Association for Information Systems
AIS Electronic Library (AISeL)

AMCIS 2008 Proceedings

Americas Conference on Information Systems (AMCIS)

2008

Understanding and Managing Website Information Content: The WICS Method

Joseph P. Hasley
University of Colorado Denver, jhasley@hotmail.com

Dawn G. Gregg
University of Colorado Denver, dawn.gregg@cudenver.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2008

Understanding and Managing Website Information Content: The WICS Method

Joseph P. Hasley
The University of Colorado Denver
jhasley@hotmail.com

Dawn G. Gregg
The University of Colorado Denver
Dawn.Gregg@cudenver.edu

ABSTRACT

This study describes and demonstrates the Website Information Content Survey (WICS), which is intended to provide practitioners and researchers with a means of systematically describing website information content. In an exploratory survey of twenty business-to-consumer websites across five e-commerce domains, we demonstrate how the survey can be used to make cross-website comparisons that can identify potential gaps in a website's information content. The results of this study offer actionable guidance to practitioners seeking to match their website's information mix to customers' demands for product, company, and channel information. We also enable future investigations of hypothesized relationships between website information content and user-website interaction outcomes.

Keywords

Information content, content analysis, e-commerce

INTRODUCTION

Despite early predictions that the Web would eliminate seller-buyer knowledge discrepancies and, thus, create a frictionless, price-based market (Anders, 1998; Kuttner, 1998), numerous studies have concluded that low prices are not the driving force behind B2C commerce. In fact, research has demonstrated that the Internet does not inevitably provide lower prices than traditional mediums, nor do customers tend to buy from the lowest priced seller (Brynjolfsson and Smith, 2000). Rather, the main advantage of the Internet for business-to-consumer (B2C) website customers lies in the relatively low cost of obtaining high-quality information (Alba et al., 1997; Bakos, 1997). Hence, for B2C websites, success depends upon understanding how customers use information to make decisions about what products to buy, what company to buy them from, and whether or not to purchase the product on-line.

Two types of studies have dominated IS studies of information content. In the first type of study, the effects of specific information cues are examined. For example, Dholakia & Rego (1998) investigated the effects of assurance seals on website hit rates. Generally, these studies seek to understand the effects of a few specific information points within a relatively restricted context. In the second type of study, various information content is cataloged as part of a larger attempt to describe a website or to identify the relative importance of information content, website design, brand familiarity, product involvement, etc. For example, the website evaluation model presented by Zhang and von Dran (2001) accounted for several information content cues whose presence or absence could be objectively assessed. These papers generally address the relative utility of information content compared to other aspects of e-commerce websites (site design, functionality, etc.)

Although both study strategies provide relevant guidance to e-commerce practitioners and managers, the instruments described in these studies offer little information to e-commerce and practitioners seeking answers to such questions as "Do visitors to my website perceive its information content in a manner that is consistent with how I intended it to be perceived?", "Does my website provide the same information that my competitors do?", "What relative importance do my customers assign to the information points presented at my website?", or "How do various mixes of information content influence visitor perceptions and behaviors?" The answers to these questions can have important consequences. For instance, the results of this study indicate that some information cues which may seem obvious and un-ambiguous to a website's designer may be confusing or otherwise unclear to the website's visitors. For example, as the authors assessed the information content of each of the targeted websites (further described later in the article), we observed that "product or general warranty information" cues were often buried deep within the text of relatively peripheral web pages, and were often ambiguously worded. For instance, does a statement such as, "satisfaction guaranteed" imply the existence of a warranty? The WICS tool

offers one way to confirm that website visitors find and interpret information cues in the manner that managers and designers intend.

The primary goal of this paper is to introduce a survey instrument that provides a broad profile of the specific information cues that are commonly presented by business-to-consumer websites. In this preliminary study, we demonstrate how the Website Information Content Survey (WICS) can be used to measure which information cues website visitors actually experience, and how the survey can be used to compare the information content profiles of various websites. Our results lay the groundwork for future studies which may address more complex questions such as "What information content do visitors to my website consider important?", or "How do various mixes of information content influence visitor perceptions and behaviors?"

MEASURING WEBSITE INFORMATION CONTENT

While it is sometimes acceptable to treat terms like 'information content' as self-defining and singular, the research proposed here requires a more specific definition of information content that can be consistently applied across a broad range of websites. Resnik and Stern (1977) defined information cues as the information points that allow a consumer to differentiate between products, make a more informed decision, or otherwise enable viewers to better achieve their own personal sets of purchase objectives. In this paper, we focus on the explicit, discrete information cues included within a website's copy or media content. We do not attempt to account for information content that is implied through website design, organization, or visual content (Kirmani and Rao, 2000).

Survey development

This study used content analysis to develop and test an information content evaluation tool that allows for meaningful description, analysis, and comparison of the information cues present in B2C websites. Content analysis develops a data set based on systematic coding of documentary evidence (Hodson, 1999; Krippendorff, 1980). The intention is to systematically assign quantitative descriptions of qualitative data (in this case, the presence or absence of information cues).

The goal of this phase of the study was to develop a comprehensive inventory of the information cues that are likely to be found within websites. We began by reviewing the literature and identifying information cues identified in studies that investigated specific information cues, types of information, and website quality. The literature review identified 64 different information cues that were used in at least 1 of 14 prior research studies. In addition to identifying information cues in the literature, the authors surveyed 25 retail websites to identify additional information cues that had not been evaluated in prior research. Ultimately, 90 cues were compiled to create the Website Information Content Survey (Appendix A). Within the WICS the information cues were grouped into sections (e.g., "product information", "company information", etc.) based upon which pages within a website the information cue was typically presented. For example, the cues included in the "product information" section of the WICS are commonly presented on web pages that describe products, cues included in the "company information" section of the WICS are commonly presented on web pages describe the website's host company, etc.

A demonstration of the WICS

As part of our exploratory study, we asked an information systems class with 21 students at a mid-sized urban university to perform a content analysis of twenty different websites using the WICS instrument. The students were asked to determine (by indicating "yes" or "no") whether the specific information cues described in the WICS instrument could be found on the website they were assigned to assess. The websites represent five different e-commerce domains: insurance, consumer electronics, travel (cruises), health care, and foods and were not the ones used to develop the original information content survey instrument. Each student was given a paper copy of the initial WICS instrument, the URL of the website they were asked to perform the content analysis for, and a list of products or services to find information about. Two students were given the same site in the insurance domain- one of these students was asked to obtain a car insurance quote, the other was asked to obtain a home insurance quote.

In order to assess the inter-rater reliability of the WICS instrument, one author also used the WICS to independently assess each of the target websites. Following the initial assessments by the students and the first author, the second author re-evaluated all information content items where the first author's assessment differed from the student's assessment. This resulted in a combined author/student assessment that was compared to the independent assessment made by the first author.

The inter-rater reliability of the student/author and author-only assessments were measured by calculating kappa (see table 1). The inter-rater reliability for each domain and for the websites overall exceeded the 0.70 criteria indicating the coding is acceptable (Krippendorff, 1980; Weber, 1990).

	Cohen's kappa					
	All Sites	**Electronics**	**Medical Services**	**Specialty Foods**	**Insurance**	**Cruise Lines**
3-rater reliability	0.805	0.783	0.840	0.860	0.721	0.790

Table 1: Inter-rater reliability scores

RESULTS

The prevalence of information cues found as a result of the content analysis are summarized in Appendix A. The table in Appendix A lists each information cue included in WICS, the source of the information cue (if it was derived from prior literature), and the percentage of websites in the sample that were found to contain the information cue, listed by domain. The frequency of occurrence across domains offers a simple comparison of which information cues are common (and could initially be inferred to be important) across various domains. Finally, Appendix A contains the overall percentage of sites surveyed that were found to contain a specific information cue.

One simple application of the WICS survey is to determine if there are any significant differences between the information content of sites from different domains. Table 2 shows the results of paired sample t-tests which were used to determine if there were significant differences in the information cues found for different domains. The t-tests indicate that there were significant differences for most of the domains examined. The information cues found on the "electronics" sites were significantly different than the cues on sites for all other domains except the "cruise line" domain. The "medical services" sites contained information cues that were significantly different from all domains except "specialty foods", and the "insurance" sites also contained information cues that were significantly different from all other sites except for the "specialty foods" sites. The fact that "insurance" and "medical services" were both similar to "specialty foods" but not to each other suggest that the information cue overlap might be for different reasons. For example, most of the "specialty food" sites and most of the "medical service" sites were for very small companies with limited websites. Although the insurance sites were all large carriers, insurance sites have no product to deliver and as such might appear to be missing some product related information content cues which smaller sites that actually sell products include.

	Electronics	Medical Services	Specialty Foods	Insurance	Cruise Lines
Electronics	-	0.0000	0.0000	0.0006	0.8791
Medical Services	0.0000	-	0.1458	0.0047	0.0000
Specialty Foods	0.0000	0.1458	-	0.1237	0.0000
Insurance	0.0006	0.0047	0.1237	-	0.0008
Cruise Lines	0.8791	0.0000	0.0000	0.0008	-

Table 2: Paired Sample t-Tests Comparing Domains (significance)

Insight can also be gained from intra-domain comparisons, which may help identify information shortfalls, industry trends, competitive advantages, or opportunities. For instance, understanding how frequently an information cue occurs within a domain (the "intra-domain frequency of occurrence") gives an indication of whether the presence of that cue on a website is relatively common (or, conversely, unique) across websites in that domain. If a cue is included at most of the websites within a domain, a website that does not provide that cue may be perceived as less informative than the competitors who do provide the information cue.

Our analysis of intra-domain frequencies of occurrence indicates that website designers may not always understand what data are expected in their particular domain. For example, our analysis found lists of product ingredients at 3 of the 4 specialty food stores we assessed. Assuming that a significant number of specialty food customers have food allergies, a specialty

food store that does not offer a list of product ingredients may be at a substantial disadvantage, especially when competing websites do prominently feature ingredient lists.

Practitioners may also need guidance identifying content that is not appropriate for their site. For example, only one of the health services websites assessed in our exercise mentioned price (in fact, that site lists only a range of prices: $499-$1500 per eye). While price is always a consideration, prudent health care providers probably do not want to be seen as differentiating themselves based on price alone.

Beyond its descriptive abilities, the WICS lays a foundation for more complex, explanatory analysis. While our methods were not sensitive enough to support inferences of causality, we did observe several potential relationships between information content and subject perceptions. One subject who assessed a website for a provider of Lasik eye surgery consistently indicated that the amount of information provided at the site they assessed was insufficient. When compared to other health-care provider sites (including another Lasik provider), we discovered that the low-ranking Lasik site was the only health-care related site that did not contain 1) warranty information and 2) information for conducting off-line financial transactions. It is possible that the lack of confidence-building (warranty) and payment method information could influence the perceptions of a consumer who is considering a potentially risky, expensive purchase such as Lasik eye surgery.

Finally, our analysis showed that there is often considerable variability regarding the presence of a given information cue within a domain. One insurance site prominently features a celebrity endorsement, while two other insurance websites featured very different types of entertainment content. The variability of information cues presented most likely reflects the very different corporate images being presented by the different insurance websites. Of course, high intra-domain frequency of occurrence variability may also signal that an information cue's presence is consistently ambiguous, subtle, or otherwise hard to assess. For example, subjects may not realize that when they are choosing how much liability insurance to carry, they are customizing the product.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The breadth and depth of information presented at even a simple B2C website makes consistently obtaining a systematic description of website information content extremely challenging. The reliability and usefulness of the WICS is largely dependent upon the domain it is applied to and the subjective interpretations of content assessors. However, the flexible nature of the survey means that it can be enhanced, clarified, or focused to address the specific domains and questions being investigated. Future researchers would need to evaluate the nature of their domain (e.g. product or service) and the size of the business they wish to assess and could eliminate specific questions that are not appropriate for those sites.

The WICS instrument is designed to be a comprehensive information content assessment. As a result of its wide scope, assessing the information content of multiple websites may prove too taxing to many potential study subjects. The comprehensiveness and granularity of information description required by any given assessor will obviously vary widely, based upon the specific questions being investigated. Future investigators may opt to use only those parts of the survey that directly interest them. For example, many prior website quality surveys have focused the quality of product related information.

The relatively small number of websites evaluated within each domain facilitated only general comparisons of the influences of information content cues on user perceptions. Future research can evaluate a large number of sites in a given domain to further investigate how information content influences user perceptions and behaviors.

The survey may also prove useful to researchers investigating hypothesized links between information content and consumer website interaction outcomes, such as perceptions of website quality, trust, intention to purchase, purchase activity, and intention to return to the website. The survey may also provide utility and insight for researchers investigating links between information content and other website dimensions such as site design and organization.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Previous studies of website information content have tended to focus on the effects of specific information cues or the importance of sub-sets of information cues. This study introduces a survey that allows practitioners and researchers to create a comprehensive, meaningful information profile of a broad range of B2C websites.

We hope that in the future, the survey may also prove useful to researchers investigating hypothesized links between information content and consumer website interaction outcomes, such as perceptions of website quality, trust, intention to purchase, purchase activity, and intention to return to the website. The survey may also provide utility and insight for researchers investigating links between information content and other website dimensions, such as site design and organization.

WICS represents an early step towards understanding how to make informed choices about what information content should be included on a website. This study describes and demonstrates a tool and analysis method that allows practitioners to simply and effectively describe and assess their website's information content, and also compare their website to competitors'. As described earlier, a systematic inventory allows practitioners to accurately identify possible information gaps in their site's information mix (e.g., product ingredients at a specialty food store), as well as information cues that differentiate their site from competitors' (e.g., entertainment content at insurance websites). Additionally, our preliminary results showed examples of possible relationships between information content and website user perceptions. Such examples invite future investigations of possible relationships between website information content and user-website interaction outcomes (i.e., visitor perceptions of website quality, trust, purchase intention and behaviour, intention to return to the site, etc.). The WICS survey also enables further research investigating the relationships between information content and other aspects of website success, such as how site design and information organization influence perceptions of information quality.

REFERENCES

Aladwani, A. M. and Palvia, P. C. (2002) Developing and validating an instrument for measuring user-perceived web quality, *Information & Management,* 39, 467-476.

Barnes, S.J. and Vidgen, R.T., An evaluation of cyber-bookshops: the WebQual method, *International Journal of Electronic Commerce,* 6, 1, Fall 2001a, 11–30.

Alba, J.W., Lynch, Weitz, Barton, Janiszewski, Chris , Lutz, R., Sawyer, A., and Wood, S., (1997) Interactive home shopping: consumer, retailer, and manufacturer incentives to participate in electronic marketplaces, *Journal of Marketing,* 61, 38-53.

Anders, George (1998) Cybersqueeze: Comparison shopping is the Web's virtue – unless you're a seller, *Wall Street Journal* July 23.

Bakos, J.Y. (1997) Reducing buyer search costs: Implications for electronic markets, *Management Science,* 43, 1676-1692.

Brynjolfsson, E. and Smith, M.D. (2000) Frictionless commerce? A comparison of internet and conventional retailers, *Management Science,* 46, 563-585.

Chan, K. and Chan, F. (2005) Information content of television advertising in China: An update, *Asian Journal of Communication,* 15, 1-15.

Dholakia, U.M. and Rego, L.L. (1998) 'What makes commercial web pages popular?', *European Journal of Marketing,* 32, 724-736.

Fay, M. and Currier, G. (1994) The rise and fall of the copy point, *European Journal of Marketing,* 28, 19-31.

Grazioli, S. and Jarvenpaa, S. (2000) Perils of Internet fraud: An empirical investigation of deception and trust with experienced internet consumers, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Management, and Cybernetics,* 30, 395-410.

Gregg, D.G. and Walczak, S. (2008) Dressing Your Online Auction Business For Success: An Experiment Comparing Two E-Bay Businesses, forthcoming *MIS Quarterly*, 2008.

Hassan, S., and Li, F. (2005) Evaluating the usability and content usefulness of websites: A benchmarking approach, Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations, *3,2, 46-67.*

Hodson, R.D. (1999) *Analyzing Documentary Accounts*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Huizingh, E. (2000) The content and design of websites: An empirical study, *Information & Management,* 37, 123-134.

Jacoby, J., Speller, D.E., and Berning, C.K. (1974) Brand Choice Behavior as a Function of Information Load: Replication and Extension', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1, 33-42.

Kang,Y.S. and Kim, Yong Jin (2006) Do visitors' interest level and perceived quantity of web page content matter in shaping the attitude toward a website?, *Decision Support Systems,* 42, 1187-1202.

Krippendorff, Klaus (1980) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kirmaniv, A. and Rao, A.R. (2000) No pain, no gain: A critical review of the literature on signaling unobservable product quality, *Journal of Marketing,* 64, 66-79.

Kuttner, R. (1998) The Net: A market too perfect for profits, *Business Week* May 11.

Lin, J.C.C. and Lu, H. (2000) Towards an understanding of the behavioral intention to use a Website, *International Journal of Information Management,* 20, 3, 197–208.

Liu, Chang and Arnett, Kirk P. (2000) Exploring the factors associated with website success in the context of electronic commerce, *Information & Management,* 381, 23-33.

Loiacono, E.T., Watson, R.T. and Goodhue, D.L. (2007) WebQual: An Instrument for Consumer Evaluation of Websites, *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 11, 3, 51-87.

Lu, H. and Liu, J.C. (2002) Predicting customer behavior in the market-space: A study of Rayport and Sviokla's framework, *Information & Management*, 40, 1, 1-10.

Lynch, J.G. and Ariely, D. (2000) Wine Online: Search Costs Affect Competition on Price, Quality, and Distribution" *Marketing Science*, 19, 1, 83-103.

Malhotra, Naresh (1982) Information Load and Consumer Decision Making, *Journal of Consumer Research,* 8, 419-430.

Montoya-Weiss, M. M. (2003) Determinants of online channel use and overall satisfaction with a relational, multichannel service provider, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31, 448-458.

Muyllea, S., Moenaertb, R. and Despontin, M. (2004) The conceptualization and empirical validation of website user satisfaction, *Information & Management*, 41, 5, 543–560.

Nielsen, J. and Norman, D.A. "Usability on the Web isn't a luxury" *Information Week* 773, February 14, 2000.

Palmer, J.W., Website Usability, Design, and Performance Metrics, *Information Systems Research*, 13, 2, 151-167.

Ranganathan, C. and Ganapathy, S. (2002) 'Key dimensions of business-to-consumer websites', *Information & Management,* 39, 457-465

Resnick, M. L. and Montania, R. (2003) Perceptions of customer service, information privacy, and product quality from semiotic design features in an online web store, *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction,* 162, 211-234.

Resnik, A. and Stern, B.L. (1977) An analysis of information content in television advertising, *Journal of Marketing,* 41, 50-53.

Robbins, S.S. and Stylianou, A.C. (2003) Global corporate websites: an empirical investigation of content and design, *Information & Management*, 40, 205-212.

Song, J. and Zahedi, F. (2005) A theoretical approach to web design in e-commerce: A brief reinforcement model, *Management Science,* 51, 1219-1235.

van Iwaarden, J., van der Wiele, T., Ball, L. and Millen, R. (2004) Perceptions about the quality of websites: A survey amongst students at Northeastern University and Erasmus University, *Information & Management,* 41, 947-959.

Venkatesh, V. and Ramesh, V. (2006) Web and Wireless Site Usability: Understanding Differences and Modeling Use, *MIS Quarterly,* 30, 1, 181-205.

Vishwanath, Arun (2004) An empirical investigation into the use of heuristics and information cues by bidders in online auctions, *Electronic Markets,* 13, 59-66.

Webb, H.W., and Webb, L.A. (2004) SiteQual: An integrated measure of website quality, *The Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 17, 6, 430-440.

Weber, Rober P. (1990) *Basic Content Analysis*, 2nd edn, London, UK: Sage

Zhang, Ping and von Dran, Gisela M. (2002) User expectations and rankings of quality factors in different website domains, *International Journal of Electronic Commerce,* 6, 9-33.

Zhang, P., von Dran, G.M., Blake, P., and Pipithsuksunt, V. (2001) Important design features in different website domains, e-Service Journal, *1, 77-91.*

Appendix A: The Website Information Content Survey (WICS) and the results of a preliminary study.

Information Cue	Prevalence of each cue in the 5 domains surveyed - % of sites with cue						Source
	Electronics (4)	Medical Services (4)	Specialty Foods (4)	Insurance (5)	Cruise Lines (4)	overall	
NAVIGATION INFORMATION							
Is a navigational bar present on every screen?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Barnes & Vidgen 2001
Is the navigation bar consistently located?	100%	100%	75%	60%	100%	86%	Song & Zahedi, 2005
Does the repeated Navigation structure (menus, links @ bottom of page) contain links to:							
a Customer service policy?	100%	50%	50%	100%	75%	76%	*Not previously studied
a Privacy policy?	100%	0%	50%	100%	100%	71%	Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002 Robbins & Stylianou, 2003 Song & Zahedi, 2005 van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
a Site map?	75%	75%	25%	100%	100%	76%	*Not previously studied
a Search engine?	75%	0%	75%	100%	75%	57%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002 Robbins & Stylianou, 2003 Song & Zahedi, 2005 Zhang, et al., 2001
the Home page?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Does the site have a site map?	75%	75%	25%	100%	75%	71%	Robbins & Stylianou, 2003 Zhang, et al., 2001
PRODUCT/SERVICE INFORMATION							
Lists of products/services offered by the company.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
List of products/services that can be purchased/used at the website	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	90%	Zhang, et al., 2001
Prices of Product or Service	100%	25%	100%	100%	100%	86%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998 Lynch & Ariely, 2000; Song & Zahedi, 2005
Availability of Product or Service	75%	0%	0%	60%	100%	48%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Product Description							
Attributes	100%	0%	75%	80%	100%	71%	Aladwani & Paliva, 2002 Dholakia & Rego, 1998 Lynch & Ariely, 2000 Song & Zahedi, 2005 Zhang, et al., 2001
Functionality	100%	50%	0%	60%	100%	62%	Chan & Chan, 2005
Materials	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%	14%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998

Ingredients	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%	14%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Nutritional Information	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%	14%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Description of services provided.	50%	100%	25%	100%	100%	76%	*Not previously studied
Product variations, e.g., color, size	50%	75%	50%	100%	100%	76%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
FAQ - list of 'Frequently asked questions'	100%	100%	25%	60%	100%	76%	Zhang, et al., 2001
Product customization information	0%	25%	0%	100%	100%	48%	Barnes & Vidgen 2001 Song & Zahedi, 2005
Claims of product superiority	100%	75%	25%	80%	75%	71%	Zhang, et al., 2001
Comparisons to competitor's products or prices	50%	25%	0%	80%	25%	38%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
'Side-by-side' comparisons of products offered by company	50%	0%	25%	0%	50%	24%	Lynch & Ariely, 2000 Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002
Product Benefits (or negative avoided)	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	95%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Product warnings (e.g. side effects, hazards)	0%	75%	50%	0%	0%	24%	*Not previously studied
Product Picture							
Static, 2D	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	76%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998 Song & Zahedi, 2005
Dynamic, 3D	50%	0%	0%	0%	75%	24%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
New Product Notification	100%	0%	50%	40%	75%	52%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998 Song & Zahedi, 2005
Owner's Manual, Assembly Instructions, etc.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Demonstration of the product in use							
Image	50%	100%	0%	0%	75%	43%	*Not previously studied
Multimedia	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	19%	*Not previously studied
Product preview (e.g., sample chapters for a book)							
Text	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	14%	*Not previously studied
Multimedia	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%	24%	*Not previously studied
Product reviews (customer, 3rd party, etc)	75%	100%	50%	40%	75%	67%	Lynch & Ariely, 2000 Song & Zahedi, 2005 Zhang, et al., 2001
Product endorsement (Celebrity/Expert)	25%	100%	0%	40%	0%	33%	Song & Zahedi, 2005
Product or general warranty information	100%	75%	25%	60%	25%	57%	Barnes & Vidgen 2001 Chan and Chan, 2005 Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Staff or service provider profiles/credentials	25%	75%	50%	80%	50%	57%	*Not previously studied
Sale information (sale prices, sale announcement, etc.)	75%	25%	50%	40%	75%	52%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998 Song & Zahedi, 2005
Purchase/Reservation Information							
Online	100%	50%	100%	80%	75%	81%	*Not previously studied
Offline	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002
Product safety information, guidelines or warnings	25%	25%	50%	20%	75%	38%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998

Contest or giveaway information	25%	25%	25%	0%	50%	24%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
PERSONALIZED INFORMATION							
Customer name appears on website	50%	0%	50%	60%	100%	52%	*Not previously studied
Customer preferences tracked/used on site	50%	0%	50%	80%	100%	57%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Barnes & Vidgen 2001 Loiacono et al. 2007 Song & Zahedi, 2005
Product recommendations/suggestions made	100%	0%	50%	60%	75%	57%	Song & Zahedi, 2005
ADVERTISEMENTS							
Banner Ad	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998 Zhang, et al., 2001
Side Ad	25%	25%	25%	0%	0%	14%	*Not previously studied
Embedded Ad	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	*Not previously studied
CUSTOMER SERVICE INFORMATION							
Company warranty policy (blanket, for all or most products)	100%	75%	50%	20%	25%	52%	Song & Zahedi, 2005
Return/Refund/Exchange policy	75%	50%	50%	0%	100%	52%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002
Order Tracking	100%	0%	0%	20%	50%	33%	Song & Zahedi, 2005
Customer Service contact info							Barnes & Vidgen 2001 Song & Zahedi, 2005 Webb & Webb 2004
Phone	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*Not previously studied
email	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	95%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002
Customer Service hours	50%	25%	0%	80%	25%	38%	*Not previously studied
Indication of customer service online conversation/chat capability	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Robbins & Stylianou, 2003 Song & Zahedi, 2005 Zhang, et al., 2001
TRANSACTION INFORMATION							
Indication of online purchase functionality	100%	0%	100%	80%	100%	76%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Loiacono et al. 2007
Taxes and other charges	100%	0%	75%	60%	100%	67%	van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
Total price	100%	0%	75%	80%	100%	71%	van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
List of individual items being purchased	100%	0%	75%	60%	100%	67%	van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
Item-by-item price list of items being purchased	100%	0%	75%	80%	100%	71%	van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
Delivery date estimation	75%	0%	50%	20%	75%	43%	Barnes & Vidgen 2001 van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
Shipping options	100%	0%	100%	0%	25%	43%	Song & Zahedi, 2005
Payment options	100%	0%	100%	60%	100%	71%	Song & Zahedi, 2005 van Iwaarden, et al, 2003
Third party security assurance (seal, endorsement, etc.)	100%	0%	25%	40%	50%	43%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Shopping cart status	100%	0%	75%	40%	100%	62%	*Not previously studied
Individual accounts with login and password	75%	0%	75%	80%	100%	67%	Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002 Zhang and von Dran, 2002

							Zhang, et al., 2001
Information on offline modes for conducting financial transactions	50%	75%	100%	60%	100%	76%	Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002
COMPANY INFORMATION							
Company logo	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	95%	Grazioli and Jarvenpaa, 2000
Company retail sites							
List	25%	100%	0%	80%	0%	43%	Grazioli and Jarvenpaa, 2000
URL	0%	25%	25%	40%	0%	19%	*Not previously studied
Map	50%	50%	25%	60%	0%	38%	*Not previously studied
Partner-company retail sites							
List	75%	25%	50%	0%	75%	43%	*Not previously studied
URL	50%	25%	25%	20%	50%	33%	*Not previously studied
Map	25%	0%	0%	0%	25%	10%	*Not previously studied
Company contact information							Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002
Phone	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Robbins & Stylianou, 2003
email	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Robbins & Stylianou, 2003
Mail address	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	90%	*Not previously studied
HQ Address	50%	100%	75%	80%	50%	71%	Robbins & Stylianou, 2003
Company history	100%	25%	50%	100%	75%	71%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Robbins & Stylianou, 2003
Press Releases	100%	25%	25%	100%	100%	71%	Robbins & Stylianou, 2003
Company Goal, Mission or Vision	100%	50%	50%	80%	50%	67%	*Not previously studied
Celebrity endorsement of company/brand	25%	100%	0%	0%	0%	24%	*Not previously studied
MULTIMEDIA							
Does the site have 'Entertainment' content?							Loiacono et al. 2007 Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002
Image	25%	0%	0%	40%	100%	33%	Dholakia & Rego, 1998
Game	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Multimedia	25%	25%	0%	40%	100%	38%	Aladwani & Palvia, 2002 Barnes & Vidgen 2001 Robbins & Stylianou, 2003 Zhang, et al., 2001 Zhang and von Dran, 2002
SECURITY							
Does the site require login with user name and password?	75%	0%	50%	80%	75%	57%	Ranganathan & Ganapathy, 2002 Zhang & von Dran, 2002 Zhang, et al., 2001
Does the key/lock display on status bar for insecure pages?	100%	0%	75%	100%	100%	76%	*Not previously studied

*"Not previously studied" cues are information cues found on a significant proportion of the websites examined as part of the WICS development process but not identified in prior literature.