

Enhancing Website Quality through Usability

Amandeep Kaur^{1*}, Jaswinder Singh², Satinder Kaur³, Kirandeep Kaur⁴

¹Research Scholar, Department of Computer Science, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India ²Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India ³Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Engineering and Technology, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India ⁴Research Scholar, Department of Computer Engineering and Technology, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India

Abstract: Every university website aspires to easily provide its visitors with important academic information. Concerns have been raised regarding these websites' usability and ability to live up to the expectations of their target audience. Examining how website usability improves website quality, this overview of the literature focuses on how it affects user experience, engagement, and general effectiveness. This work summarizes important results and recommends best practices for improving website usability through a thorough examination of academic journals, industry reports, and case studies. Through knowledge of the connection between website quality and usability, businesses may make wise choices in the digital environment to raise user happiness and accomplish their strategic goals.

Keywords: website, quality, usability, users, web.

1. Introduction

In today's digital age, websites are essential tools for connection, business, and communication. The quality of a website greatly influences user attitudes, actions, and results. Even if there are many elements that go into making a website good, usability is essential in influencing the user experience and figuring out how successful a website is all around. This review of the literature examines the relationship between quality and usability of websites, highlighting the importance of usability principles and best practices in achieving intended results. High-learning curve websites attract more visitors and, by increasing consumer lock-in, improve business outcomes (Johnson, Bellman, and Lohse, 2003). Emphasizing the process of customer lock-in, Zauberman (2003) notes that utilizing and understanding the website raises the cost of changing and implies that users are unaware of the mechanism that locks them in. On the other hand, most studies confirm that ease-ofuse plays a major impact on the choice to learn and use technology applications (Davis, 1989; Nielsen, 2000). A website that is easier to understand and use (Nielsen, 2000) and provides a "compelling" experience (Novak, Hoffman, and Yung, 2000) encourages users to use and return to the website after controlling for extrinsic factors like perceived utility and company-related characteristics. However, further research is required to thoroughly assess the factors that contribute to the success of an IT artifact, such as its usefulness and ease of use, and to examine the relationships between usability components and users' attitudes and actions towards the IT artifact (Benbasat

*Corresponding author: amandeep2761@gmail.com

and Barki, 2007). In fact, not much research looks at how the usability aspects of a website affect performance while taking into account the user experience and the final product the website provides. Agarwal and Venkatesh (2006) To put it another way, what effect do certain usability aspects have on the attitudes and behavior intentions of website users? And do these effects differ based on the final good the website provides or the user's experience? This study develops and tests a set of hypotheses in two proximate cultures (English vs. French-speaking Canadians) to answer these problems.

2. Literature Review

The literature on website usability uses theories and frameworks from information architecture, user experience (UX) design, and human-computer interaction (HCI). Fundamental ideas in website usability improvement include user-centered design, cognitive load theory, and Nielsen's usability heuristics. Websites are the main means of recruiting and admissions for schools and universities in the digital age (Raisman, 2003; Slaughter et al., 2004). Universities' websites serve as both a means of information dissemination and a channel for communicating admissions, major announcements, hiring, and events to prospective students, recruiters, and professionals (Poock & Andrews Bishop, 2006; Poock & Lefond, 2001; Schneider, 2005). Universities are also using their websites to differentiate themselves from other universities and look more inviting (LeFauve, 2001; Rigol, 2003; Urciuoli, 2003). Table 1 lists the information on most university websites. Admission is one of the main obstacles to obtaining an intangible good like higher education. For this reason, universities are stressing concrete proof to support their reputation (Anctil, 2008; Morphew & Hartley, 2006). Consequently, universities are increasingly utilizing websites as their primary tool to enhance their reputation and establish a more robust identity. For any stakeholder, college or university websites are their first impression. Anderson and Reid (1999) correctly noted, "Visiting university websites seems to have become the norm, with many people considering their visit to a university website as their first visit to the university itself." Universities' websites are the main informational source, so Slabá (2015) claims that they will establish a reputation among stakeholders. Ramasubramanian et al. (2003) proposed that the

university website's virtual tour has replaced the traditional handshake, which involves congratulating prospective students during a campus visit, with a digital handshake. Schimmel et al. (2010) state that universities should have easily navigable websites with information on their programs, course offers, location, accreditation, etc. Soegoto (2018) also discussed the potential enhancement of a higher education institution's brand image through the use of the Laravel framework in website design. Furthermore, the website's representation of the university's reputation, activities, and style significantly influenced the in-person campus experience.

3. Website Usability Dimensions

A. Efficient

The degree of efficacy and precision with which users accomplish their objectives is a significant factor. If a user is unable to accomplish their intended task, the duration and difficulty of the experience become irrelevant. Ultimately, they have been unsuccessful in accomplishing their tasks or achieving their objectives. To assess effectiveness, it is imperative to understand how individuals perceive success or usefulness, whether it is a straightforward concept.

B. Effective

This task can be completed efficiently while maintaining precision. At a call center, operators' ability to manage a high volume of calls within a day can precisely specify efficiency. Assessing whether a task is taking "too long" or requiring "too many clicks" is a subjective determination.

C. Engaging

The usability of an interface is measured by its pleasantness, satisfaction, and interest level. Instead of using the word "satisfaction," we use "engaging" to describe how the interface might draw someone to a website or an activity. Furthermore, it scrutinizes the quality of the interaction, or the degree to which the consumer can form a bond with the presentation and organization of the product.

D. Fault-tolerant

The product's effectiveness in error prevention and user recovery from any occurring errors is noteworthy. While it would be ideal to claim that something is completely devoid of faults or capable of preventing them, the reality is that mistakes, accidents, and misunderstandings are bound to occur. As you click, the cat gently pushes the mouse. If you have misinterpreted a hyperlink and wish to return to the previous page, or if you have made a typographical error while entering a number, you need to rectify the situation. The true measure is the interface's effectiveness after encountering an error.

E. Easy to acquire

The extent to which the product facilitates both initial orientation and deeper learning. You can use a product once, occasionally, or continuously. The system can assist with tasks of varying difficulty, regardless of the user's level of expertise. However, each use of the interface necessitates the recall or acquisition of knowledge, leading to the gradual discovery of other aspects of the product.

4. Impact of Usability on Website Quality

According to research findings, a website's usability has a significant impact on its quality and performance in a number of ways:

- Websites that are easy to use contribute to increased levels of user happiness, which in turn leads to favourable opinions of the brand or business.
- Usable websites encourage visitors to explore content, products, or services by facilitating user engagement and interaction. This increases the likelihood that users will explore the website.
- There is a correlation between improved usability and greater conversion rates. Improved website usability increases the likelihood of users completing desired actions, like making a purchase or filling out a form.

5. Best Practices for Optimizing Usability

The following are some of the best practices that, according to the research, can improve the quality and usability of websites:

- *Perform User Research:* Utilize techniques such as questionnaires, interviews, and usability testing to gain an understanding of each individual user's requirements, preferences, and actions.
- *Simplify Navigation:* Create navigation structures that are accessible and easy to understand. In order to accommodate people with disabilities, we should prioritize accessibility and check websites to ensure they adhere to accessibility standards and rules.
- *Optimize Performance:* Increase the website's speed and performance to improve the overall user experience and satisfaction.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the usability of websites is an important factor that plays a significant part in defining the quality and effectiveness of websites. Organizations are able to develop user-friendly websites that improve customer satisfaction, engagement, and conversion rates by giving usability principles a higher priority and putting best practices into action. In light of the ongoing evolution of the digital landscape, it is necessary to pay constant attention to usability in order to maintain a competitive edge and achieve strategic goals.

References

- [1] Anctil, E. (2008). Market driven versus mission driven. ASHE Higher Education Report: Selling Higher Education, 34(2), 1–119.
- [2] Anderson, C. E., & Reid, J. S. (1999). Are higher education institutions providing college-bound high school students with what they want on the Web? A study of information needs and perceptions about university and college Web pages. Proceedings of the 1999 Symposium for the Marketing of Higher Education, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 54–59.
- [3] Benbasat, I., Barki, H.: Quo Vadis TAM. Journal of the AIS 8(4), 211– 218, 2007.

- [4] Davis, F.D.: Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly 13(3), 319–340, 1989.
- [5] Geron, G. (2018). Best practices in institutional websites for international visibility.

https://er.educause.edu/articles/2018/2/best-practices-in-institutionalwebsites-for-international-visibility

- [6] Johnson, E.J., Bellman, S., Lohse, G.: Cognitive lock-in and the power law of practice. Journal of Marketing 67(2), 62–75, 2003.
- [7] LeFauve, L. M. (2001). The place of the web in college choice: Information or persuasion? AIR 2001 Annual Forum Paper.
- [8] Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. Journal of Higher Education, 77(3), 456–471.
- [9] Nielsen, J.: Designing Web Usability. New Riders, Indianapolis (2000)
- [10] Novak, T., Hoffman, D., Yung, Y.-F.: Measuring the customer experience in online environments: A structural modeling approach. Marketing Science 19(1), 22–43, 2000.
- [11] Poock, M. C., & Andrews Bishop, V. (2006). Characteristics of an effective community college web site. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30(9), 687–695.
- [12] Poock, M. C., & Lefond, D. (2001). How college-bound prospects perceive university web sites: Findings, implications, and turning browsers into applicants. College and University, 77(1), 15.
- [13] Raisman, N. A. (2003). Ah, what rotten webs we weave. Chronicle of Higher Education, 19(3), 17.

- [14] Ramasubramanian, S., Gyure, J. F., & Mursi, N. M. (2003). Impact of internet images: Impression-formation effects of university web site images. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 12(2), 49–68.
- [15] Rigol, G. W. (2003). Admissions decision-making models: How US institutions of higher education select undergraduate students. College Entrance Examination Board.
- [16] Schimmel, K., Motley, D., Marco, G., & Eschenfelder, M. (2010). The importance of university web pages in selecting a higher education institution. Research in Higher Education Journal, 9(1), 1–16.
- [17] Schneider, R. L. (2005). Marketing medical education: An examination of recruitment web sites for traditional and combined-degree MD programs. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 14(2), 19–36.
- [18] Slaba, M. (2015). Stakeholder groups of public and private universities in the Czech Republic–Identification, categorization and prioritization. Review of Economic Perspectives, 15(3), 305–326.
- [19] Slaughter, S., Slaughter, S. A., & Rhoades, G. (2004). Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education. JHU Press.
- [20] Soegoto, E. S. (2018). Implementing Laravel framework website as brand image in higher-education institution. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 407(1), 12066.
- [21] Urciuoli, B. (2003). Excellence, leadership, skills, diversity: Marketing liberal arts education. Language & Communication, 23(3-4), 385–408.
- [22] Venkatesh, V., Agarwal, R., Turning Visitors into Customers: A Usability-Centric Perspective on Purchase Behavior in Electronic Channels. Management Science 52(3), 367–383, 2006.
- [23] Zauberman, G., The Intertemporal Dynamics of Consumer Lock-In. Journal of Consumer Research 30(3), 405–419, 2003.