-313.

- Gamon, M., Aue, A., Corston-Oliver, S., & Ringger, E. (2005). Pulse: Mining customer opinions from free text. In *Advances in Intelligent Data Analysis VI*(pp. 121-132). Spain: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gill, M. (2007, February). Levels of consumer participation. In *Unpublished paper presented at Consumer Participation in Chronic Disease Management workshop, Melbourne, Australia.*
- Greenfield, T. 1996. *Research Methods Guidance for Postgraduates*. London: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Gutowska, A., Sloane, A., & Buckley, K. A. (2009). On desideratum for B2C e-commerce reputation systems. *Journal of computer science and technology*, 24(5), 820-832.
- Hair.JR, J.F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Hamid, F.T. (2014). *A Framework for Cots Software Evaluation and Selection for Cots Mismatches Handling and Non Functional Requirements*. PhD thesis, Utara University Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Hamilton, S., & Chervany, N. L. (1981). Evaluating information system effectiveness – Part I: Comparing evaluating approaches. *MIS Quarterly*, 5(3), 55–69.
- Hasan, L. (2009). *Usability evaluation framework for e-commerce websites in developing countries*. PhD thesis Loughborough University. United Kingdom.
- Hasan, L., & Abuelrub, E. (2011). Assessing the quality of web sites.*Applied Computing and Informatics*, 9(1), 11-29.
- Hasslinger, A., Hodzic, S., & Obazo, C. (2007).Consumer Behaviour in Online Shopping. *Kristianstaad University Department of Business Studies*.
- Hasslinger, A., Kallstrom, L., Hodzic, S., Ekelund, C., & Opazo, C. (2008). Consumer Behaviour in Online Shopping.Unpublished master's thesis, Kristianstad University.
- Hausman, A., & Siekpe, J. (2009). The effect of web interface features on consumer online purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(1), 5-13.
- Hiltunen, V., Kangas, J., & Pykäläinen, J. (2008). Voting methods in strategic forest planning—experiences from Metsähallitus. *Forest policy and economics*,10(3), 117-127.

- Ho, R. (2006). *Handbook of Univariate and Multivariate Data Analysis and Interpretation with SPSS*. New York: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Hoffman, R. R. (1998). How can expertise be defined? Implications of research from cognitive psychology. In R. Williams, W. Faulker & J. Fleck (Eds.), *Exploring expertise*, 62(1), 81–100.
- Hsu, T. H., Hung, L. C., & Tang, J. W. (2012). A hybrid ANP evaluation model for electronic service quality. *Applied Soft Computing*, 12(1), 72-81.
- Hu, Y. C. (2009). Fuzzy multiple-criteria decision making in the determination of critical criteria for assessing service quality of travel websites. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(3), 6439-6445.
- Huang, J., Jiang, X., & Tang, Q. (2009). An e-commerce performance assessment model: Its development and an initial test on e-commerce applications in the retail sector of China. *Information & Management*, 46(2), 100-108.
- Hwang, C. L., & Yoon, K. S., (1981). *Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications*, Springer, Berlin.
- IEEE Computer Society, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, & IEEE Standards Board. (1993). IEEE standard for a software quality metrics methodology. New York, NY, USA: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Jackson, P., Del Aguila, R., Clarke, I., Hallsworth, A., De Kervenoael, R., & Kirkup, M. (2006). Retail restructuring and consumer choice 2.Understanding consumer choice at the household level. *Environment and Planning A*, 38(1), 47-67.
- Jarvenpaa, S., & Todd, P. (1996). Consumer reactions to electronic shopping on the World Wide Web. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 1(2), 88.
- Jinling, C. (2005). Comprehensive evaluation of e-commerce Web site based on concordance analysis. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on e-Business Engineering (ICEBE'05) held on 18–21 October 2005 at Beijing, China*, 179 - 182. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Jinling, C. H. A. N. G., & Guoping, X. (2005). Usability Evaluation of B2C E-Commerce Web Site. *Journal of the China Society for Scientific and Technical Information*, 24(10), 15-17.

- Jinling, C., & Huan, G. (2007). Measuring Website Usability of Chinese Enterprise with a Heuristic Procedure. *Proceedings ICEBE 2007 IEEE International Conference on e-Business Engineering held on 24-26 October 2007 at Hong Kong, China*. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Joia, L. A., & Oliveira, L. C. B. D. (2008). Development and testing of an e-commerce website evaluation model. *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 9(1), 11-36.
- Joia,L., & Olivera,L. (2008). Development and Testing of an E-commerce Web Site Evaluation Model. *Journal of Electronic Commerce in organizations*, 6(3), 37-53.
- Jones, T. O., & Sasser, W. E. (1995). Why satisfied customers defect. *Harvard business review*, 73(6), 88.
- Kabassi, K., & Virvou, M. (2004). Personalised adult e-training on computer use based on multiple attribute decision making. *Interacting with computers*, 16(1), 115-132.
- Kahraman, C., Ruan, D., & Doğan, I. (2003). Fuzzy group decision-making for facility location selection. *Information Sciences*, 157, 135-153.
- Kalaimagal, S., & Srinivasan, R. (2010/a). Q Facto 10-A commercial off-the-shelf component quality model proposal. *J. Software Eng*, 4(1), 1-15.
- Kameshwaran, S., Narahari, Y., Rosa, C. H., Kulkarni, D. M., & Tew, J. D. (2007). Multiattribute electronic procurement using goal programming. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 179(2), 518-536.
- Kang, H. Y., & Lee, A. H. (2007). Priority mix planning for semiconductor fabrication by fuzzy AHP ranking. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 32(2), 560-570.
- Kasli, M., & Avcikurt, C. (2008). An investigation to evaluate the websites of tourism departments of universities in Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 7(2), 77-92.
- Keeney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. (1993). *Decisions with multiple objectives: preferences and value trade-offs*. Cambridge university press.
- Kengpol, A., & Tuominen, M. (2006). A framework for group decision support systems: an application in the evaluation of information technology for logistics firms. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 101(1), 159-171.

- Kim, M., Kim, J. H., & Lennon, S. J. (2006). Online service attributes available on apparel retail web sites: an ES-QUAL approach. *Managing Service Quality*, 16(1), 51-77.
- Kim, S., & Stoel, L. (2004). Dimensional hierarchy of retail website quality. *Information & Management*, 41(5), 619-633.
- Kim, W. G., & Kim, D. J. (2004). Factors affecting online hotel reservation intention between online and non-online customers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 23(4), 381-395.
- Kirakowski, J. (2000). *Questionnaires in usability engineering: a list of frequently asked questions* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition.). Cork, Ireland: Human Factors Research Group.
- Kitchenham, B. A., & Pickard, L. M. (1998). Evaluating software engineering methods and tools: part 9: quantitative case study methodology. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 23(1), 24-26.
- Kontio, J. (1995). OTSO: A Systematic Process for Reusable Software Component Selection. University of Maryland, College Park, USA.
- Kontio, J. (1996, March). A case study in applying a systematic method for COTS selection. In *Software Engineering, 1996., Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on IEEE*.
- Koufaris, M. (2003). Applying the technology acceptance model and flow theory to online consumer behavior. *Information systems research*, 13(2), 205-223.
- Kunda, D. (2001). *A social-technical approach to selecting software supporting COTS-Based Systems*. PhD thesis, University of York.
- Kuo, M. S., Liang, G. S., & Huang, W. C. (2006). Extensions of the multicriteria analysis with pairwise comparison under a fuzzy environment. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 43(3), 268-285.
- Kwong, C. K., & Bai, H. (2003). Determining the importance weights for the customer requirements in QFD using a fuzzy AHP with an extent analysis approach. *IIE transactions*, 35(7), 619-626.
- Lau, S. Q. (2006). Domain analysis of e-commerce systems using feature-based model templates. Master's thesis, Dept. of ECE, University of Waterloo, Canada.
- Law, R. (2007). A fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making model for evaluating travel websites. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(2), 147-159.

- Law, R., Qi, S., & Buhalis, D. (2010). Progress in tourism management: A review of website evaluation in tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 31(3), 297-313.
- Lazar, J., Dudley-Sponaugle, A., & Greenidge, K. (2004). Improving web accessibility: a study of webmaster perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 20(2), 269-288.
- Leahy, M. (2004). Project Evaluation Training Guide for MRS Grants Program Applicants and Recipients. Retrieved 19, Jun, 2010, from [http://mi.mi.gov/documents/PE\\_MRS\\_Grants\\_Program\\_Training\\_FINAL\\_100504\\_106025\\_7.pdf](http://mi.mi.gov/documents/PE_MRS_Grants_Program_Training_FINAL_100504_106025_7.pdf).
- Lederer, A., Maupin, D., Sena, M., & Zhuang, Y. (2000). The technology acceptance model and the World Wide Web. *Decision Support Systems*, 29(3), 269-282.
- Lee, C. C., Chiang, C., & Chen, C. T. (2012). An Evaluation Model of E-service Quality by Applying Hierarchical Fuzzy TOPSIS Method. *International Journal of Electronic Business Management*, 10(1).38-49.
- Lee, C. C., Tzeng, G. H., & Chiang, C. (2011). Determining Service Quality Measurement Key Indicators in a Travel Website Using a Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process. *International Journal of Electronic Business Management*, 9(4).322-333.
- Lee, J. W., & Kim, S. H. (2001). An integrated approach for interdependent information system project selection. *International Journal of Project Management*, 19(2), 111-118.
- Lee, Y., & Kozar, K. A. (2006). Investigating the effect of website quality on e-business success: an analytic hierarchy process (AHP) approach. *Decision support systems*, 42(3), 1383-1401.
- Leijnse, A., & Hassanizadeh, S. M. (1994). Model definition and model validation. *Advances in water resources*, 17(3), 197-200.
- Liao, Z., & Cheung, M. (2001). Internet-based e-shopping and consumer attitudes: an empirical study. *Information & Management*, 38(5), 299-306.
- Li, W., Sun, Y., & Wang, Z. (2005). Research On A New Recognition Method Of E-Commerce Models. *The fourth International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics (ICMLC 2005) Held on 18-21 August 2005 at Guangzhou, China* (1789-1794). China: IEEE press.
- Lin, H. F. (2010). An application of fuzzy AHP for evaluating course website quality. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 877-888.

- Lin, P. W. (2006). *The effects of consumers' online shopping goals and their characteristics on perceived interactivity and shopping behaviors*. PhD thesis, University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Liu, C., & Arnett, K. (2000). Exploring the factors associated with Web site success in the context of electronic commerce. *Information & Management*, 38(1), 23-33.
- Liu, P., & Hu, R. (2008, January). Research on Evaluation of E-Commerce WebSites Based on linguistic ordered weighted averaging Operator. In *Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 2008. WKDD held on 23-24 January 2008. First International Workshop on* (245-248). Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Liu, Y. W., & Kwon, Y. J. (2007, August). A Fuzzy AHP approach to evaluating e-commerce websites. In *Software Engineering Research, Management & Applications, 2007.SERA 2007. 5th ACIS International Conference on* (114-124). Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Loiacono, E. T., Watson, R. T., & Goodhue, D. L. (2002). WEBQUAL: A measure of website quality. *Marketing theory and applications*, 13(3), 432-438.
- Lopez, M. (2000). *An evaluation theory perspective of the Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Method (ATAM)*. (Rep. No. CMU/SEI-2000-TR-012). Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh Pa Software Engineering Inst., USA. Retrieved from DTIC. (ADA387265).
- Madu, C. N., & Madu, A. A. (2002). Dimensions of e-quality. *International Journal of Quality & reliability management*, 19(3), 246-258.
- Marsden, P. V., & Wright, J. D. (2010). *Handbook of survey research*: Emerald Group Publishing.
- McGarry, J., Card, D., Jones, C., Layman, B., Clark, E., Dean, J., et al. (2002). *Practical software measurement: objective information for decision makers*. Argentina: Addison-Wesley.
- McGovern, G., & Norton, R. (2002). *Content critical: Gaining competitive advantage through high-quality web content*. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Miranda, F.J., Cortés, R., & Barriuso, C. (2006). Quantitative Evaluation of e-Banking Web Sites: an Empirical Study of Spanish Banks. *The Electronic Journal Information Systems Evaluation*, 9(2), 73-80.

- Miranda González, F. J., & Palacios, B. (2004). Quantitative evaluation of commercial web sites:: an empirical study of Spanish firms. *International Journal of Information Management*, 24(4), 313-328.
- Moody, D. L., Sindre, G., Brasethvik, T., & SÅlvberg, A. (2003). Evaluating the quality of information models: empirical testing of a conceptual model quality framework. *The Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Software engineering held on 3-10 May 2003 at Portland, Oregon, USA*, 295 - 305. USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Morrison, A. M., Taylor, J. S., & Douglas, A. (2005). Website evaluation in tourism and hospitality: the art is not yet stated. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 17(2-3), 233-251.
- Morris, M. G., & Dillon, A. (1997). The influence of user perceptions on software utilization: application and evaluation of a theoretical model of technology acceptance.
- Moustakis, V., Tsironis, L., & Litos, C. (2006). A model of web site quality assessment. *Quality Management Journal*, 13(2), 22.
- Myers, B., Kappelman, L., & Victor, R. (1997). A comprehensive model for assessing the quality and productivity of the information systems function: toward a theory for information systems assessment. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 10(1), 6-25.
- Nielsen, J., & Molich, R. (1990, March). Heuristic evaluation of user interfaces. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems* (249-256). ACM.
- Noruzi, A. (2005). "Web impact factors for Iranian universities", Webology, Vol. 2 No. 1, Article 11. <http://www.webology.ir/2005/v2n1/a11.html>
- Oliveira, L., & Joia, L. (2005). A model for evaluating B2C e-commerce web sites: application in the CD e-retailing industry in Brazil. In *Proceedings of the 13th European Conference on Information Systems*, Information Systems in a Rapidly Changing Economy, ECIS 2005, Regensburg, Germany.
- Olsina, L., & Rossi, G. (2000). Web Engineering: A Quantitative Methodology for Quality Evaluation and Comparison of Web Applications. Retrieved 13, May, 2010, from <http://www.emis.de/journals/SADIO/vol.3.1/olsinasantos.pdf>.
- Olsina, L., & Rossi, G. (2002). A Quantitative Method for Quality Evaluation of Web Sites and Applications. *IEEE Multimedia Magazine*, 9(4), 20-29.

- Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2004). Compromise solution by MCDM methods: A comparative analysis of VIKOR and TOPSIS. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 156(2), 445-455.
- Page, C. & Meyer, D. (2000). *Applied Research Design for Business and Management*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
- Perkowitz, M., & Etzioni, O. (2000). Towards adaptive web sites: Conceptual framework and case study. *Artificial Intelligence*, 118(2-1), 245-275.
- Phan, D., Chen, J. Q., & Ahmad, S. (2005). Lessons learned from an initial e-commerce failure by a catalog retailer. *Information Systems Management*, 22(3), 7–13.
- Phippen, A., Sheppard, L., & Furnell, S. (2004). A practical evaluation of Web analytics. *Internet Research*, 14(4), 284-293.
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. (1991). A Manual for the Use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Pita, Z., Cheong, F., & Corbitt, B. (2009). The development of an evaluation model of e-commerce websites for the Taiwanese airline industry. Retrieved 8 August, 2012, from <http://is2.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecis/20090015.pdf>
- Pitt, L., Watson, R., & Kavan, C. (1995). Service quality: a measure of information systems effectiveness. *MIS Quarterly*, 173-187.
- Pohekar, S. D., & Ramachandran, M. (2004). Application of multi-criteria decision making to sustainable energy planning—a review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 8(4), 365-381.
- Pressman, R. S. (2000). Software engineering: *A practitioner's approach* (5th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Punter, T. (1997). Using checklists to evaluate software product quality. In Proceedings of European Software Control and Metrics (ESCOM) Conference held on 26-28 May 1997 at Berlin, German.
- Rababah, O. M. A., & Masoud, F. A. (2010). Key factors for developing a successful e-commerce website. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 2010, 1-9.
- Rae, A. K., Hausen, H. L. & Robert, P. (1995). *Software Evaluation for Certification : Principles, Practice and Legal Liability*. Middlesex, UK: McGraw-Hill.

- Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 15(4), 353-375.
- Saaty, T. L. (1980). *The analytic hierarchy process*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Saaty, T. L. (1990). How to make a decision: The analytic hierarchy process. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 48(1), 9–26.
- Saeid, M., Ghani, A., Azim, A., & Selamat, H. (2011). Rank-order weighting of web attributes for website evaluation. *The International Arab Journal of Information Technology*, 8(1), 30-38.
- Salman, A., & Hasim, M. S. (2011). Internet usage in a Malaysian sub-urban community: A study of diffusion of ICT innovation. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 16(2), 1-15.
- Scriven, M. (1991). Evaluation thesaurus. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2010). Research methods for business: A skill building approach (5th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sekaran, U. (2006). Research methods for business: A Skill Building Approach (5th Ed.). UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shee, D. Y., & Wang, Y. S. (2008). Multi-criteria evaluation of the web-based e-learning system: A methodology based on learner satisfaction and its applications. *Computers & Education*, 50(3), 894-905.
- Shen, Z., & Shen, B. (2010). Trust evaluation method handling multi-factors for C2C E-Commerce. Paper presented at the Progress in Informatics and Computing (PIC), 2010 IEEE International Conference on held on 10-12 Dec. 2010 at Beijing, China, (pp. 1236 - 1240) USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Smith, A., & Rupp, W. (2003). Strategic online customer decision making: leveraging the transformational power of the Internet. *Online Information Review*, 27(6), 418-432.
- Song, J., & Zahedi, F. (2005). A Theoretical Approach to Web Design in E-Commerce: A Belief Reinforcement Model. *Management Science*. 51 (8), 1219-1235.
- Song, Y., & Wang, L. (2009, December). High Credible Model of E-commerce Website. In *Information Science and Engineering (ISISE), 2009 Second International Symposium on* (pp. 109-113). IEEE.

- Srinivasan, A. (1985). Alternative measures of system effectiveness: Associations and implications. *MIS Quarterly*. 9(3), 243-253.
- Sullivan, T. (1996). *User Testing Techniques - A Reader- Friendliness Checklist*. Retrieved 29, August, 2010, from <http://www.pantos.org/atw/35317.html>.
- Sun, C., & Lin, G. (2009). Using fuzzy TOPSIS method for evaluating the competitive advantages of shopping websites. *Expert Systems With Applications*. 36 (9), 11764-11771.
- Stewart, R., & Mohamed, S. (2002). IT/IS projects selection using multi-criteria utility theory. *Logistics Information Management*, 15(4), 254-270.
- Swanson, E.B., (1974). Management information systems: appreciation and involvement. *Management Science* 21 (2), 178–188.
- Tarawneh, O., Ahmad, F., & Yahaya, J. (2012). Business to Consumer Evaluation Practices, Obstacles, and Factors: A Pilot Study from Consumers Perspectives on Jordanian Firm. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 3(1). 1-7.
- Tam, M. C., & Tummala, V. M. (2001). An application of the AHP in vendor selection of a telecommunications system. *Omega*, 29(2), 171-182.
- Tan, F. T., L. (2009). Exploring website evaluation criteria using the repertory grid technique: A web designers' perspective. In the *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Workshop on HCI Research held on 12-13 December 2003 at Seattle, WA* (PP. 65-69). Washington: AIS SIGHCI.
- Tan, G. W., & Wei, K. K. (2006). An empirical study of Web browsing behaviour: Towards an effective Website design. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*. 5 (4), 261-271.
- Tarafdar, M., & Zhang, J. (2005). Analyzing the influence of web site design parameters on web site usability. *Information Resources Management Journal (IRMJ)*, 18(4), 62-80.
- Tate, J. (2003). *Software process quality models: A comparative evaluation* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Computer Science, Durham University).University of Durham, Durham, UK.

- Tesch, D., Kloppenborg, T. J., & Frolick, M. N. (2007). IT Project Risk Factors: The Project Management Professionals Perspective. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 47(4).
- Tian, J. (2004). Quality-Evaluation Models and Measurements. *IEEE Software*. 21 (3), 84-91.
- Tong, S., & Ji-Shun, Z. (2010, May). E-business website evaluating base on extension theory. In *Industrial Mechatronics and Automation (ICIMA), 2010 2nd International Conference on* (Vol. 2, pp. 483-486). IEEE.
- Tsai, W. H., Chou, W. C., & Lai, C. W. (2010). An effective evaluation model and improvement analysis for national park websites: A case study of Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 936-952.
- Tsai, W. H., Chou, W. C., & Leu, J. D. (2011). An effectiveness evaluation model for the web-based marketing of the airline industry. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(12), 15499-15516.
- Tsaur, S. H., Chang, T. Y., & Yen, C. H. (2002). The evaluation of airline service quality by fuzzy MCDM. *Tourism management*, 23(2), 107-115.
- Tzeng, G. H., Lin, C. W., & Opricovic, S. (2005). Multi-criteria analysis of alternative-fuel buses for public transportation. *Energy Policy*, 33(11), 1373-1383.
- Velasquez, M., & Hester, P. T. (2013). An Analysis of Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods. *International Journal of Operations Research*, 6(10), 56-66.
- Venkatesh, V., Ramesh, V., & Massey, A. P. (2003). Understanding usability in mobile commerce. *Communications of the ACM*, 46(12), 53-56.
- Wahab, S., Al-Momani, K., & Noor, N. (2010). The relationship between e-service quality and ease of use on customer relationship management (CRM) performance: an empirical investigation in Jordan mobile phone services. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 15(1), 1-15.
- Wan, C. S. (2002). The web sites of international tourist hotels and tour wholesalers in Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 23(2), 155-160.
- Wang, N., Liu, D., & Cheng, J. (2008). *Study on the Influencing Factors of Online Shopping*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 11th Joint Conference on Information Sciences, Atlantis Press.

- Wang, W., & Zhou, Y. (2009). E-Business Websites Evaluation Based on Opinion Mining. *International Conference on Electronic Commerce and Business Intelligence (ECBI 2009) held on 6-7 June 2009 at Beijing, China* (87 - 90). Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Wang, X., & Triantaphyllou, E. (2008). Ranking irregularities when evaluating alternatives by using some ELECTRE methods. *Omega*, 36(1), 45-63.
- Wibowo, S. (2011). *Fuzzy Multicriteria Analysis and Its Applications for Decision Making under Uncertainty* (Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University).
- Wibowo, S., & Deng, H. P. (2009). A consensus support system for supplier selection in group decision making. *Journal of Management Science and Statistical Decision*, 6(4), 52-59.
- Wong, J. K., & Li, H. (2008). Application of the analytic hierarchy process (AHP) in multi-criteria analysis of the selection of intelligent building systems. *Building and Environment*, 43(1), 108-125.
- Wu, F., Mahajan, V., & Balasubramanian, S. (2003). An analysis of e-business adoption and its impact on business performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(4), 425-447.
- Xu, Z. (2009). An automatic approach to reaching consensus in multiple attribute group decision making. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 56(4), 1369-1374.
- Xu, Z. S., & Chen, J. (2007). An interactive method for fuzzy multiple attribute group decision making. *Information Sciences*, 177(1), 248-263.
- Yahaya, J., Deraman, A. (2010). Measuring Immeasurable Attributes of Software Quality Using Pragmatic Quality Factor. *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Computer Science and Information Technology held on 9-11 July, 2010 at Chengdu, China* (pp. 197 - 202). Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Yahaya, J., Deraman, A., & Hamdan, A. (2006). Software quality and certification: Perception and practices in Malaysia. *Journal of ICT*, 5, 63-82.
- Yahaya, J.H. (2007). The Development of Software Certification Model Based on Product Quality Approach. UKM PhD thesis.
- Yahaya, J., Deraman, A., & Hamdan, A. (2008). Software Quality from Behavioral and Human Perspectives. *IJCSNS*, 8(8), 53-63.

- Yang, Z., & Fang, X. (2004). Online service quality dimensions and their relationships with satisfaction: a content analysis of customer reviews of securities brokerage services. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(3), 302-326.
- Yeh, C. H., Deng, H., & Chang, Y. H. (2000). Fuzzy multicriteria analysis for performance evaluation of bus companies. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 126(3), 459-4
- Yin, R. k. (2003). Case Study Research: Design and Methods (3rd Ed.). California: sage Publication.
- Yousef, M. A. (2013) *Harmonizing Cmmi-dev1.2 and Xp Method to Improve The Software Development Processes in Small Software Development Firms*. PhD thesis, Utara University Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Yu, X., Guo, S., Guo, J., & Huang, X. (2011). Rank B2C e-commerce websites in e-alliance based on AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(4), 3550-3557.
- Yücenur, G. N., & Demirel, N. Ç. (2012). Group decision making process for insurance company selection problem with extended VIKOR method under fuzzy environment. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(3), 3702-3707.
- Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and control*, 8(3), 338-353.
- Zadeh, L. A. (1975). The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning-II. *Information sciences*, 8(4), 301-357.
- Zarghami, M., & Szidarovszky, F. (2009). Revising the OWA operator for multi criteria decision making problems under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 198(1), 259-265.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (2002). Service excellence in electronic channels. *Managing Service Quality*, 12(3), 135-139.
- Zhang, X., Liu, P., & Du, Z. (2008, October). Research on E-commerce Website Evaluation with Hybrid Decision-Making Index and Extension of the TOPSIS method. *Paper presented at the Pervasive Computing and Applications, 2008. ICPCA 2008.Third International Conference on* (Vol. 1, pp. 106-109).IEEE.
- Zhang, X., & Prybutok, V. R. (2005). A consumer perspective of e-service quality. *Engineering Management, IEEE Transactions on*, 52(4), 461-477.

Zimmermann, H. J. (1987). *Fuzzy sets, decision making, and expert systems*, 193-233. Boston: Kluwer.

Zviran, M., Glezer, C., & Avni, I. (2006). User satisfaction from commercial web sites: the effect of design and use. *Information & Management*, 43(2), 1-22.