

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Ali Ahmed Alfaki of the faculty of computer science at El-Mashriq University. The door to Dr. Ali Ahmed Alfaki office was always open whenever I ran into a trouble spot or had a question about my research. He consistently allowed this thesis to be my own work, but steered me in the right the direction whenever he thought I needed it.

I would also like to thank the experts who were involved in the validation survey for this research:Dr. Nisreen and my friends without their passionate participation and input, the validation survey could not have been successfully conducted.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Mubarak Mohammed Ahmed and Dr. Nagi Ishag as the second readers of this thesis, and I am gratefully indebted to them for their very valuable comments on this thesis.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents and to my family and to my teachers and my Friends for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

Author

Mohammed Awed Allah Ahmed Wahab Allah

Abstract

The main goal of this thesis was to propose a website quality evaluation model for academic websites to cover important factors that affect for quality of the educational websites. For this purpose, an extensive study of the literature on existing quality evaluation models, essential website success factors and criteria was made to identify necessary quality factors, sub factors and criteria. A new and improved quality evaluation model consisting of seven high-level quality factors (*Functionality, Reliability, Usability, Efficiency, Content, Navigation and Design and Structure*), hierarchically arranged into sub quality factors and criteria was designed.

The proposed model was applied on an education website using questionnaire to evaluate the quality of website. The data from the questionnaire was analysis using MATLAB.

The results of evaluating the education website showed that the website in general has a very good quality of Quality of information (content, design and structure) and usability, while having good quality in its functionality, reliability, efficiency and navigation features.

المستخلص

الهدف الاساسي من هذ البحث هو تصميم نموذج لتقييم جوده المواقع التعليمية هذا النموذج يغطي اهم العوامل التي تؤثر علي جودة المواقع التعليمية ويغطي جميع المستخدمين الذين يتعاملون مع الموقع. لهذا الغرض تمت دراسة واسعة النطاق علي الدراسات السابقة التي تم تصميم نماذج فيها لقياس جودة المواقع التعليمية.

تم اختيار العوامل التي تساعد علي نجاح تقييم المواقع وتحديد العوامل الاساسية الضرورية للجوده والعوامل الفرعية. بعد ذلك تم انشاء النموذج الجديد لتقييم جوده المواقع التعليمية, هذا النموذج يحتوي علي سبعة عوامل عالية المستوي هي (الوظائف والاعتمادية وسهولة الاستخدام والكفاءة والمحتوى والتبويب والتصميم والبنية) ثم تمت اعادت ترتيبها تصميم عوامل جزئية منها.

تم تطبيق النموذج المقترح علي موقع باستخدام استبانته تحتوي علي اسئلة تشمل جميع عوامل الجوده في النموذج المقترح لتقييم جودة الموقع بعد ذلك القيام بتوصية لتحسين الموقع في الجزء المحدد. تم تحليل نتائج الاستبيان باستخدام الماتلاب.

نتائج التقييم وضحت ان الموقع جيد جدا من ناحية جودة المعلومات (المحتوي والتصميم والبنية) وسهولة الاستخدام كما ان الموقع جيد من ناحية الوظائف والاعتمادية والكفاءة وخصائص التبويب. كما اوصي بتحسين الموقع للوصول الي درجة عالية من الكفاءة.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgement | I |
| Abstract | II |
| المستخلص | III |
| Table of contents | IV |
| List of figure | VI |
| List of tables | VII |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Problems of the research | 2 |
| 1.3 Objectives | 2 |
| 1.4 Research Methodology | 3 |
| 1.5 Hypotheses | 3 |
| 1.6 Thesis Organization | 4 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review & Related Works | |
| 2.1 Background | 5 |
| 2.2 website quality and quality model | 5 |
| 2.3 Existing Software and website quality model | 5 |
| 2.3.1 Boehm Model | 5 |
| 2.3.2 FURPS Model | 6 |
| 2.3.3 Dromey Model | 7 |
| 2.3.4 Bayesian Belief Network Model | 8 |
| 2.3.5 ISO 9126-1 quality standard | 8 |
| 2.3.6 McCall Model | 11 |
| 2.4 Related Works | 14 |
| 2.5 Discussion | 15 |
| Chapter 3: Methodology | |
| 3.1 Introduction | 16 |
| 3.2 Uses of academic websites | 16 |
| 3.2.1 The main users of education website | 16 |
| 3.3 Quality characteristics of the ISO 9126-1 quality model | 16 |
| 3.4 Website Quality Assessment Criteria | 18 |
| 3.5 The proposed Model | 19 |
| 3.6 Sub quality factors of proposed model | 20 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.6.1 Reliability | 21 |
| 3.6.2 Usability | 21 |
| 3.6.3 Efficiency | 22 |
| 3.6.4 Content | 22 |
| 3.6.5 Navigation | 23 |
| 3.6.6 Design and structure | 23 |
| 3.7 Testing of the new model | 24 |
| 3.7.1 Applying the proposed model in a case study | 24 |
| 3.7.2 Preparation of Questionnaire | 24 |
| 3.8 Quality factors in the new Model | 26 |
| Chapter 4: Results and Discussion | |
| 4.1 Introduction | 27 |
| 4.2 Validation of the proposed model | 27 |
| 4.3 Result of questionnaire data | 29 |
| Chapter 5: Conclusions and recommendations | |
| 5.1 Conclusions | 40 |
| 5.2 Recommendations | 41 |
| References | 42 |
| Appendix | 44 |

List of figures

| Number | Descriptions | Page |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| Figure 2.1 | Boehm Model | 6 |
| Figure 2.2 | Dromey Model | 7 |
| Figure 2.3 | ISO 9126-1 Quality Standard | 10 |
| Figure 2.4 | ISO 9126-1 model external and internal quality approaches | 11 |
| Figure 2.5 | ISO 9126-1 Quality in use model | 11 |
| Figure 2.6 | McCall Model | 12 |
| Figure 4.1 | Users | 29 |
| Figure 4.2 | Quality of information | 31 |
| Figure 4.3 | Efficiency | 33 |
| Figure 4.4 | Reliability | 35 |
| Figure 4.5 | Usability | 37 |
| Figure 4.6 | Navigation | 38 |
| Figure 4.7 | Overall rating | 39 |

List of Tables

| Number | Descriptions | Page |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| Table 2.1 | Comparison of Software Quality Models | 13 |
| Table 3.1 | ISO 9126-1 factors | 17 |
| Table 3.2 | Web quality assessment criteria | 18 |
| Table 3.3 | proposed model | 20 |
| Table 3.4 | Quality factors in the new Model | 26 |
| Table 4.1 | correlation for easy task | 27 |
| Table 4.2 | correlation for medium task | 28 |
| Table 4.3 | correlation for hard task | 28 |
| Table 4.4 | Quality of information | 30 |
| Table 4.5 | Quality of information ratios in details | 31 |
| Table 4.6 | Efficiency | 32 |
| Table 4.7 | Efficiency ratios in details | 33 |
| Table 4.8 | Reliability | 34 |
| Table 4.9 | Reliability ratios in details | 34 |
| Table 4.10 | Usability | 36 |
| Table 4.11 | Usability ratios in details | 36 |
| Table 4.12 | Navigation | 37 |
| Table 4.13 | Navigation ratios in detail | 38 |
| Table 4.14 | The overall rating | 39 |