

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON METHODS FOR
MEASURING WEB USABILITY**

ROHANA HUSIN

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA

2004

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON METHODS FOR MEASURING WEB USABILITY

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Information Technology in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science (Information Technology),
Universiti Utara Malaysia

By
Rohana Husin

Copyright © Rohana Husin, 2004. All rights reserved.



JABATAN HAL EHWAL AKADEMIK
(Department of Academic Affairs)
Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PROJEK
(Certificate of Project Paper)

Saya, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(I, the undersigned, certify that)

ROHANA HUSIN

calon untuk Ijazah
(candidate for the degree of) **MSc. (IT)**

telah mengemukakan kertas projek yang bertajuk
(has presented his/her project paper of the following title)

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON METHODS FOR MEASURING
WEB USABILITY**

seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas projek
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of project paper)

bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan
dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.
*(that the project paper acceptable in form and content, and that a satisfactory
knowledge of the filed is covered by the project paper).*

Nama Penyelia Utama
(Name of Main Supervisor): **ASSOC. PROF. DR. SHAHIZAN HASSAN**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

:

Tarikh
(Date)

:

24-06-2004

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirement for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor, in their absence, by the Dean of the Graduate School. 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 material in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

Dean of Graduate School

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Kedah Darul Aman.

ABSTRAK

Terdapat banyak kaedah untuk mengukur kebolegunaan web. Setiap kaedah mempunyai kekuatan dan kekangan masing-masing. Penyelidikan ini telah mengenalpasti tiga kaedah yang biasa digunakan untuk mengukur kebolegunaan web. Ketiga-tiga kaedah ini telah diuji dengan menggunakan prototaip yang direka mengandungi beberapa kecacatan utama. Keputusannya menunjukkan tiga kaedah yang biasa digunakan untuk mengukur kebolegunaan web ialah *usability testing*, *heuristic evaluation* dan *cognitive walkthrough*, dan kaedah *usability testing* lebih baik berbanding dua kaedah lain dari segi pengenalpastian masalah kebolegunaan, dan keberkesanan kos.

ABSTRACT

There are many methods in measuring web usability. Each method has its strength and limitation. This study identified the top three most commonly-used methods in measuring web usability. The three methods were applied and tested using a prototype designed with some major flaws. The results show that usability testing, heuristic evaluation, and cognitive walkthrough are the top three methods, and usability testing method (think-aloud technique) is more preferable than the other two in terms of usability problem identified and cost effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and Most Merciful.

I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to:

My supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Shahizan Hassan for his wonderful support and efforts in assisting me carrying out this research project to become a reality;

My beloved husband, Mr. Abdul Aziz Othman for his love and patience; both of my parents and parents-in-law for being there;

The staff members of School of Information Technology, Mr. Hasbullah Omar, Mr. Ahmad Hisham Zainal Abidin, Mr. Ariffin Abdul Mutalib, Ms. Zakirah, Mrs. Juliana Aida, Mrs. Yusrita, Mrs. Cik Fazilah, Ms. Rohaida, and Ms. Nor Fadziana for their kindness and support;

And all individuals involved in the accomplishment of this research project.

2.3	The Needs to Measure Web Usability	8
2.4	Methods for Measuring Web Usability	10
2.5	Summary	15
 CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		17
3.1	Introduction	17
3.2	Phases Involved	17
3.2.1	Content Analysis of Previous Studies on Web Usability	19
3.2.2	Development of the Prototype	19
3.2.3	Evaluation of the Prototype Using All Identified Method	22
3.2.3.1	Usability Testing	22
3.2.3.2	Heuristic Evaluation	23
3.2.3.3	Cognitive Walkthrough	24
3.2.3.4	Participant	25
3.2.3.5	Data Collection Procedures	25
3.2.4	Comparative Analysis of the Result	26
3.3	Summary	26
 CHAPTER FOUR: PREVIOUS STUDY ON WEB USABILITY		28
4.1	Introduction	28
4.2	Top Three Most Commonly-Used Method for Measuring Web Usability	28
4.3	Summary	37

CHAPTER FIVE: PROTOTYPE INTERFACE DESIGN	38
5.1 Introduction	38
5.2 Navigational Mapping	39
5.3 Storyboard	40
5.4 Screen Design	41
5.5 Prototype Contents	43
5.6 Summary	47
CHAPTER SIX: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RESULT	48
6.1 Introduction	48
6.2 Data Analysis	49
6.2.1 Problem Identification	49
6.2.2 Cost Effectiveness	51
6.2.3 Human Factor Involvement	54
6.3 Summary	55
CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	56
7.1 Introduction	56
7.2 Conclusions	56
7.3 Problems and Limitations	57
7.4 Recommendation for Future Work	58
REFERENCES	59
APPENDICES	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1:	Methods for Measuring Web Usability	12
Table 2.2:	Data Collection Methods	14
Table 4.1:	Methods, Number of Studies and Researchers	29
Table 4.2:	Summary Methods Used in Measured Web Usability	30
Table 6.1:	Total Problems Identified by the Flaws Type and Evaluation Method	49
Table 6.2:	Cost Effectiveness Data	51
Table 6.3:	Usability Testing – Time Spent for Each Evaluator	52
Table 6.4:	Heuristic Evaluation – Time Spent for Each Evaluator	53
Table 6.5:	Cognitive Walkthrough – Time Spent for Each Evaluator	53

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1:	Usability as an Attribute of Software Quality According to ISO 9126	10
Figure 2.2:	Summary of Categories of Evaluation Techniques	11
Figure 3.1:	Summary of Phases Involved	18
Figure 3.2:	Web Site Development Life Cycle	20
Figure 4.1:	30 Studies of Usability Evaluation Method	36
Figure 5.1:	Navigation Map of the Prototype Design	40
Figure 5.2:	Rough Storyboard of Prototype	41
Figure 5.3:	Home Interface and Flaws	44
Figure 5.4:	Lecturers Interface	45
Figure 5.5:	Notes Interface	46
Figure 6.1:	Percentage of Each Method Found the Usability Problem	50
Figure 6.2:	The Average Time Spent for Each Method	54

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WWW	- World Wide Web
HTML	- Hypertext Markup Language
MOT	- Management of Technology
OLMOT	- Online Learning for Management of Technology Courses

CHAPTER ONE

PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The advancement in technology has changed the communication process among the people around the world. The technology such as computer has become an important medium for people to communicate between each other. Nowadays, many people already have good knowledge and experiences in using computers in particular the Internet. The Internet technology allows many people to retrieve web sites that contain massive amount of information. Everyday, new web pages are being added to the World Wide Web (WWW) at rapid rate (Comber, 1995). For web sites to be widely accepted and regularly visited, the sites should be well designed.

One of the most important aspects of web design to be considered is usability. According to Nielsen (1993), usability is one of the quality attributes that assesses how easy the user interface is to use. The main aim of usability is to allow users to navigate web sites easily and effectively (Pettersen, 1996). There are many methods available to measure web sites which are proposed in the literature review but only a few are widely used. However, these methods differ between each other in term of coverage, approach and criteria used.

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Athanasios, K. & Andreas, P. (2001). Heuristic Evaluation of Web-Sites: The Evaluator Expertise and the Heuristic List. World Conference on the WWW and Internet Proceedings. Orlando.
- Avouris, N.M. (N.D). An Introduction to Software Usability. Retrieved March 3, 2004 from http://www.ee.upatras.gr/hci/usabilitynet/5Avouris_intro_in_usability.pdf.
- Barnum, C. (2002). Usability Testing and Research. New York: Longman
- Barravale, A. & Lanfranchi, V. (2003). Remote Web Usability Testing. Behavior Research Methods, Instrument, & Computers, 35(7), 364-368.
- Benny, A. (2002). Web Site Development Process-The Life-Cycle Steps. Retrieved March 27, 2004 from http://www.macronimous.com/resources/web_development_life_cycle.asp.
- Battleson, T., Booth, A. & Weintrop, J. (2001). Usability Testing of an Academic Library Web Site: A Case Study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 27(3), 188-198.

Campbell, N., Chistman, J., Diller, K. & Walbridge, S. (2001). Designing for the User: How to Test for Usability. Retrieved Feb 20, 2004 from <http://www.vancouver.wsu.edu/fac/campbell/acrl/>.

Catherine, C. (2000). Focus Group Go Online, to Measure Appeal of Web Sites. *New York Times*. 149 (51441).

Christy, H. & Julie, S. (1998). Recommendations for Benchmarking Web site Usage Among Academic Library. *College & Research libraries*. 59(1), 61.

Clayton, N., Biddle, R. & Tempero, E. (2000). A Study of Usability of Web-Based Software Repositories. *International Conference on Software Methods and Tools*.

Comber, T. (1995). Building Usable Web Pages: An HCI Perspective. Retrieved Jan 25, 2004 from <http://ausweb.scu.edu.au/aw95/hypertext/comber/>.

D Micheal, C. & W Theodore, F. (1997). User-Centered Design and Usability Testing of Web sites: An illustrated case study. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 45(4). *Communication and Technology*, (1-2).

Dick, D. (2000). *PC Multimedia Handbook: Technology and Techniques*. Dumbreck Publishing

Ereback, A. L. & Hook, K. (1994). Using Cognitive Walkthrough for Evaluating CSCW Applications. Conference companion on human factors in computing systems, 91-92. Boston, Massachusetts, United States.

Galitz, W. (2002). *The Essential Guide to User Interface Design*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gediga, G., Hamborg, K. C., & Duntch, I. (1999). Evaluation of Software Systems.

Retrieved Feb 20, 2004 from

<http://citeseer.nj.nec.com/cache/papers/cs/24724/http:zSzzSzpeople.freenet.dezSzgedigazSzsofteval.pdf/evaluation-of-software-systems.pdf>.

Grady, H. M. (2000). Web site: A Case Study in Usability Testing Using Paper Prototype. Proceeding of IEEE professional communication society international communication conference, (pp. 39-45). Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Gunther, E. & Christian, K. (2002). How Do Consumers Search for and Appraise Health Information on the World Wide Web? Qualitative Study Using Focus Group, Usability Tests and in Depth Interview. *British Medical Journal*. 324 (7337), 573.

Gwyneth, C., Rob, L., Diana, R., Judith, H & Tommy, A. (2002). User Perceptions of the Library's Web pages: A Focus Group Study at Texas A&M University. 28 (4), 205.

Hakan, T., Sun Myung, L., Charles, G. & Kirk Job, S. (2001). Usability Testing of the Indiana University Education Faculty Web Forms. Annual Proceeding of Selected Research and Development Practice Papers presented at National Convention of the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, (1-2).

Hughes, M., Blackmon, Kitajima, M. & Lewis, C. (2002). Cognitive Walkthrough for the Web. Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems: Changing our world, changing ourselves, (pp. 463-470). Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA.

Hughes, M., Blackmon, Kitajima, M. & Polson, P. G. (2003). Repairing Usability Problems Identified by the Cognitive Walkthrough for the Web. Proceedings of the conference on human factors in computing systems, (pp.497-504). Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, USA.

Ince, D. (2001). *Dictionary of the Internet*. USA: Oxford University Press, Inc.

ISO DIS 9241-11 (1993). Ergonomic Requirements for Office Work with Visual Display Terminal. Part 11: Guidance on specifying and measuring usability. International Organization for Standardization.

Ivory, M & Hearst, M. (2001). The State of the Art in Automating Usability Evaluation of User Interfaces. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 33(4), 470-516.

Jae Soon, A., Su-Hong, P. & Eun-ok, B. (2001). Web Usability Test Finding and Analysis Issues. Annual Proceeding of Selected Research and Development Practice Papers presented at National Convention of the Association for Educational

John, B (1996). Evaluating Usability Evaluation Techniques. *ACM Computing Survey*. (28 n.4es).

Karat, C. M., Campbell, R., & Fiegel, T. (1992). Comparison of Empirical Testing and Walkthrough Methods In User Interface Evaluation. Conference on Human Factor in Computing System. Proceeding of SIGCHI Conference on Human Factor in Computing System.

Kim, S., Thomas, S., & Helmut, S. (2003). Web site Design Benchmarking within Industry Groups. *Internet Research*. 13(1), 17.

Kuutti, K, Battarbee., Sade, S., Mattelmaki, T., Keinonen, T., Teirikko, T. & Tornberg, A. (2001). Virtual Prototype in Usability Testing. 34th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Science, Volume 5.

Lautenbach, M. A. E., Schegget. I. S., Schoute, A. M., & Witteman, C. L. M. (NoDate).

Evaluating the Usability of Web Pages: A Case Study. Retrieved Jan 20, 2004
from

<http://www.phil.uu.nl/~mjanssen/ckipreprints/PREPRINTS/preprint011.pdf>.

Law, L. & Hvannberg, E. (2002). Complementary and Convergence of Heuristic Evaluation and Usability Test: A Case Study of UNIVERSAL Brokerage Platform. Proceeding of the Second Nordic Conference on Human- Computer Interaction. Aarhus, Denmark.

Lee, S. (1999). Usability Testing for Developing Effective Interactive Multimedia Software. *Educational Technology and Society*, 2(2).

Levi, M. D. & Conrad, F. G. (1996). A heuristic Evaluation of a World Wide Web Prototype. *Interaction*. 3(4).

Molich, R. & Rubin, J. (2003). Comparative Expert Reviews. CHI '03 Extended Abstract on Human Factors in Computer Systems. Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, USA.

Molich, R., Thomsen, A.D., Karyukina, B., Schmidt, L., Ede, M., Oel, W.V. & Arcuri, M. (1999). Comparative Evaluation of Usability Tests. Conference on human factors in computing system. CHI'99 extended abstracts on human factor in computing systems, (pp. 83-84). Pittsburg, Pennsylvania.

Muller, M. J. & McClard, A. (1995). Validating an Extension to Participatory Heuristic Evaluation: Quality of Work and Quality of Work Life. Conference companion on human factors in computing systems, (pp.115-116). Denver, Colorado, United States.

Muller, M. J., Matheson, L., Page, C. & Gallup, R. (1998). Methods & Tools: Participatory Heuristic Evaluation. *Interactions*. 5(5), 13-28.

Myra, S., Bamshad, M., Bettina, B. & Miki, N. (2003). A Framework for the Evaluation of Session Reconstruction Heuristics in Web Usage Analysis. *Journal on Computing* 15(2).

Nielsen, J. (1992). Finding Usability Problems through Heuristic Evaluation. Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing system: empowering people, (pp. 373-380). Monterey, California, United States.

Nielsen, J. (1993). *Usability Engineering*. USA: Academic Press, Inc.

Nielsen, J. (1994). How to Conduct a Heuristic Evaluation. Retrieved March 5, 2004 from http://www.useit.com/papers/heuristic/heuristic_evaluation.html

Nielsen, J. (2000). *Designing Web Usability: The Practice of Simplicity*. USA: Academic Press, Inc.

Nielsen, J. (2003). Heuristic Evaluation. Retrieved March 11, 2004 from <http://www.useit.com/papers/heuristic>.

Nielsen, J. & Molich, R. (1990). Heuristic Evaluation of User Interfaces. Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing system: empowering people, (pp. 249-256). Seattle, Washington, United States.

Penny, Y. & Jonathan, V (1999). A Web Accessible Tutorial for PsyScope Based on Classic Experiments in Human Cognition. *Behavior Research Methods, Instrument, & Computers*. 31(1). (107).

Perlman, G. (1997). Practical Usability Evaluation. Retrieved March 23, 2004 from <http://www.acm.org/sgchi/chi97/proceedings/tutorial/gp.htm>.

Petterson, G. (1992). A Design Model For Computer Based Training, D. Phil Thesis, Universiti of Ulster, Jordanstown, N. Ireland.

Powell, T. A. (2000). *Web Design: The Complete References*. USA: McGraw-Hill.

- Preece, J., Rogers, Y., & Sharp, H. (2002). *Interaction Design: Beyond Human Computer Interaction*. USA: John Willey & Sons, Inc.
- Rieman, J., Franzke, M. & Redmiles, D. (1995). Usability Evaluation with the Cognitive Walkthrough. CHI companion 95. Denver, Colorado, USA.
- Ritu, A. & Viswanath, V. (2002). Assessing a Firm's Web Presence: A Heuristic Evaluation Procedure for the Measurement of Usability. *Information System Research*, 13(2).
- Rubin, J. (1994). *Handbook of Usability Testing*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rubin, J., Miller, J. R., Wharton, C., & Uyeda, K.M. (1991). User Interface Evaluation In The Real World: A Comparison of Four Techniques. Conference on Human Factor in Computing System. Proceeding of SIGHI Conference on Human Factor in Computing System.
- Scholtz, J. (2001). Adaptation of Traditional Usability Testing Methods for Remote Testing. 34 Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Science, Vol. 5.
- Shahizan, H. & Norshuhada, S. (2003). Utilizing IGV Approach in Evaluating the Usability of Web Sites. *Journal of Information and Communication Technology, UUM*.

Shahizan, H. & Li, F. (2003) Benchmarking the Usability and Content Usefulness of Web Site: A Practical Approach. International Conference on Web Engineering (ICWE2003), Aviedo, Spain, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1923, Springer-Verlag:Berlin.

Shneiderman, B. (1998). *Design The User Interface: Strategies For Effective Human Computer Interaction*. Masschusetts: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.

Simeral, E. J, & Branaghan, R. J. (N.D). A Comparative Analysis of Heuristic and Usability Evaluation Methods. Retrieved March 14, 2004 from <http://www.stc.org/confproceed/1997/PDFs/0140.PDF>.

Sulaiman, S, Abdullah, I & Jais, J. (2001). Usability Testing for Developing Effective Interactive Multimedia Software: Concept, Dimension and Procedures. Proceeding of the International Conference on Information Technology and Multimedia at UNITEN.

Susan, M. (2001). Usability Testing in a Library Web site Redesign Project. RSR: *Reference Service Review*, 29 (1), 7 7-22.

Sutcliffe, A. (2002). Assessing the Reliability of Heuristic Evaluation for Website Attractiveness and Usability. Proceedings of the 35th Hawaii International Conferences on System Sciences.

Usability Evaluation. Retrieved April 15, 2004 from

<http://www.pages.drexel.edu/~zwz22/UsabilityHome.html>

Vaughan, T. (2001). *Multimedia Making it Work*. USA: McGraw-Hill.

Wixon, D. (2003). Evaluating Usability Methods Why the Current Literature Fail The Practitioner. *Interactions*. 10(4), 28-34.

Zulzalil, H., Udzir, N. I., Khalid, F., Abdullah, R., & Kamarudin, A. (2001). A Study on Usability Web Pages Using Heuristic Evaluation. Proceeding of The International Conference On Information Technology and Multimedia at UNITEN.