

WWW

iadis international conference

WWW/Internet 2006

5 - 8 October 2006 - Murcia, SPAIN

WWW

WWW

**PROCEEDINGS
Volume II**

**Edited by:
Pedro Isaías
Miguel Baptista Nunes
Inmaculada J. Martínez**

WWW



iadis

international association for development of the information society

IADIS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

WWW/INTERNET 2006

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
IADIS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
WWW/INTERNET 2006**

Volume II

MURCIA, SPAIN

OCTOBER 5 - 8, 2006

Organised by
IADIS

International Association for Development of the Information Society

Co- Organised por
Universidad de Murcia - Facultad de Comunicación y Documentación

Copyright 2006

IADIS Press

All rights reserved

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Permission for use must always be obtained from IADIS Press. Please contact secretariat@iadis.org

Edited by Pedro Isaías, Miguel Baptista Nunes and Inmaculada J. Martínez

Associate Editors: Luís Rodrigues and Patrícia Barbosa

ISBN: 972-8924-19-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME II

FOREWORD	xi
PROGRAM COMMITTEE	xiii
KEYNOTE LECTURES	xix

SHORT PAPERS

USING WQM FOR CLASSIFYING USABILITY METRICS <i>V.M.R. Penichet, C.Calero, M.D. Lozano and M. Piattini</i>	3
THE LAVA PROJECT: A SERVICE BASED APPROACH TO SUPPORTING EXPLORATORY LEARNING <i>Kristoffer Getchell, Alan Miller, Colin Allison, Clare Kerbey, Ruth Hardy, Rebecca Sweetman, Victoria Crook and Jeremy Complin</i>	8
THE TEACHER'S ROLE AND PERSPECTIVES TOWARD INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATED CURRICULUM FOR YOUNG CHILDREN: THE CASE IN TAIWAN <i>Poh-Hwa Liang and Jin-Yi Wang</i>	14
SOCIAL COMPUTING AND USER LITERACY DEMOGRAPHICS: PREDICTORS FOR ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE PLANNING? <i>Deborah G. Coleman and Carla Lorek</i>	18
THE E-FOTO PROJECT: CONCEPTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN ENVIRONMENT FOR E-LEARNING IN DIGITAL PHOTOGRAMMETRY <i>Jorge L. N. e S. Brito, Luiz C. T. Coelho Filho, Francisco J. C. da Silveira, Guilherme L. A. Mota, Orlando Bernardo Filho, João A. Ribeiro, Marcelo T. Silveira and Rodrigo J. M. da Fonseca</i>	24
INTERNET AND FACULTY TRAINING PROGRAMS <i>Hosein Moeini</i>	29
CONSTRUCTION OF INTEGRATING OF CONCEPT CARTOONS INTO TWO-TIER ON-LINE TESTING SYSTEM <i>Tzu-Hua Huang, Yuan-Chen Liu, Tien-Ying Lin and Vaci Istanda</i>	34

MARKING STUDENT WORK ON THE WEB <i>Hu, Bo; Koster, Kai and Hu, Bin</i>	39
EXPLORING INTERACTIONS IN TEXT CHAT ROOMS <i>Mei-Ya Liang</i>	43
THE ASSESSMENT ON COOPERATIVE-LEARNING ONLINE GAMES AND ON THE TEACHING OF MATHEMATICS <i>Yuan-Chen Liu, Tzu-Hua Huang, Horng-Huei Wu and Vaci Istanda</i>	48
INVESTIGATING THE APPROPRIATENESS OF PERSONALISED INFORMATION FOR PEOPLE WITH MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS <i>Fadi Qutaishat, Steve Proberts and Mark Hepworth</i>	53
A FULLY WEB ORIENTED EXPERT SYSTEM TOOL <i>José L. López-Cuadrado, Israel González-Carrasco, Ángel García-Crespo and Belén Ruiz-Mezcua</i>	58
TOWARDS THE SEMANTIC WEB: EXTRACTING OWL ONTOLOGIES FROM SQL RELATIONAL SCHEMATA <i>Irina Astrova and Ahto Kalja</i>	62
WWW → WWW: MIGRATION TO THE WISDOM WEB <i>Julia A. Johnson and Grant G. O. Duncan</i>	67
MAPPING XML SCHEMA TO EXISTING OWL ONTOLOGIES <i>Toni Rodrigues, Pedro Rosa and Jorge Cardoso</i>	72
HISTREE - A HIERARCHICAL BACK MENU <i>Daniel Orner and I. Scott MacKenzie</i>	78
CANTRA: MYTHOLOGICAL UTOPIA AND METAPHORICAL REALITY FOR VISUALIZING AND ACCESSING INFORMATION IN 3D INTERACTIVE WORLDS <i>Enrica Lovaglio</i>	83
CROSS-CULTURAL SYSTEM DESIGN STRATEGY: AVOIDING PROBLEMS IN USABILITY EVALUATION <i>Jainaba Jagne, Elke Duncker-Gassen, Serengul Smith-Atakan and Paul Curzon</i>	88
HCI SUPERDESIGNER: DESCRIBING, PREDICTING, FOSTERING AND CONTROLLING EMERGENCE <i>Christian Briggs</i>	93
FUTURE MOBILE PHONE USER INTERFACES: A SURVEY <i>Timo Kivikangas and Arto Kaarna</i>	98
AN INTERACTIVE DATA PROCESSING ENVIRONMENT WITH DATA AND OPERATION HISTORY <i>Ken Nakayama, Motohiro Shibata, Satoshi Yazawa, Yoshitake Kobayashi, Mamoru Maekawa and Toshio Okamoto</i>	104
PERSONALIZATION OF INFORMATION BROWSING USER INTERFACE: EVALUATION OF THE USER POLICIES CONCEPTS <i>Encelle Benoit and Baptiste-Jessel Nadine</i>	110
ADAPTING AN ONLINE WEBSITE TO A PALM OS WITH YOUNG ELDERLY PEOPLE <i>Sergio Sayago and Josep Blat</i>	115

THE IMPACT OF CUSTOMER LOYALTY ON COMPLAINING BEHAVIOUR <i>Alexandra Zaugg and Natalie Jäggi</i>	119
STANDARDIZING THE ACCESS TO E-BUSINESSES <i>Enric Jaen Villoldo and Joan Serrat-Fernandez</i>	124
THE ROLE OF INTERNET IN THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY OF COCA-COLA <i>Mariola Palazón and María Sicilia,</i>	129
E-MARKET PROJECT; THE E-MARKETPLACE OF THE MARCHES REGION <i>Corradini Flavio, Gagliardi Roberto, Polzonetti Alberto, Santarelli Dario and Trojani Massimo</i>	133
SUBPROCESS DEFINITION RETRIEVAL THROUGH COLLABORATIVE TAGGING <i>Jochen Reich</i>	138
FRIENDS NETWORK <i>Maytham Safar and Haya Bin Ghaith</i>	143
ELEMENTS FOR DESIGNING A WEB ENVIRONMENT TO PROMOTING COLLABORATIVE LEARNING OF AUTOMATA THEORY <i>G M. da Nóbrega, A. S. M. Fernandes, E. Ferneda and E. S. Guimarães</i>	147
HYBRID CONTEXT DESIGN – INTEGRATING SEMANTIC WEB IN KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS ON THE BASIS OF OPEN SOURCE COMPONENTS <i>Jan vom Brocke and Jan Hermans</i>	151
A TOOL SUPPORTING WEB-BASED APPLICATIONS TESTING: A CONTROL FLOW MODEL BASED APPROACH <i>Adnane Ghannem and Linda Badri</i>	156
DESIGNING OBJECT ORIENTED SYSTEMS USING STEREOTYPES AND PATTERNS <i>Vinicius Miana Bezerra and Kechi Hiramã</i>	162
BUILDING COLLABORATIVE KNOWLEDGE-BASED SYSTEMS: A WEB ENGINEERING APPROACH <i>George Gkotsis, Christina E. Evangelou, Nikos Karacapilidis and Manolis Tzagarakis</i>	167
SERVICE ORIENTED METHOD TO MODEL WEB INFORMATION SYSTEMS: A CASE STUDY <i>Guillermo López, Valeria de Castro and Esperanza Marcos</i>	172
BURSTINESS DETECTION LOCATION IN CLUSTER-BASED NETWORK SERVERS BASED ON THE APRA ALGORITHM: A CASE STUDY <i>Katja Gilly, Javier Huertas Amores, Carlos Juiz and Ramon Puigjaner</i>	177
OVERLOADING PREVENTION BASED ON ADAPTIVE REQUEST PROCESSING <i>Miroslav Kripac</i>	182
OPTIMIZING THE EXECUTION STRUCTURE OF COMPOSED WEB SERVICES <i>Leo Rela and Juha Puustjärvi</i>	187
A MEMORY OBJECT LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT TOOL FOR C++ APPLICATIONS <i>Hamid Mcheick, Hafedh Mili, Aymen Sioud, Hamdan Msheik and Marc Gravel</i>	191

DESIGNING A RESOURCE DISCOVERY METHOD BASED ON MULTI-AGENTS IN P2P SYSTEMS <i>Yoshikuni Harada and Yasushi Kambayashi</i>	196
A WEB-BASED INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR A UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT <i>Raquel Martínez, José Alberto Jaén, Alberto Acebrón, Francisco de Asís Montañés, Ángel García and Santiago Tapia</i>	201
A MOBILE DEVICE-BASED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM AND ITS PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS <i>Yoshiro Imai , Yuichi Sugie , Yukio Hori, Daisuke Yamane and Shin'ichi Masuda</i>	206
A SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT FOR RESIDENT PARTICIPATING GIS- BASED TSUNAMI DISASTER CONTROL <i>Takashi Muramoto, Ken Nakayama, Yoshitake Kobayashi and Mamoru Maekawa</i>	211
WEB-BASED MUSIC NOTATION EDITING <i>Stuart Cunningham, Nicole Gebert, Rich Picking and Vic Grout</i>	217
AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK FOR DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT: THE ROLE OF SEMANTIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION <i>Flavio Corradini, Alberto Polzonetti, Barbara Re, Lucio Forestieri and Andrea Sergiacomi</i>	222
SARIPOD: A SYSTEM BASED ON HIERARCHICAL SMALL WORLDS AND POSSIBILISTIC NETWORKS FOR INTERNET INFORMATION RETRIEVAL <i>Bilel Elayeb, Montaceur Zaghdoud, Mohamed Ben Ahmed and Fabrice Evrard</i>	227
BABEL, A MULTILINGUAL BLOG CMS <i>A. Gkamas, G. Panagiotou and C. Papazafeiropoulos</i>	233
EXTRACTION OF OBJECTS AND RELATIONS FROM HYPERTEXT DATA <i>Doina Babu, Bich-Liên Doan and Yolaine Bourda</i>	238
DISCOVERY OF IMPORTANT THREADS USING THREAD ANALYSIS REPORTS <i>Shigeaki Sakurai and Ryohei Orihara</i>	243
REGULATION FOR INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN NETWORK OPERATORS IN A LIBERALISED MARKET <i>S. Verbrugge, B. Lannoo, J. Van Ooteghem, T. Pingnet, D. Colle, M. Pickavet and P. Demeester</i>	249
EXTENDING THE P2P AUDIO NETWORK STREAMONTHEFLY FOR VIDEO USAGE AND VODCASTING <i>Markus Seidl, Martin Schmidt and Matthias Husinsky</i>	254
WEBSITE EVALUATION: DISCUSSION FOR A MODEL PROPOSAL <i>Manuela Aparício, Pedro Faria Lopes and Maria Joaquina Barrulas</i>	260
A TOPIC MAPS-BASED ARCHITECTURE FOR MOBILE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT <i>Ando Ratsimanohatra, Nicolas Prat and Martin Schader</i>	266
SITUATED VIEWS ON AUGMENTED MEMORIES <i>Alexander Kröner and Nathalie Basselin</i>	272
AGENTS, GRAMMARS AND STYLE: MULTI-AGENT VISUAL COMPOSITION WITH SHAPE GRAMMARS <i>Joaquim Reis</i>	278

TOWARDS A MULTIAGENT ARCHITECTURE TO PROCESS KNOWLEDGE <i>Juan Pablo Soto, Aurora Vizcaíno and Mario Piattini</i>	283
MULTI-AGENT COOPERATIVE SCHEDULING AND RE-SCHEDULING IN THE SUPPLY-CHAIN (A SHORT VERSION) <i>Joaquim Reis</i>	288
COMPREHENSIVE XML FOR CONTACT CENTER <i>Nikolay Anisimov, Brian Galvin and Herbert Ristock</i>	294
WHOIS, JOINT WHOIS AND CRISP <i>Milena Constantino Caires</i>	300
AUTOMATIC LOCATION-BASED MAP DISTRIBUTION SERVICE FOR MOBILE COORDINATED POSITIONING SYSTEM <i>Daniel F. Santos, Ricardo Matos, José E. Sanguino and António Rodrigues</i>	305
ENSURING WEB SERVICE DATA INTEROPERABILITY <i>Enric Jaen Villoldo and Joan Serrat-Fernandez</i>	310
LICENSING SYSTEM IN AN ONLINE MPEG-21 ENVIRONMENT <i>Chris Poppe, Ingo Wolf, Sven Wischnowsky, Saar De Zutter and Rik Van de Walle</i>	315
SECURITY THREAT SOURCES AND SUPPLIERS: A MANAGEMENT THREAT PROCESS MODEL <i>B. Dawn Medlin and Adriana Romaniello</i>	320
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE: KNOWLEDGE MEETS ORGANIZATION <i>Flavio Corradini, Alberto Polzonetti, Romeo Pruno and Roberto D'Angelo</i>	325
KNOWLEDGE EVOLUTION ON THE BASIS OF REFERENCE MODELS – TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FOUNDATION <i>Jan vom Brocke and Christian Buddendick</i>	329
UNDERSTANDING JPDA (DEBUGGING) & JVMTI (PROFILING) JAVA APIS WITHIN JAVATRACEIT! <i>D. Glez-Peña and F. Fdez-Riverola</i>	334
MODELLING AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF PROBABILISTIC PACKET MARKING SCHEMES FOR IP TRACEBACK <i>Shigeo Shioda and Hui Jing Wang</i>	339
ANALYSIS OF THE USAGE STATISTICS OF ROBOTS EXCLUSION STANDARD <i>Ajay, Smitha and Jaliya Ekanayake</i>	345
FRACTAL DIMENSION OF TEXT DOCUMENTS: APPLICATION IN FRACTAL SUMMARIZATION <i>M. Dolores Ruiz and Antonio B. Bailón</i>	349
E-DEMOCRACY: THE INTERNET EFFECT TO THE CITIZENS OF TOMORROW <i>D. Kalogeras , N. Sklavos and V. D. Triantafillou</i>	354

POSTERS

INTACT TRANSPOSITION OF A MULTI-COLUMNAR DATA BASE SORT <i>R.F. Gonzales and D.B.L. Miles</i>	361
HOW SEMANTICS CAN IMPROVE E-LEARNING TOOLS <i>Abraham Rodríguez-Rodríguez, Laura Cruz-García, Concepción Hernández-Guerra and Francisca Quintana-Domínguez</i>	364
U-LEARNING FRAMEWORK FOR U-CLASSROOM <i>Byung-jin Oh, Nam-kyoung Um, Sang-ho Lee and Sung-hee Woo</i>	367
A WEB APPLICATION MODEL FOR SOFTWARE RELIABILITY <i>Tuulikki Gyllensvärd</i>	371
SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' USE OF THE INTERNET: A GLANCE AT PISA 2003 RESULTS <i>Serpil Yalcinalp</i>	375
COLLABORATION <i>Caoimhín O'Nualláin and Sławomir Grzonkowski</i>	377
SEARCH INTERFACE BASED ON NATURAL LANGUAGE QUERY TEMPLATES <i>Sebastian Ryszard Kruk, Krystian Samp, Caoimhin O'Nuallain, Brian Davis, Bill McDaniel and Sławomir Grzonkowski</i>	381

AUTHOR INDEX

FOREWORD

These proceedings contain the papers and posters of the IADIS International Conference WWW/Internet 2006, which was organised by the International Association for Development of the Information Society and co-organised by Universidad de Murcia – Facultad de Comunicación y Documentación in Murcia, Spain, October 5 – 8, 2006.

The purpose of this conference is to serve as a forum to gather researchers, practitioners, students and anyone who works or studies the field of WWW/Internet. The following fifty-seven areas have been object of paper and poster submissions:

Accessibility; Adaptive Web Systems; Collaboration; Computer-Mediated Communication; Data Mining; Database Planning and Development; Digital Economy; Digital Libraries and E-Publishing; Distributed and Parallel Applications; E-Business and E-Commerce; E-Government; E-Learning; Electronic Data Interchange; Quality, Evaluation and Assessment; Extensible Languages; Global Tendencies in WWW/Internet; Groupware; Human Computer Interaction; Hypermedia; Information Architectures; Information Visualization; Intelligent Agents; Interfaces; Internet & Customer Relationship Management; Internet Payment Systems; Internet Services; Languages; Metadata; Performance Issues; Personalized Web Sites and Services; Portal strategies; Protocols and Standards; Searching and Browsing; Security Issues; Semantic Web; Social & Legal Issues; Storage Issues; System Integration; Teaching and Learning Strategies; Technology Innovation and Competitiveness; Technology Management; Technology Strategies; Tele-Work; WWW/Internet Applications; WWW/Internet Case studies; WWW/Internet Impacts; Web Engineering; Web Personalization; Web Software; Wireless Applications; Ubiquitous Computing; Usability; User Modelling; Virtual Communities; Virtual Reality; XML.

The IADIS WWW/Internet 2006 Conference had 286 submissions from more than 29 countries. Each submission has been anonymously reviewed by at least two independent reviewers, to ensure the final high standard of the accepted submissions. The final result was the approval of 71 full papers, which means that the acceptance rate was below 25%. A few more papers have been accepted as short papers and posters. Best papers will be selected for publishing as extended versions in the *IADIS International Journal on WWW/Internet (IJWI)*.

The conference, besides the presentation of full papers, short papers, posters, and doctoral consortium presentations also included keynote presentations and a tutorial from internationally distinguished researchers.

As we all know, organising a conference requires the effort of many individuals. We would like to thank all members of the Program Committee for their hard work in reviewing and selecting the papers that appear in the proceedings.

These volumes have taken shape as a result of the contributions from a number of individuals. We are grateful to all authors who have submitted their papers to enrich the conference proceedings. We would like also to express our gratitude to Professor Katia Sycara, Director of the Intelligent Software Agents Lab, Carnegie Mellon University, USA, and to Professor Fausto Giunchiglia, Head of the Department of Information and

Communication Technology, University of Trento, Italy, for accepting our invitation as keynote speakers. We wish to thank all members of the local organizing committee in Murcia, sponsors, delegates, invitees and guests whose contribution and involvement are crucial for the success of the conference.

Each of the Proceedings contains a rich experience of the academic & research institutions and the industry on diverse themes related to the Internet and Web. We do hope that researchers, knowledge workers and innovators both in academia and the industry will find it a valuable reference material.

Last but not the least, we hope that everybody will have a good time in Murcia, and we invite all participants for the next year edition of the *IADIS International Conference WWW/Internet 2007*.

Pedro Isaías, Universidade Aberta (Portuguese Open University), Portugal
Inmaculada J. Martínez, Universidad de Murcia, Spain
Conference Co-Chairs

Miguel Baptista Nunes, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
Program Chair

Murcia, Spain
October 2006

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

CONFERENCE CO-CHAIRS

Pedro Isaías, Universidade Aberta (Portuguese Open University), Portugal
Inmaculada J. Martínez, Universidad de Murcia, Spain

PROGRAM CHAIR

Miguel Baptista Nunes, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Abdolhossein Sarrafzadeh, Massey University, New Zealand
Al Warner, Penn State – Erie, USA
Alessandro Micarelli, University of "Roma Tre", Italy
Alexander Kröner, DFKI, Germany
Alexander Schill, TU Dresden, Germany
Alexander Wöhrer, University of Vienna, Austria
Alfredo Cuzzocrea, University of Calabria, Italy
Alvaro Ortigosa, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain
Ana Regina Cavalcanti da Rocha, Centroin, Brazil
Ananya S. Guha, Indira Gandhi National Open University, India
Andrea Kienle, Fraunhofer IPSI, Germany
Andrea Rodriguez, Universidad de Concepción, Chile
Andreas Albers, T-Mobile Stiftungsforschung für M-Commerce, Germany
Andreas Schrader, ISNM - International School of New Media, Germany
Andy Lapham, Thames Valley University, United Kingdom
Angel López Cima, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
Angélica de Antonio, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
Angelo Di Iorio, University of Bologna, Italy
Anna Maddalena, University of Genova, Italy
Anthony Savidis, ICS-FORTH, Greece
Anurag Saxena, Indira Gandhi National Open University, India
Arnaldo Belchior, University of Fortaleza, Brazil
Aykut Firat, Northeastern University, USA
Axel Küpper, Ludwig-Maximilians University of Munich, Germany
Axel Polleres, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain
Azita Bahrami, Armstrong Atlantic State University, USA
Berardina De Carolis, University of Bari, Italy
Bernard Espinasse, Université d'Aix-Marseille, France

Brahmananda Sapkota, DERI, Ireland
 Celso Saibel, UNIFACS – CEPERC, Brazil
 Chris Messom, Massey University, New Zealand
 Christoph Schmitz, Universität Kassel, Germany
 Christos Fidas, University of Patras, Greece
 Claudia Buzzi, CNR-IIT, Italy
 Claudia Linnhoff-Popien, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany
 Cristina Baroglio, Università Degli Studi Di Torino, Italy
 Cristina Gena, Università di Torino, Italy
 Daniel Burgos, The Open University, The Netherlands
 Daniel Cunliffe, University of Glamorgan, United Kingdom
 Daniel Fernández Lanvin, Universidad de Oviedo, Spain
 David Caduff, University of Zurich – Irchel, Switzerland
 David Crowther, De Montfort University, United Kingdom
 David Eduardo Pinto Avendaño, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain
 David Powers, Flinders University, Australia
 Davide Buscaldi, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain
 Debajyoti Mukhopadhyay, Techno India (West Bengal University of Technology), India
 Demetrios Sampson, University of Piraeus, Greece
 Dietmar Dengler, DFKI, Germany
 Dimitrios Rigas, University of Bradford, United Kingdom
 Dirk Thissen, RWTH Aachen, Germany
 Dominic Heutelbeck, FernUniversität Hagen, Germany
 Dominik Heckmann, DFKI, Germany
 Dumitru Roman, DERI, Austria
 Edilson Feredna, Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil
 Elena Calude, Massey University at Albany, New Zealand
 Elhadi Shakshuki, Acadia University, Canada
 Elias Kirche, Florida Gulf Coast University, USA
 Emilia Mendes, The University of Auckland, New Zealand
 Enrique Alfonseca, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain
 Eric Schwarzkopf, DFKI, Germany
 Erica Melis, DFKI, Germany
 Eva Söderström, University of Skövde, Sweden
 Ezendu Ariwa, London Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
 Fabio Vitali, University of Bologna, Italy
 Fernanda Lima, Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil
 Fernando Lyardet, Darmstadt University of Technology, Germany
 Francesco Guerra, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy
 Fred Fonseca, The Pennsylvania State University, USA
 Fuensanta Medina-Domínguez, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

Georg Groh, Technische Universität München, Germany
 Germana Menezes da Nóbrega, Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil
 Giorgia Lodi, University of Bologna, Italy
 Gonzalo Méndez, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain
 Guido Roessling, Darmstadt University of Technology, Germany
 Gustavo Rossi, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina
 Hamid Mcheick, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Canada
 Hannes Werthner, University of Innsbruck, Austria
 Hans Schlichter, Technische Universität München, Germany
 Hans Weghorn, BA-University of Cooperative Education, Germany
 Heiko Tapken, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Germany
 Henk de Vries, Rotterdam School of Management Erasmus University, The Netherlands
 Henrique Paques, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
 Henry Oinas-Kukkonen, University of Oulu, Finland
 Ian van der Linde, University of Texas, USA
 Idris Rai, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
 Iliaria Torre, Università degli Studi di Torino, Italy
 Ioan Toma, DERI, Austria
 Ismael Sanz Blasco, University Jaume I, Spain
 Ismail Khalil Ibrahim, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria
 Ivan Tomek, Acadia University, Canada
 Jacek Kopecký, DERI, Austria
 Jaime Ramírez, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
 Jaime Sánchez, University of Chile, Chile
 James Thong, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong
 Janez Brank, Jozef Stefan Institute, Slovenia
 Jessica Rubart, ORGA Kartensysteme, Germany
 Jesús Boticario, UNED, Spain
 Jialie Shen, University of New South Wales, Australia
 Jon Schutz, YourAmigo Pty Ltd, Australia
 Jörg Leukel, University of Hohenheim, Germany
 Jörg Roth, University of Applied Sciences Nuremberg, Germany
 Jos de Bruijn, DERI, Austria
 Jose Enrique Fernández Martín, University of Malaga, Spain
 José Laurindo Campos, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas na Amazonia, Brazil
 Juan Manuel Pérez, University Jaume I, Spain
 Juan Pedro Caraça-Valente, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
 Juan Ramón Pérez Pérez, Universidad de Oviedo, Spain
 Juergen Hofer, University of Innsbruck, Austria
 Jürgen Karla, Rwth Aachen University, Germany
 Juhnyoung Lee, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, USA

Jure Ferlez, Jozef Stefan Institute, Slovenia
 Jussi Kangasharju, Darmstadt University of Technology, Germany
 Kai Jakobs, Aachen University, Germany
 Kai Koster, Kosmicon, Germany
 Karina Villela, Universidade Salvador, Brazil
 Kathia Oliveira, Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil
 Kiduk Yang, Indiana University, USA
 Kinshuk, Massey University, New Zealand
 Kostas Tsagkaris, University of Piraeus, Greece
 Liliana Ardissono, Università Degli Studi Di Torino, Italy
 Liping Liu, University of Akron, USA
 Loris Penserini, ITC-IRST, Italy
 Luca Spalazzi, Polytechnical University of Marche, Italy
 Lucia Rapanotti, The Open University, United Kingdom
 Manolis Tzagarakis, University of Patras, Greece
 Manuel Montes y Gomez, INAOE, Mexico
 Margherita Antona, ICS-FORTH, Greece
 María del Puerto Paule Ruíz, University of Oviedo, Spain
 María Isabel Sánchez-Segura, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain
 Markus Anding, University of Munich, Germany
 Martin Gaedke, University of Karlsruhe, Germany
 Massimo Marchiori, University of Venice, Italy
 Marco Mesiti, Università degli Studi di Genova, Italy
 Martin Hepp, University of Innsbruck, Austria
 Martin Wenig, RWTH Aachen, Germany
 Martin Wessner, Fraunhofer IPSI, Germany
 Mathias Bauer, DFKI, Germany
 Matteo Baldoni, Università Degli Studi di Torino, Italy
 Maurizio Vincini, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy
 Max J. Egenhofer, University of Maine, USA
 Maytham Safar, Kuwait University, Kuwait
 Michael Weber, University of Ulm, Germany
 Michael Welzl, University of Innsbruck, Austria
 Michalis Vaitis, University of the Aegean, Greece
 Mick Kerrigan, DERI, Austria
 Miguel-Angel Sicilia Urbán, University of Alcalá, Spain
 Mike Radmacher, Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt a. M., Germany
 Milos Kravcik, Fraunhofer Gesellschaft, Germany
 Nicola Henze, University of Hannover, Germany
 Nik Nailah binti Abdullah, University Montpellier II, France
 Nikolaos Avouris, University of Patras, Greece

Nikolaos Tselios, University of Patras, Greece
 Nikos Karacapilidis, University of Patras, Greece
 Nilufar Baghaei, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
 Olga Santos Martín, UNED, Spain
 Oliver Haase, University of Applied Sciences Konstanz, Germany
 Omair Shafiq, DERI, Austria
 Panagiotis Demestichas, University of Piraeus, Greece
 Paola Podestà, Università di Génova, Italy
 Paolo Bresciani, ITC-IRST, Italy
 Paolo Massa, ITC, Italy
 Paolo Rosso, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain
 Paul Johannesson, Stockholm University and Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
 Paul Smith, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
 Peter Westerkamp, Universität Münster, Germany
 Piedachu Peris García, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain
 Pramuditha Suraweera, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
 Rainer Eckstein, Helmholtz Center for Infection Research (HZI), Germany
 Ralf Ackermann, Darmstadt University of Technology, Germany
 Raluca Bunduchi, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom
 Ricardo Imbert, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
 Robert Goodwin, Flinders University, Australia
 Robin Laney, The Open University, United Kingdom
 Rolf Winter, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
 Rosa Carro, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain
 Roxana Danger, Universitat Jaume I, Spain
 Samar Saha, SYNOPSIS, USA
 Shawn Newsam, University of California, Merced, USA
 Shivakant Mishra, University of Colorado, USA
 Sinuhe Arroyo, University of Alcalá de Henares, Spain
 Spiridon Bakiras, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong
 Stefan Diepolder, RWTH Aachen, Germany
 Stefan Fischer, Universität zu Lübeck, Germany
 Steven Demurjian, The University of Connecticut, USA
 SungKook Han, WonKwang University, Korea
 Sven Groppe, University of Innsbruck, Austria
 Sven Meyer zu Eissen, Bauhaus University Weimar, Germany
 Timothy Shih, Tamkang University, Taiwan
 Tomoo Inoue, University of Tsukuba, Japan
 Tsvi Kuflik, University of Haifa, Israel
 Umesh Rajashekar, University of Texas at Austin, USA
 Urs-Jakob Rüetschi, University of Zurich, Switzerland

Vanessa Evers, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Vassilis Kapsalis, Industrial Systems Institute, Greece
Vera Stavroulaki, University of Piraeus, Greece
Vic Grout, University of Wales, United Kingdom
Viviana Patti, Universita' di Torino, Italy
Wei Tang, NCR Corporation Teradata Division, USA
Wei Wang, The University of New South Wales, Australia
Ying Ding, University of Innsbruck, Austria
Yingcai Xiao, The University of Akron, USA
Yufei Tao, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Zakaria Maamar, Zayed University, United Arab Emirates

AUXILIARY REVIEWERS

Amali Weerasinghe, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Gonzalo Macarro Palazuelos, University of Alcalá de Henares, Spain

USING WQM FOR CLASSIFYING USABILITY METRICS

V.M.R. Penichet¹, C.Calero², M.D. Lozano¹ and M. Piattini²

¹ *LoUISE Research Group*

² *ALARCOS Research Group*

Department of Computer Science.

University of Castilla-La Mancha (Spain)

{Victor.Ruiz, Coral.Calero, Maria.Lozano, Mario.Piattini}@uclm.es

ABSTRACT

Quality is an essential characteristic for web success. Several authors have described different methodologies, guidelines, techniques and tools in order to assure the quality of web sites. Among them the WQM model (Web Quality Model), which distinguishes three dimensions related to web features, lifecycle processes and quality characteristics. This last dimension is based on the ISO 9126 standard being usability one of the defined quality characteristic. In this paper, we classify some usability metrics using this framework.

KEYWORDS

Quality, models, usability, metrics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays it is very common to apply metrics in the development of systems. Metrics are used as mechanisms for evaluating the quality of the product in terms of efficiency, portability, usability, maintainability, reliability and functionality (ISO, 2001; Landauer, 1995). Then software development and maintenance projects can be understood, controlled, supervised, guessed and predicted by using metrics (Briand, 1996) and, in many cases the difference between two systems can be something so simple and so important like applying quality.

Usability metrics are important in order to do a product easy to use. Usability can help to make a system nearer to the final user. If a system is usable, it is easy to learn how to use it productively (Constantine, 1999).

In this paper we present a some usability metrics some authors consider important, then these metrics are classified using WQM, a three-dimensional quality model proposed by (Calero, 2004).

A quality model defined for supporting a given kind of analysis, is a description of which attributes are important for the analysis and which measurement methods have to be used to assess the attributes values (Brajnik, 2002). In web site design, a quality model is essentially a set of criteria that are used to determine if a website reaches certain levels of quality.

Next section will explain why to use WQM and usability metrics in this proposal. Section 3 shows the selected metrics which are going to be classified. The classification of the metrics will come on section 4 and the paper will finish with the conclusions and further work on section 5.

2. WEB QUALITY MODEL (WQM) AND USABILITY

We have selected WQM (Calero, 2004) as a quality model for classifying metrics because is composed by three dimensions, a quality dimension, a life cycle processes dimension and a web features dimension. So, by classifying a metric using this model we will know more about the metric. In that way we think it is fundamental to know who can use the metric and when to use it.

WQM included the three “classic” Web Aspects in a dimension: *Content*, *Presentation* and *Navigation*. The description of the Quality Characteristics Dimension is based on the Quint2 model (Niessink, 2002) which is based on the ISO 9126 standard (ISO, 2001): Functionality, Reliability, Usability, Efficiency, Portability and Maintainability. Lastly, the Life Cycle Processes dimension includes the diverse processes of the web site life cycle following the ISO 12207 standard (ISO, 1995).

Computer systems built with usability (ISO, 1998; ISO, 2001) criteria have several benefits such as productivity improvement, cost and learning time reduction and a notable increment of final user autonomy.

In (Landauer, 1995) the author stated that 80% of maintenance costs are due to user-system interaction problems and not to technical problems. Besides, the author indicates that 64% of these costs are related with usability problems.

This situation highlights the importance of usability and justifies the need to incorporate usability criteria before, during and after software systems development.

3. USABILITY METRICS

There are a lot of usability metrics which take care on the web user interface. In general, those metrics can be classified into three broad categories (Constantine, 1999): *structural metrics*, based on surface properties; *semantic metrics*, which are content sensitive; or *procedural metrics*, which are task sensitive.

There are also proposed a group of five metrics called *essential usability metrics suite*, which is composed by: *essential efficiency*, *task concordance*, *task visibility*, *layout uniformity* and *visual coherence*.

Such a suite was proposed as the best set of metrics to measure the usability of a user interface and this is the reason why we have selected them for be classified into WQM.

3.1. Essential Usability Metrics Suite

This suite was defined by (Constantine, 1999) and is composed by five metrics that must to be used together because none of them is, by itself, an indicator of the quality of a system.

The suite, that their authors argue can improve the usability in every software, is composed by: essential efficiency, task concordance, task visibility, layout uniformity and visual coherence.

Metrics one to three are procedural metrics, layout uniformity is a structural metric and visual coherence can be considered as a semantic metric.

Essential efficiency tries to measure how near is the user interface design from the ideal use case for making a particular task. That is, it is a ratio between the number of essential steps that are needed for a user to get an objective and the number of steps actually needed to get it.

$$EE = 100 \cdot \frac{S_{essential}}{S_{enacted}}$$

Task concordance is based in use cases and evaluates task efficiency and simplicity. It is an indicator about the difficulty of the most frequent tasks. Thereby, a system would be better than other system if the most frequently used tasks are simpler.

This is the only metric which takes values from -100% to +100%. When the most frequently used tasks are the simplest, then task concordance takes the 100% value. On the other hand, if the most frequently used tasks are the tasks needing the most number of steps for completing, then task concordance takes the -100% value.

$$TC = 100 \cdot \tau = 100 \cdot \frac{D}{P}$$

D = number of pairs of tasks ranked in correct order by enacted length less number of pairs out of order.

P = number of possible tasks pairs.

Task visibility metric is grounded in the Visibility Principle (user interfaces only should show what users need to do a particular thing). It measures the relationship between visibility of characteristics and the capacity needed to finish a task or a set of tasks.

$$TV = 100 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{S_{total}} \cdot \sum_{\forall i} V_i \right)$$

S_{total} = number of steps to complete use cases

V_i = feature visibility (0 to 1) of enacted step i .

Layout uniformity is well known that developers do not have a graphic designer's eye, or at least, it is not very common. Then, this metric measures the layout of the different objects in the user interface without taking account into the functionality of these items what they are or what they do.

$$LU = 100 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{(N_h + N_w + N_t + N_l + N_b + N_r) - M}{6 \cdot N_c - M} \right)$$

N_c = number of visual components on the interface.

$N_h, N_w, N_t, N_l, N_b, N_r$ = heights, widths, alignments... between components.

M = this is an adjustment to make the layout uniformity value from 0 to 100.

Visual coherence metric is based on the distance between related visual components. And works taking into account that for users it is easier to find what they are looking for in a well structured user interface. This happens because all related items are near each other and non related items are distant.

$$VC = 100 \cdot \left(\frac{\sum_{\forall k} G_k}{\sum_{\forall k} N_k \cdot (N_k - 1) / 2} \right)$$

$$G_k = \sum_{\forall i, j | i \neq j} R_{i,j}$$

With

Where N_k = number of visual components into the group K .

$R_{i,j}$ = semantic relation between i and j components into the set k , $0 \leq R_{i,j} \leq 1$

3.2. Other selected metrics

There are other metrics which are mentioned as previous work in usability measurements by (Constantine, 1996) like other yardsticks. These metrics have been also taken into account for being classified into WQM.

Layout Complexity metric (Comber, 1994; Comber, 1995) is based in sizes and positions distribution of visual objects. A layout is more complex when height and width variations in visual components and the distance from the edges of the visual interaction context are bigger. Layout complexity can be considered as structural metric.

Layout Appropriateness metric, proposed by (Sears, 1993) is a procedural metric which estimates the efficiency of a screen in terms of cost for completing a collection of tasks.

A system is better if visual components which do related tasks are closer because the time needed to complete them is reduced.

Conceptual and semantic relationships among internal parts of a particular visual component are measured by **data cohesion** (Yourdon, 1979) metric. Data cohesion can be classified as a procedural metric.

The strength of interconnection or the degree of interdependence between two components is measured by **coupling** metric (Yourdon, 1979). This can be considered also as a procedural metric.

4. CLASSIFICATION WITHIN WQM

Once the metrics selected have been shown, we will explain the classification criterions used. As it was detailed in point 2, classification within WQM (Calero, 2004) takes into account Web features, quality characteristics (ISO, 2001; Landauer, 1995) and lifecycle processes (ISO, 1995). How to decide which exact web feature, quality characteristic or lifecycle process are related to a metric has been done based mainly, on the information given by authors.

However, most of the times, this information is not given by authors. In that case, we have used our own criteria based on our experience on web quality. For example, when talking about web features, if the metric we want to classify seems to measure something related to aspects of moving around the Web, accessing to data, information or similar, this metric has been classified as navigation aspect rather than the others. Related to quality characteristics, if a metric measures, for example, how easy is to do a particular task for a user, it has been classified, obviously, as *usability*, but also as *efficiency*. Finally, the third dimension is about phases in lifecycle processes. In that case, for classifying the metric, we must decide when the metric could be used. There are a lot of metrics that can be useful in several processes. In these cases, we have decided to classify the metric on all of them.

4.1. Metrics classification

Based on the criterions described on the last point, we present, in Table 1, the classification of the metrics explained in the section 3.1 using WQM. In this table, the name of the metric, the author and the classification within the model will be shown.

4.2. Results

As we have considered only usability metrics to be classified into WQM, usability always appears as quality characteristic, but what is really interesting is the relationship of usability metrics with the other dimensions proposed in WQM, and even within the quality dimension.

For example, a *usability* metric classified in WQM usually is related with *efficiency* and *functionality* in the quality characteristics dimension. In the lifecycle processes dimension, usability is usually connected to *architectural design*, *system analysis*, and *maintenance*. And finally, in the Web feature dimension is related with *content* and *presentation*.

Table 1. Usability metrics classification

Metric Name	Author	Web features	Quality characteristics	Life Cycle processes
Essential efficiency	Constantine, 1999	content, navigation	efficiency, usability, functionality	systems analysis, validation, operation, maintenance
Task concordance		content	efficiency, usability, functionality	verification, systems analysis, validation, operation, maintenance
Task visibility		content, presentation	efficiency, usability, functionality	architectural design, implementation, systems analysis, validation, maintenance
Layout uniformity		presentation	Usability	architectural design, systems analysis, validation, operation, maintenance
Visual coherence		content, presentation, navigation	efficiency, usability, functionality	architectural design, systems analysis, validation, operation, maintenance
Layout Appropriateness	Sears, 1993	presentation, navigation	efficiency, usability, maintainability, functionality	Lifecycle process: requirements analysis, architectural design, implementation, integration, systems analysis, operation, maintenance
Layout Complexity	Comber, 1994 -95	presentation	Usability	architectural design, implementation, systems analysis, validation, maintenance
Data cohesion	Yourdon, 1979	Content	efficiency, portability, usability, maintainability	Lifecycle process: architectural design, implementation, integration, systems analysis, maintenance
Coupling		content	efficiency, portability, usability, maintainability	Architectural design, implementation, integration, systems analysis, maintenance

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

There are many web usability metrics proposed. However, more information is needed in order to systemize its use. In order to give more information about the metrics we have used WQM, a three dimensional web quality model (composed by web features, quality characteristics and life-cycle processes) and we have surveyed some of the most relevant web usability metrics.

As a result of our classification we have found that it seems that a *usability* metric classified in WQM usually is related with *efficiency* and *functionality* in the quality characteristics, in the lifecycle process dimension is usually connected to *architectural design*, *system analysis*, and *maintenance*. And finally, in the Web feature dimension is related with *content* and *presentation*.

Nevertheless, this is only a first approach that needs to be reviewed and completed including more usability metrics in order to obtain definite conclusions about the usability metrics defined into the literature. For example, once the study will be completed, we will know in which life cycle processes or for what stakeholders there are not metrics defined. In that way, we will be able to define new metrics for these cases. Another conclusion derived from the completed model will allow us to know in which cell of the cube the biggest metric definition effort has been done having a guideline about the factors that are considered the most important for the web metric researchers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is part of projects TIC 2003-07804-C05-03, TIN2004-08000-C03-01 supported by the Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia and by the grants PCC-05-005-1 and PAI06-0093 from Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha.

REFERENCES

- Brajnik, G., 2002. Quality Models based on Automatic Webtesting. *Presented at CHI2002 workshop Automatically evaluating usability of Web Sites*. Minneapolis (MN)
- Briand, L.C. et al, 1996. Property-based Software Engineering Measurement. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp 68-85.
- Calero, C. et al, 2004. A web metrics survey using WQM, *ICWE 2004*, Munich
- Comber, T., Maltby, J. R., 1994. Screen Complexity and User design Preferences in Windows Applications, in Howard, S. and Leung, Y.K., eds., *OzCHI'94 Proceedings*. Camberra: CHISIG, Ergonomics Society of Australia.
- Comber, T., Maltby, J. R., 1995. Evaluating Usability of Screen Design with Layout Complexity, in Howard, S. and Leung, Y.K., eds., *OzCHI'95 Proceedings*. Camberra: CHISIG, Ergonomics Society of Australia.
- Constantine, Larry L., 1996. *Usage-centered Software Engineering: New Models, Methods, and Metrics*, In Purvis, M., ed, *Software Engineering: Education and Practice*. Los Alamitos, Califor.: IEEE Computer Society Press.
- Constantine, Larry L. et al, 1999. *Software for Use. A practical Guide to the models and Methods of Usage-Centered Design*, Addison Wesley Longman, Massachusetts.
- ISO 12207, 1995. *ISO/IEC 12207. Information Technology. Software Life Cycle Processes*.
- ISO 9241, 1998. *The ISO 9241 Usability Standard*
- ISO/IEC 9126, 2001. *Software Engineering. Product quality*.
- Landauer, T.K., 1995. *The Trouble with Computers: Usefulness, Usability and Productivity*. MIT Press.
- Niessink, F., 2002. Software Requirements: Functional & Non-functional Software Requirements. www.cs.uu.nl/docs/vakken/swa/Slides/SA-2-Requirements.pdf
- Sears, A., 1993. *Layout Appropriateness: A Metric for Evaluating User Interface Widget Layout*. *IEEE Trans Software Engineerin*: 707-719
- Yourdon, E., Constantine, L. L., 1979. *Structured Design*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall.