

University of Wollongong

Research Online

Faculty of Informatics - Papers (Archive)

Faculty of Engineering and Information
Sciences

1-1-2009

Experiences of users from online grocery stores

Mark Freeman

University of Wollongong, mfreeman@uow.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/infopapers>



Part of the [Physical Sciences and Mathematics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Freeman, Mark: Experiences of users from online grocery stores 2009, 139-160.
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/infopapers/761>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Experiences of users from online grocery stores

Abstract

Grocery shopping, traditionally considered as the pinnacle of the selfservice industry, is used as the case study in this chapter. As the Internet has become widely used by many segments of the population, the opportunity to shop online for groceries has been presented to consumers. This chapter considers issues that need to be addressed to make online grocery shopping systems more usable for these consumers, based on feedback from individuals who participated in a study of user interactions with Australian online grocery stores.

Keywords

online, users, grocery, stores, experiences

Disciplines

Physical Sciences and Mathematics

Publication Details

Freeman, M. (2009). Experiences of users from online grocery stores. In D. Oliver, C. Romm Livermore & F. Sudweeks (Eds.), *Self service in the internet age: expectations and experiences* (pp. 139-160). London: Springer-Verlag.

1 **Chapter 7**
2 **Experiences of Users from Online Grocery Stores**
3
4

5 **Mark Freeman**
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Abstract** Grocery shopping, traditionally considered as the pinnacle of the self-
14 service industry, is used as the case study in this chapter. As the Internet has
15 become widely used by many segments of the population, the opportunity to
16 shop online for groceries has been presented to consumers. This chapter con-
17 sideres issues that need to be addressed to make online grocery shopping systems
18 more usable for these consumers, based on feedback from individuals who
19 participated in a study of user interactions with Australian online grocery
20 stores.
21

22
23 **7.1 Introduction**
24

25 The ability to purchase groceries via an online mechanism has the potential to
26 significantly alter the behaviour of consumers. The challenge for online grocery
27 stores is to provide a functional method of self-service item selection and
28 ordering that consumers find more convenient than using a conventional self-
29 service grocery store. Grocery stores appeared in the early twentieth century,
30 and over the past 100 years have adapted to become a weekly part of most
31 individuals' lives. The initial concept behind the grocery store was for a self-
32 service, cash and carry facility for consumers. The three factors that led to the
33 initial success of grocery stores were the growth of cities; an increasing popula-
34 tion with a rising demand for food; and the spread of the motor vehicle and
35 refrigerator. With these developments, the grocery store has become an institu-
36 tion in western economies.
37

38 It is essential for online grocers to realise that, while the public must shop for
39 groceries, consumers have the choice of using conventional self-service grocery
40 stores or their online counterparts. While, originally, many Internet users
41 purchased goods via e-commerce for the novelty factor, online grocery stores

42 M. Freeman (✉)
43 School of Information Systems and Technology, University of Wollongong,
44 Wollongong, NSW 2522 Australia
45 e-mail: mfreeman@uow.edu.au

46 need to provide a strong incentive for consumers to continue to purchase their
47 goods online once the novelty wears off. To date, this incentive has been
48 advertised as the convenience of being able to purchase from home and the
49 reduced stress involved when shopping for groceries online. A number of
50 studies have found that conventional self-service grocery shopping is the most
51 stressful of all types of shopping (Aylott & Mitchell 1998). The decision to
52 purchase groceries online and the users' perceptions of success are affected by
53 many issues, both online and offline. These issues include the selection process,
54 payment process, receipt of goods, returns, customer service, quality of goods,
55 substitutions, price, privacy, security, time and convenience. The importance
56 of each of these issues varies among users, and is likely to be influenced by the
57 structure of the grocery store (i.e. whether the store is 'web only', or has a
58 physical presence). This chapter will focus on issues of usability related to online
59 grocery shopping.

60 This chapter presents the results of an extensive case study into the usability
61 of one Australian online grocery store, and identifies issues that need to be
62 overcome by online grocery stores in order to be successful. The results pre-
63 sented will discuss the differences between conventional self-service and online
64 grocery stores, and feedback provided by users who completed the usability
65 testing. This information is used to develop recommendations for necessary
66 features of online grocery stores, which may be used to assist online grocery
67 stores (and potentially online stores in other industries) to provide a functional
68 method of self-service item selection and ordering for their users.

69

70

71

72 **7.2 Background**

73

74 The development of the Internet has introduced a new shopping medium for
75 consumers. The Internet continues to create a great deal of hype and hysteria,
76 and alongside the more sensational aspects, issues of e-commerce have arisen.
77 One of the major issues that has been identified is the usability of e-commerce
78 websites, as shown in previous studies (Raijas 2002; Tilson et al. 1998). If an
79 online store is unusable then customers are unlikely to make a purchase (James
80 2001). There have been numerous predictions of a dramatic increase in online
81 grocery shopping in the next few years; however, these predictions are only
82 likely to be fulfilled if online grocery stores provide an efficient and logical
83 shopping experience for consumers. Usable systems are paramount in meeting
84 the expectations of consumers using this self-service medium for their groceries.
85 Most e-commerce usability research has focused on the ordering of single
86 products, and the issue of multiple product multiple quantity ordering, such
87 as in a grocery store, has only been addressed in a very limited way.

88 With usability being a prime concern for online stores, it is playing an
89 increasingly important role in the development of e-commerce systems such
90 as online grocery systems, and with this various techniques for conducting

91 usability testing have emerged. These techniques range from informal processes
92 such as heuristic evaluation to formal techniques such as usability laboratories.
93 If usability testing deems a site to be poor in that respect, there is a need to
94 redesign the site, thus mandating a prompt reaction in order to remain compe-
95 titive in the marketplace.

96 A set of ten preliminary guidelines have been established during previous
97 research as a basis for orders that deal with multiple product and varied
98 quantity ordering. The preliminary guidelines established (Freeman 2003; Free-
99 man et al. 2003) were as follows:

- 100 1. Informative home page
- 101 2. Pages should follow a clear left to right path
- 102 3. Searching capabilities visible and usable
- 103 4. Searching available across multiple columns
- 104 5. Logical ordering of results, with consistent naming
- 105 6. A separate column for each part of the description
- 106 7. Each row differentiated by different colours
- 107 8. Clear method for item and quantity selection
- 108 9. Buttons differentiated from text and graphics
- 109 10. Simple instructions

110
111 It can be argued that grocery shopping is fundamentally different to any
112 other typical shopping experience by its nature, in both conventional self-
113 service and online contexts. A typical grocery shopping trip involves selecting
114 and purchasing multiple products with multiple quantities, while other shop-
115 ping typically involves purchasing one or a limited number of items. Website
116 designers for grocery shopping should reflect these considerations as they
117 endeavour to support users fulfil these traditional patterns of behaviour.

118 The emphasis and concerns of this research differ from all previous HCI
119 research because of the inherent complexity of placing multiple product multi-
120 ple quantity orders, as opposed to purchasing only a few items. The issue of
121 multiple product multiple quantity ordering has been shown to be of signifi-
122 cance in previous studies (Heikkila et al. 1998) and is of great significance in
123 self-service, with a grocery order having 54 items on average. Harlam and
124 Lodish (1995) identified a difference in mindset for purchasing multiple pro-
125 ducts as shoppers 'balance' the contents of their trolley. Research has shown
126 that grocery shopping is the most stressful form of shopping (Aylott & Mitchell
127 1998) due to a range of factors, many of which are removed by shopping online.
128 Previous research in the field of online shopping has also usually focused on the
129 purchase of a 'hard-good', such as a book, CD or item of clothing. These items
130 are fundamentally different to those that a consumer purchases from a grocery
131 store.

132 One figure suggests that just over 3% of the total grocery sales in Australia
133 occurred online in 2002 (Hannen 2002). There are a growing number of indivi-
134 duals using the Internet to perform their shopping duties. These users are also
135 gaining greater competence and confidence in using such services. There is

136 therefore a need for the systems to have ever-increasing levels of usability and to
137 ensure that a high level of user satisfaction is maintained.

138 A study (Raijas 2002) of online grocery shopping in Helsinki, Finland, found
139 that the average user is a woman, 35–46 years old living in a household with
140 children. 73% of customers were women, 88% were under 45 years old and
141 most users had high incomes. A similar situation of the typical online user has
142 been established through this research, with interviews of online stores in
143 Australia indicating that over 80% of their registered customers were women.

144 Online shopping research has traditionally focused on non-essential items,
145 with the experience designed for enjoyment. Online grocery shopping involves
146 the purchase of essential items, and efficiency is therefore more important than
147 enjoyment. Efficiency is also an issue when it is considered that groceries are
148 usually disposable and therefore need to be repurchased on a regular basis.
149 Groceries are substitutable goods, meaning that if one product is not available
150 then the consumer will usually be able to purchase a similar product as a
151 replacement. Facilities to support the identification of alternate products are
152 currently not available in online grocery stores, but would be of great advantage
153 to consumers. As a result of these issues, online grocery stores are inherently
154 different to other types of online stores.

155 With the introduction of the Internet and the development of online shop-
156 ping during the 1990s, individuals were offered the opportunity to purchase
157 their weekly groceries online, releasing the consumer from the stressors asso-
158 ciated with conventional self-service shopping. Behavioural and consumer
159 research has proven that the weekly grocery-shopping trip is one of the most
160 stressful shopping experiences that an individual has to undergo (Aylott &
161 Mitchell 1998). By providing access to the grocery shopping process online,
162 consumers are now more able to shop at their convenience and in an environ-
163 ment which is comfortable for them (Kempiak & Fox 2002). With the ubiqui-
164 tous nature of the Internet providing the possibility of purchasing items in an
165 environment that is familiar to the user, there is scope for reducing shopping-
166 related stress. However, it is still to be determined whether, in reality, online
167 grocery stores are a true alternative to conventional self-service shopping.

168 When designed well, the basic experience that a user gains from using an
169 online grocery system should be not unlike that of a conventional self-service
170 shop. Browsing allows customers to explore the website and purchase goods in
171 a manner that is similar to a conventional self-service grocery store by viewing
172 virtual aisles to narrow down the products that are available. Online systems
173 also have the advantage of a search facility, which most users associate with the
174 Internet, and this allows a user to locate a product by typing in product
175 descriptors such as the name, brand or type of good. With both methods, lists
176 of results are displayed for the consumer to select from.

177 Images and explanations are essential to support online browsing and selec-
178 tion, because consumers are unable to touch or see the products they are con-
179 sidering purchasing (Bannister 2002; Consumer Union of U.S. 2000). A limited
180 number of researchers (McGovern 2001; Nielsen 2001) disagree with the use

181 of supporting images, suggesting that ‘the web is a literate rather than a visual
182 medium’, and is visually constrained, so sites should be based around text due
183 to resolution and screen size limitations. Limited bandwidth also supports this
184 requirement, with users inevitably being impatient and the web being time-
185 sensitive, meaning that information needs to be displayed in a timely manner
186 (McGovern 2001). Lohse and Spiller’s (1998) research contradicts these recom-
187 mendations, stating that the most sophisticated ‘list windows’ (which combine a
188 description, an ADD button and an image) use both images and extra naviga-
189 tion buttons, such as ‘more details’. Hong et al. (2004) corroborate this argu-
190 ment, finding that the design of product listing pages can dramatically influence
191 the users’ performance and their attitude to shopping online. By providing a
192 product image on the listing page to support the brand name, the efficiency and
193 effectiveness of finding a product is dramatically increased, and the provision of
194 a vertical list of the products as opposed to that of ‘an array’ (in a grid) improves
195 performance. Yen and Gwinner (2003) identify four attributes that are of
196 importance for Internet self-service technologies (ISST): perceived control;
197 performance; convenience; and efficiency. These four attributes will be dis-
198 cussed throughout this chapter.

199
200

201 **7.3 History of the Grocery Store**

203 Conventional self-service grocery stores have existed in their current form for
204 more than 90 years. The first conventional self-service grocery store, ‘Piggly
205 Wiggly Store’, was established in the United States by Charles Saunders in
206 1916. His idea was for a self-service, cash and carry grocery store (Oi 2004).
207 Although this grocery store failed due to the US stock market crash of 1929, the
208 idea for such stores was created. The three factors that led to the initial success
209 of grocery stores were ‘(i) the growth of cities, (ii) a rising demand for food, and
210 (iii) the spread of the automobile and refrigerator’ (Oi 2004). With these devel-
211 opments, the self-service grocery store became a worldwide success.

213 Over the second half of the twentieth century, grocery stores have established
214 themselves in the Australian retail sector, just like in the rest of the developed
215 world. The first self-service grocery stores in Australia appeared in the 1950s
216 and have since risen to a position of dominance, accounting for 61% of all food
217 and grocery purchases in Australia in 1998–99 (ACNeilson 1998, p37 cited in
218 Pritchard 2000). In 2003–04 ‘food and non-alcoholic beverages’ had the highest
219 average household expenditure of \$153 per week, representing 17% of total
220 household expenditure on goods and services (ABS 2003–04). In the United
221 States of America, annual grocery expenditure is around US \$540 billion.
222 Australia’s largest grocery store group, Coles Myer, had sales in their food
223 and liquor division of AU \$19,255 million during 2005 (Coles Myer Ltd 2005).
224 These figures demonstrate that there is an enormous potential market for
225 business to consumer (B2C) e-commerce in the online grocery area.

226 With expenditure in Australian grocery stores accounting for such a large
227 percentage of household expenditure, numerous grocery stores have established
228 themselves in the market. This provides consumers with the ability to select
229 their preferred supermarket company for regular grocery shopping visits. Since
230 the introduction of the Internet, consumer choices have expanded further and
231 they may now choose to conduct their regular grocery shopping using an online
232 grocery system. In some societies, conventional self-service grocery stores have
233 been incorporated into larger ‘supermarkets’ over the recent years, with these
234 supermarkets having a wider selection of products. This chapter compares the
235 stressors of using a conventional self-service grocery store with its online
236 counterpart.

237 238 239 **7.3.1 Online Grocery Stores**

240 Online grocery stores realise that, while the public must shop for groceries,
241 consumers have the choice of using conventional self-service grocery stores or
242 their online counterparts. While, originally, many Internet users purchased
243 goods via e-commerce out of curiosity, online grocery stores must provide a
244 strong incentive for consumers to continue to purchase their goods online once
245 the novelty wears off (Goldstein 2002). To date, this incentive has been adver-
246 tised as the convenience and ease of being able to purchase from home. How-
247 ever, this concept of convenience must be extended to the convenience and ease
248 of use of a specific online grocery system, not just the overall idea of online
249 shopping. It is also important to note that the benefits provided by the con-
250 venience of shopping online can come at a cost to the user.

251 Despite predictions of a high take-up rate for online grocery shopping, this
252 has not occurred to date. The slow acceptance of online grocery shopping
253 compared to other types of online shopping has been considered in previous
254 research by analysing the products commonly purchased online (Kempiak &
255 Fox 2002). Products traditionally purchased online are ‘hard-good’ items such
256 as music and books. In contrast, shoppers are used to inspecting groceries for
257 quality when shopping in a traditional grocery store, and some grocery pro-
258 ducts such as fruits are considered to be high-touch items (Kempiak & Fox
259 2002). Shoppers using online grocery stores are not able to ‘touch’ items to
260 assess quality. Another significant feature of grocery products is their perish-
261 able nature, with many products having specific delivery needs, such as refrig-
262 eration and a limited life span. The perishable nature of products demands a
263 regular turnover of inventory, often resulting in changing availability of pro-
264 ducts. This poses an added challenge for online shoppers, as they are forced to
265 vary their purchasing patterns based on limited information. Consumer percep-
266 tions regarding the delivery of ‘soft-good’ items need to be changed to allow for
267 further growth in online grocery shopping (MyWebGrocer 2001).
268
269
270

271 When designing online grocery systems, a key concept to consider is the aisle
272 layout of conventional self-service grocery stores. Designers of online grocery
273 systems need to understand the ‘mental models’ that users associate with
274 grocery shopping in the ‘real-world’ environment (Badre 2002). This notion is
275 based on the idea that users of online grocers are likely to have experience with
276 buying goods in a conventional self-service grocery store, and who are therefore
277 experienced in determining the aisle location of items. It is the categorisation of
278 items that is important for website designers and developers, with users com-
279 monly transferring conventional self-service grocery shopping experiences to
280 the online domain.

281 There are three forms of virtual store layout presented in conventional
282 retailing store layout theory (Vrechopoulos et al. 2004):

- 283 • Freeform. It is a free-flowing layout with both displays and aisles in different
284 sizes and shapes (this type of layout is generally used in large clothing stores);
- 285 • Grid. It is usually set in a rectangular layout of long aisles running parallel to
286 each other (this type of layout is generally used in grocery stores); and
- 287 • Racetrack. It is organised into individual semi-separate retail areas with each
288 area being built around a theme (this type of layout is generally used in large
289 department stores).

291 In conventional environments, it has been found that ‘selling floor layouts
292 are extremely important because they strongly influence in-store traffic pat-
293 terns, shopping atmosphere, shopping behavior, and operational efficiency’
294 (Lewison 1994, p. 289). The layout of an online grocery website significantly
295 affects online consumer behaviour; however, practical research has found that
296 predictions generated from the literature of conventional retailing about differ-
297 ences in the outcome of layouts do not generally hold in a virtual setting
298 (Vrechopoulos et al. 2004). This is in opposition to the proposal for designing
299 a website based on the users’ ‘mental model’ (Badre 2002). Vrechopoulos et al.
300 (2004) and Nielsen (2000a) claim that some of the research findings, such as
301 users taking what appears to be the ‘easiest’ path rather than the most logical,
302 can be explained by human–computer interaction theories that suggest users
303 prefer simple online design due to the self-service nature of the Internet.

304 Interviews conducted with major online grocery stores revealed that for one
305 store, of their 200,000 registered customers, only 100,000 had ever made a
306 purchase. Out of these customers, 30,000 had only ever placed one order (Free-
307 man 2003). Completed orders at online grocery stores have an average order
308 size of 54 items. While a user may struggle with an e-commerce website when
309 placing an order for a single item, it is unlikely that users will be willing to repeat
310 the process 54 times if it is difficult or time-consuming. Although the percentage
311 of registered customers who have made a purchase is high, Hicks (2002) claimed
312 that the registration process was the first hurdle in online ordering, with studies
313 revealing high dropout rates during the registration process. Another possible
314 explanation is that the online grocery stores are not usable, causing users to feel
315 stressed during the registration process and thus discontinue using the system.

316 Due to the repeated nature of grocery shopping, online grocery systems have
317 the potential to develop time-saving features to enable a consumer to complete
318 repeat purchases easily. Research indicates that convenience is a more impor-
319 tant factor than cost savings when users decide to purchase groceries online
320 (Bellman et al. 1999). A significant incentive to use only one vendor and shop
321 online is argued to be the persistent shopping trolley (also referred to as a cart)
322 (Bannister 2002; Consumer Union of U.S. 2000), which allows shoppers to
323 place items in their trolley, and return later to continue shopping. The ability
324 to 'recognise' customers on return visits forms the basis for users being able to
325 customise the site (Consumer Union of U.S. 2000). Product information used to
326 build the shopping trolleys commonly includes availability information for each
327 item. This information allows users to make efficient choices, rather than
328 requiring contact from grocery store staff after the order is placed (Consumer
329 Union of U.S. 2000). The trolley feature aids sales in several ways:

- 330 ● Users can see that you 'recognise' them, and that they have visited previously
331 (Bannister 2002).
- 332 ● Users can build their orders gradually before placing it (Consumer Union of
333 U.S. 2000).
- 334 ● Users can access previous purchases on a repeat visit. The first shopping
335 experience can be time-consuming because users must search for the indivi-
336 dual items, with future visits becoming more efficient as users are able to
337 choose from a list of their previous purchases (Consumer Union of U.S.
338 2000). This is a significant incentive to use only one vendor.
- 339 ● The e-business can gather customer tracking and behavioural data, used to
340 further tailor the site to increase usability (Bannister 2002).

342 Claims that grocery shopping is the most stressful form of shopping
343 (Aylott & Mitchell 1998) are based on a range of factors including the need to
344 attend a busy store and the transportation of a large quantity of items, which
345 may be difficult for some groups of the population. Online grocery shopping
346 removes these stressors, as ordering can be completed in the user's home and the
347 transportation is completed by the store. Despite these apparent benefits, only
348 about 3% of the total grocery sales in Australia occurred online in 2002
349 (Hannen 2002). It has been suggested that poor usability is creating new
350 stresses, and this may be a contributing factor to the low usage.

351 Compared to other forms of shopping, 'grocery shopping has more negative
352 associations. It is a necessity, and even though some consumers experience it as
353 relaxing, it remains something you cannot avoid, something you have to do'
354 (Geuens et al. 2003, p. 244). A list of positive and negative associations related
355 to conventional self-service grocery shopping was developed by Geuens et al.
356 (2003). Of the 15 negative associations, only 1 (the possibility of out-of-stock
357 products) is apparent when using an online grocery store. The negative factors
358 that are removed when purchasing groceries online are as follows: waiting in
359 lines; decayed products; melting products; crowds of people; elderly people;
360 annoying music; no parking spaces; badly manoeuvrable trolleys; bringing back

361 trolleys on rainy days; narrow aisles; unfriendly personnel; ignorant personnel;
362 and stress before closing hour. An online grocery system may have a different
363 set of negative connotations and/or stressors when users become familiar with
364 the technology, such as the loss of the trolley contents or issues with delivery.

365 A study conducted in the United States of America (Ahuja et al. 2003) on the
366 current use of the Internet and its future use by both students and non-students
367 presented the following figures about grocery shopping online. The population
368 was classified into students and non-students based on Phelps et al.'s (2000)
369 article, which stated that students were more likely to know how to use the
370 Internet and had less privacy concerns when working online. In 2003, 6.9% of
371 students and 6.8% of non-students were purchasing their groceries online, with
372 18.6% of students and 9.6% of non-students having future intentions to pur-
373 chase groceries online. The major reasons that they stated for purchasing
374 products online were convenience, saving time and better prices. The major
375 reasons that they did not purchase products online were privacy/security,
376 customer service, lack of interaction and high prices including high shipping
377 and handling costs. One factor identified by some of the respondents that was
378 especially relevant to the nature of groceries was an inability to touch and feel
379 the product. Online grocery stores have little control over the negative factors
380 identified in the Phelps et al. study (2000). The online stores must therefore
381 work to maximise the advantages of using online grocery shopping, with the
382 focus commonly on usability. With usability being a prime concern for online
383 stores, the field of usability testing has come into prominence. Two clear
384 usability goals have been identified when dealing with e-commerce websites: a
385 clear path to products and transparency of the ordering process (Benbunan-
386 Fich 2001).

387

388

389

390

391

391 ***7.3.2 Shopping Differences Between User Groups***

392

393 Links have been identified between user groups (as defined by their online
394 shopping experience) and their behaviour (James 2001). Most online purchases
395 are made by users who have had over 2 years of Internet experience (usually
396 considered 'advanced' or 'expert' users), and have therefore adapted to the
397 medium and the related purchasing arrangements. The typical web customer
398 is one who spends a significant amount of their time on the Internet, indicating
399 that they are an advanced user (Bellman et al. 1999, p. 32). In contrast, only
400 56% of light Internet users have attempted to make a purchase of any type
401 online (James 2001).

402

403

404

405

402 Search facilities must be flexible to be able to cater for different user groups
403 with varying levels of Internet experience, due to the behavioural differences
404 between these groups (Hölscher & Strube 2000). While novice users experienced
405 severe problems when attempting to develop successful queries, advanced users

406 did not experience such problems (Freeman 2006; Freeman et al. 2006).
407 A flexible system that provides support to all users would be likely to reduce
408 the problems experienced by less experienced users; however, it should not
409 impede the interactions of more advanced users.
410

412 **7.4 Research Method**

414
415 As previously stated, many issues affect a user's perception of an online shop-
416 ping experience. The research described in this chapter considers *usability*
417 issues. Fifty-four users selected items in an online grocery store from shopping
418 lists provided by the researcher. The selection and classification of these users
419 into groups was based on their online shopping experience. All users completed
420 their shopping tasks using the same online grocery store, in a laboratory
421 environment to ensure consistency and comparability of results. This store
422 was selected based on extensive heuristic evaluations of 14 online grocery stores
423 internationally, which deemed this store to be highly usable relative to the other
424 stores evaluated. A store with high usability was chosen to ensure that the
425 results from this research informed best practice, rather than addressing issues
426 of poor design.
427

429 **7.4.1 Usability Testing**

431
432 While there is no single definition of usability, for the purposes of this chapter,
433 the key elements in usability are ease of use, ease of learning, efficiency, visual
434 pleasure, speed and effectiveness (Bara et al. 2001; Mandel 1997; Preece 2000).
435 Preece (2000) explains that, in a practical sense, 'usability is concerned with
436 developing computer systems to support rapid learning, high skill retention,
437 and low error rates.' According to the ISO 9241-11 (1998) standard, usability is
438 the 'extent to which a product can be used by specified users to achieve specified
439 goals with effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction in a specified context of use.'
440 If a system is usable then it is believed that a user will be less stressed and their
441 reaction to using it will be more positive.

442 The term 'usability testing' refers to 'a process that employs users who
443 are representative of the target population to evaluate the degree to which
444 a product meets specific usability criteria' (Rubin 1994). Its use as a
445 research tool is based on traditional experimental methodology, and allows
446 tests to be conducted under a generic title, rather than being required to
447 specify the particular method to be used. Usability testing encompasses a
448 range of methods. Developers are able to gain greater understanding about
449 their website by conducting usability testing, and observing how users
450 interact with it. User interaction is often different to the designer's

451 envisaged flow of interaction, and usability testing is therefore an impor-
452 tant tool to employ, as it can provide valuable feedback on unplanned use
453 and areas requiring improvement.

454 Usability testing involves evaluating users' experiences of a website through
455 carefully prepared tasks. As users perform these tasks, they are observed and
456 their interactions with the system are logged. The performance of the user is
457 commonly measured by task completion time and the number of errors made
458 during each task. The usability testing process is highly controlled and is usually
459 conducted in a laboratory-style environment. This environment eliminates
460 typical distractions such as answering telephone calls, checking emails or dis-
461 cussions with colleagues. This method was used in this research to assess online
462 grocery shopping because it provides a constant environment for all users
463 conducting the evaluations. It provides constant access times due to consisten-
464 cies in Internet bandwidth.

465 Usability testing was used in this research to observe the interaction of users
466 with the chosen online grocery shopping website. On completion of the usability
467 testing, users completed a post-test questionnaire, which recorded user percep-
468 tions of the online grocery system. The method of usability testing is based on
469 scientific research (Rubin 1994), where controlled experiments are conducted
470 and the outcomes recorded. These results are then examined to identify trends
471 in the data. For this study, *Camtasia Recorder* was used to record the interac-
472 tion of the users with the online grocery system. The statistical tool SPSS was
473 used to examine the data.

474 The test comprised two stages that were 1 week apart. In the first stage,
475 users completed two shopping lists one of 10 products and one of 20 products.
476 In the second stage, users completed one shopping list of 50 products. Each
477 user was required to complete a post-test questionnaire at the conclusion of
478 each round of tests on the online grocery system. This information was used to
479 gain overall feedback of users' perceptions of ordering grocery products
480 online and to conduct a comparison of their views across the three shopping
481 lists.

482 The recommended usability testing group sample size varies amongst the
483 experts in the field, and is dependent on the type of study that is being con-
484 ducted. Qualitative testing sample size recommendations range from 5 (Nielsen
485 2000b) to 12 users (Rubin 1994). However, for the use of quantitative tests
486 Nielsen recommends testing be conducted with 20 users. The discrepancies
487 between experts indicate that there is no generally agreed size for usability
488 testing groups.

489 For this study a sample size of 54 users was chosen, consisting of three types
490 of users: beginner, intermediate and advanced users of e-commerce websites.
491 Advertisements for participants were displayed on public notice boards, and
492 participants received AU \$20 gift voucher as remuneration. Each of these
493 groups consisted of 18 users to give statistically significant results (Cochran &
494 Cox 1957, p. 24). Beginner users had never made an online purchase; however,
495 they were familiar with using the Internet. Intermediate users had purchased

‘hard-goods’ only online, such as books and CDs. Advanced users had purchased ‘soft-goods’ online, typically food and clothing items. Each user was required to complete a background/screening questionnaire to determine to which user group they belonged. This questionnaire is based on previous studies about users of websites.

7.5 Results – Usability Test Analysis

7.5.1 User Performance

The following sections present the user performance using the online grocery system based on the average time taken per product when completing the lists of products. The short test consisted of 10 products, each with a quantity of 1. The medium test consisted of 20 products, with some products having multiple quantities (30 items in total). The long test consisted of 50 products, with some products having multiple quantities (75 items in total). The descriptive statistics for the average time per product for the three tests are shown in Table 7.1.

In the three tests, the mean for the advanced users was lower than the mean for the intermediate users, and the mean for the intermediate users was lower than the mean for the beginner users, i.e. the differences in the means were in the direction expected.

An analysis of variance was also conducted across the three tests looking for changes in the average time users spent locating products. The results of the ANOVA between subject effects of the tests and participants were $F(53,106) = 8.364$, $p < 0.001$, which indicates that there is a statistical significance of the difference at the 5% significance level.

The results for the Scheffe comparison (see Table 7.2) indicate that there is a statistical significance at the 5% level between the short and medium tests (p value of 0.000) and the short and long tests (p value of 0.000). However, there is no statistical significance between medium and long tests. This result indicates that the users learnt how to use the online grocery system very quickly, with a 26% decrease in average time per product between the short and the medium tests. No difference between the medium and the long test could be

Table 7.1 Descriptive statistics – average time per product

	All users		Advanced		Intermediate		Beginner	
	Mean	Std. dev	Mean	Std. dev	Mean	Std. dev	Mean	Std. dev
Short test	44.6s	19.57s	33.3s	17.50s	44.1s	16.02s	56.5s	18.58s
Medium test	33.0s	10.75s	26.7s	11.33s	32.0s	6.94s	40.2s	9.30s
Long test	32.9s	10.61s	26.5s	9.37s	30.5s	6.92s	41.8s	9.10s

Table 7.2 Scheffe comparison of between tests for all users – average time per product

Short (I), Medium (J)		Short (I), Long (J)		Medium (I), Long (J)	
Difference (I–J)	p value	Difference (I–J)	p value	Difference (I–J)	p value
11.6630	.000	12.0044	.000	.3415	.974

attributed to the week delay between the medium and the long tests, or fatigue associated with the longer product list.

As stated previously in this chapter, one of the key elements of usability is that a system is easy to learn (Mandel 1997; Preece 2000). This element is especially important for systems such as an online grocery system, because they are self-service and require a great deal of interaction from users. One method of assessing whether a system is easy to learn is to evaluate how long a task takes at different points in time. A benchmark for the analysis of time spent purchasing grocery products was in Polegato and Zaichkowsky (1994), which discussed the purchase of products at conventional self-service grocery stores. This study by Polegato and Zaichkowsky (1994) revealed that an average grocery shopping trip for females was about 60 minutes, while for males it was about 51 minutes. The average time travelling to and from the grocery store was approximately 30 minutes. In this study, the average time for the long test-ordering process was approximately 27 minutes, which is below the times stated in Polegato and Zaichkowsky's study.

7.6 Results – Post-Test Questionnaire Analysis

Although the time taken to add products to the online grocery system trolley suggests that using an online grocery system for grocery shopping is quicker than going to a grocery store, additional information was gathered on the users' perceptions of the system. Each user completed three post-test questionnaires, one after each of the tests. Analysis is based on the two constructs from the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis 1989): perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) uses six questions with Likert scale responses (1 – strongly disagree, 7 – strongly agree). The results from these questions are averaged to give the overall rating on the perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use.

The results showed that beginner and intermediate users believed that the online grocery system was more useful than did advanced users during the short and medium tests. This outcome may be explained by Nielsen and Levy's (1994) statement that experienced users rate their satisfaction of systems lower than users with little or no experience. However, for the long test, which closely represents a typical visit to an online grocery system with over 50 items, the perceived ease of use was higher for intermediate and advanced users, who

Table 7.3 Means for perceived usability for the three tests

	Short test	Medium test	Long test
Advanced users	5.21	5.51	5.38
Intermediate users	5.25	5.54	5.15
Beginner users	5.68	5.57	5.62
Total	5.38	5.54	5.20

would have had more experience. Beginners appeared to struggle with the longer list of items based on their lower average ease of use score. Table 7.3 shows the means for the perceived usability of the three tests for each user group, with Table 7.4 showing the means for perceived ease of use.

Fifty-seven different studies were compared by Nielsen and Levy (1994). These 57 studies involved a comparison of two or more systems, with 40 of the studies measuring subjective performance. Nielsen and Levy's meta-analysis of these studies has allowed benchmarks to be created on subjective preferences for systems. The results from Nielsen and Levy's study are comparable with the results from this study, as the methods that were used seem to be compatible. Nielsen and Levy's comparison normalised the studies with differences. The users Nielsen and Levy reported on were from a broad range of backgrounds (beginner through to advanced). The study reported that the subjective preference mean (at a 95% confidence interval) for a 7-point Likert scale was 4.82 ± 0.19 . However, Nielsen and Levy stated that this is not suitable as a benchmark for two reasons: it has been affected by both systems that the users liked and disliked; and the median of system satisfaction was higher than the numeric middle as users tend to be polite and give fairly high ratings unless they dislike a system greatly. Upon further study, Nielsen and Levy recommended a benchmark of 5.6 for the mean and median for a good quality system, based on the systems that were preferred by the users in the studies evaluated.

Overall, across the three tests in this research the mean for perceived usability was 5.37 ± 0.17 . This result is slightly lower than the benchmark for a good quality system. For the perceived ease of use, the mean was 5.63 ± 0.14 . This result shows that users considered the ease of use of the system to be high. Some of these results are also confirmed by the open-ended responses given by users.

Table 7.4 Means for perceived ease of use for the three tests

	Short test	Medium test	Long test
Advanced users	5.58	5.60	5.62
Intermediate users	5.58	5.88	5.73
Beginner users	5.70	5.80	5.30
Total	5.59	5.76	5.55

7.6.1 *User Responses to the Open-Ended Question*

The open-ended question asked users if they had any comments on the online shopping experience. Many users took this opportunity to state some of the issues that they had whilst shopping using the online grocery system. Some users also provided personal comments about their own shopping habits.

7.6.1.1 Short Test

There were numerous comments made by users in the open-ended section of the post-test questionnaire for the short test. The total number of participants that provided a response, number of comments of a positive nature and number of comments of a negative nature are shown below in Table 7.5 for each participant group.

The positive comments that were made by users after the short test referred to the way that users felt that this process was quicker than purchasing groceries via conventional self-service means. They also felt that searching was easy and that with products being categorised by product type, the lists were easy to navigate. The negative feedback that was given was mainly about the difficulties that users had when attempting to find items using the in-built search function or adding the item to the trolley.

In total, 29 responses (43.9%) of a positive nature and 37 responses (56.1%) of a negative nature were recorded for the short test. Users were impressed with the speed of locating products, and the convenience of the online grocery store overall. The most problematic issue with the online grocery store was adding an item to the trolley. Many of the negative comments from all types of users were due to users' misunderstanding of the online grocery store, indicating that the system should be simplified to address the needs of all users. While there were more negative comments than positive comments, overall the comments were neutral.

7.6.1.2 Medium Test

The total number of participants that provided a response in the medium test post-test questionnaire, number of comments of a positive nature and number of comments of a negative nature are shown below in Table 7.6 for each participant group.

Table 7.5 Participant responses to the short test

	Total responses	Positive comments	Negative comments
Advanced users	15	9	15
Intermediate users	15	12	10
Beginner users	14	8	12
Total	44	29	37

Table 7.6 Participant responses to the medium test

	Total responses	Positive comments	Negative comments
Advanced users	11	4	14
Intermediate users	14	7	10
Beginner users	13	6	10
Total	38	17	34

The positive comments that were made by users during the medium test referred to the way that users interacted with the online grocery store. A number of the comments referred to the fact that users felt it was quicker interacting with the online store the second time and now believed that it was definitely faster than visiting a conventional self-service grocery store. The negative feedback given was similar to that from the short test outlining difficulties using the search feature.

In total, there were 17 responses (33.3%) of a positive nature and 34 responses (66.7%) of a negative nature for the medium test. Users in all categories stated that using the online grocery store was faster and easier than conventional self-service grocery shopping, with some attributing this to their previous experience in the short test. Again, the majority of the negative comments were related to issues with adding products to the trolley. This was a major concern for users. The other issue repeatedly identified in the negative comments was the need for a spelling check facility or a facility to prompt likely product alternatives. The positive comments were widely supportive of the online grocery store, with the negative comments identifying small issues that could be rectified by the online grocery store owner.

7.6.1.3 Long Test

The total number of participants that provided a response in the long test post-test questionnaire, number of comments of a positive nature and number of comments of a negative nature are shown below in Table 7.7 for each participant group.

The positive comments that were made by users during the long test referred to the way that users interacted with the online grocery store compared to a conventional self-service grocery store. One user stated that 'I went shopping yesterday. It took over an hour. This is a lot quicker.' Others felt that the

Table 7.7 Participant responses to the long test

	Total responses	Positive comments	Negative comments
Advanced users	13	6	11
Intermediate users	13	5	14
Beginner users	11	5	8
Total	37	16	33

721 process became easier after using the system a number of times. The negative
 722 feedback given was similar to that from the short and medium tests outlining
 723 difficulties using the search feature. Users stated that a spell-checking facility
 724 was essential for a system such as this.

725 In total, 16 responses (32.7%) of a positive nature and 33 responses (67.3%)
 726 of a negative nature were recorded for the long test. Positive comments identi-
 727 fied that using an online grocery store was faster than conventional self-service
 728 grocery shopping, required information (e.g. prices) could be easily identified,
 729 the system could be ‘learnt’, and the search box was easy to use. Negative
 730 comments for the long test repeated the comments in previous tests about issues
 731 associated with adding a product to the trolley, and the need for a spelling-
 732 check feature. Users also became more discerning about the naming and display
 733 of product information. As for the medium test, while there were more negative
 734 comments than positive comments, the negative comments identified issues that
 735 could be resolved by the online grocery store owners. The positive comments
 736 were of a more general nature, and included the following statement: ‘The
 737 process became easy after some practice.’

739 **7.6.1.4 Overall Feedback**

740 Overall there were several comments that were made by a number of users in the
 741 different user groups across the three tests. These comments included

- 743 ● The search facility has no error correction
- 744 ● The users did not know if a product was not on the shelf or if they had
 745 searched using incorrect terms. Previous research (Raymond 2001) found
 746 that an inability to find products was one major reason customers do not
 747 return to an online store
- 748 ● Problems with the shopping trolley, including no display of number of items
 749 added, total cost or a receipt
- 750 ● Problems with truncations and plurals (This comment is referring to the
 751 system’s inability to process truncated terms (e.g. ‘bisc’ does not return
 752 results for biscuit) and its inability to effectively deal with plurals (e.g.
 753 ‘apples’ does not find results containing the word ‘apple’). These issues
 754 were compounded by the inconsistency of item names in the system.)

755 Some of the comments that were made by beginner users were actually
 756 incorrect. These comments included

- 758 ● It would be difficult to use this system to find uncommon brands
 - 759 – The search facility provides users the ability to search for all products via
 760 the same mechanism. The linking is the same as conventional self-service
 761 aisles in a grocery store. Therefore, it should be no more difficult to find
 762 an uncommon brand compared to a common one
- 763 ● Quantity has to be changed from zero before adding a product
 - 764 – When the check box is clicked, the quantity automatically changes to one
 765

766 The overall negative comments presented above all identify serious concerns
767 for the users. Addressing these concerns should be of high priority to online
768 grocery systems because users in all user groups identified them, suggesting that
769 experience using an online grocery system would not overcome these problems.
770 The negative comments mainly identified specific problems, and were largely
771 relating to issues associated with adding a product to the trolley. Many of these
772 identified problems could be overcome with a relatively small investment from
773 the online grocery system owner. The positive comments were of a more general
774 nature, with users describing the system as 'quick' and 'easy to use'. On the basis
775 of the content of the comments, it could be stated that the post-test question-
776 naire responses were of an overall neutral or slightly positive nature.
777

780 **7.6.2 Stressors**

781
782 Online grocery system usage styles and attitudes varied, with some testers
783 preferring shopping for groceries online compared with conventional self-ser-
784 vice means. This was shown with a number of users stating that online grocery
785 shopping was faster and that they were going to recommend it to family and
786 friends. However, there was no correlation to suggest that age, gender or
787 experience impacted upon how users felt about using the systems. This result
788 was different to previous studies, which stated that experience and age are the
789 influencing factors when using such systems.

790 Table 7.8 shows the issues and stressors when a customer interacts with both
791 conventional self-service and online grocery shopping environments. The
792 results were obtained from users' feedback in the post-test questionnaire and
793 from previous research (Ahuja et al. 2003; Geuens et al. 2003).

794 An online grocery store can potentially reduce the stress of grocery shopping
795 as customers can purchase the products from anywhere which is convenient to
796 them at any time. The products are delivered to an address the customer gives
797 the grocery company during a specified time frame. A customer does not have
798 to deal with crowds or trolleys that are difficult to manoeuvre as manual
799 processes are handled by the supermarket staff in an online environment.

800 However, there are a number of new stressors that a customer could
801 possibly be faced with when purchasing their groceries through an online
802 grocery store. Privacy and security concerns with the website can be mini-
803 mised by using a recognised company. Issues with the navigation of the system
804 can be reduced through the development of thoughtfully designed websites by
805 the store. While there is no conventional self-service customer service if the
806 customer has an issue with using the site, help pages are generally available.
807 A customer does not have the ability to touch or feel the product, which is
808 traditionally important when selecting fruit and vegetables, requiring the
809 customer to trust the store in providing good quality products. The customers
810

Table 7.8 Issues and stressors of grocery shopping

Conventional self-service grocery store issues only	Online grocery store issues only
Need to attend a busy store	Privacy/security concerns
The transport of a large quantity of items	Difficulty in finding products
Waiting in lines	Issues with the building search mechanism
Decayed products	Customer service
Melting products	Lack of interaction
Crowds of people	High prices including high shipping and handling costs
Elderly people	Inability to touch and feel the product
Annoying music	Loss of the trolley contents
No parking spaces	Issues with delivery
Badly manoeuvrable trolleys	Issues with the companies website
Bringing back trolleys on rainy days	Issues with the consumers Internet connection
Narrow aisles	
Unfriendly personnel	
Ignorant personnel	
Stress before closing hour	
Conventional self-service grocery store and online grocery store issues (shared)	
The possibility of out-of-stock products	

could also have issues with the website or with their Internet connection, which may cause frustration and stress.

One issue that is common to both conventional self-service and online grocery stores that can potentially cause stress to a customer is out-of-stock products.

7.7 Conclusion

The results from this study into users' interactions with online grocery systems have many benefits for designers of ISSTs. Users learnt how to use the online grocery system quickly, with a 26% decrease in average time per product between the short and the medium tests. The time difference per product between the medium and the long tests was negligible. This could have been due to the week delay between testing and/or fatigue associated with the longer product list. Results show that the interface of an online grocery system can be learned within a short period of time and all users can perform the majority of tasks for which the system is designed. Overall the experiences of users with this type of system were positive. Users described the system as 'quick', 'easy to use' and 'will recommend this to others'. These insights have shown that the use of online grocery systems can reduce some of the stressors associated with grocery shopping. Realistic solutions an online store can implement to reduce potential

856 stressors for customers include: a smart search facility with in-built spell-
857 checker; an intuitive shopping trolley system; clear presentation of product
858 information and stock levels; and access to more detailed information on the
859 current order. However, it is essential that online stores remember that the
860 usability of the online interaction is only one element of a user's experience with
861 online grocery shopping.

862 The statistics for adoption of online purchasing show increasing levels of use,
863 and this growing demand is also being experienced in the grocery industry.
864 Many studies have shown that one way to increase the number of households
865 using such services is to offer a more usable and efficient service to the users.
866 The results from the user testing phase of this research could be used by
867 companies to set initial benchmarks for their online grocery systems, as the
868 only benchmarks available to date relate to conventional self-service grocery
869 stores. However, the benchmarks developed in this study are by no means
870 comprehensive. Further analysis of other online grocery systems via usability
871 testing with online grocery system users would be needed to provide a repre-
872 sentative analysis for comprehensive online grocery system benchmarks.

873 An important area of further research is the impact of experience on issues
874 such as usability for online grocery systems, and whether it is possible to make
875 use of such systems intuitively. 'Bricks and mortar' grocery stores allow shop-
876 pers the ability to locate staff when help is required; however, no such support is
877 available in an online environment with these systems. Such research would
878 require greater rigour in the user selection process, with extensive knowledge of
879 user experience gathered prior to tester selection. This study only asked users
880 whether they had purchased any product or service online and if they had
881 purchased any goods from an online grocery system.

882 Ensuring that online ordering systems follow usability guidelines will allow
883 users to develop greater understanding and confidence in purchasing online,
884 and provide benefits to both users and online sites. If websites adopt usability
885 guidelines, shoppers are likely to be more willing to shop online, providing
886 benefits to both users and website owners.

887 This chapter identified several issues that affected users in all experience
888 categories. Addressing these concerns should be of high priority to online
889 grocery systems because users in all user groups identified them, suggesting
890 that experience using an online grocery system would not overcome these
891 problems. These included numerous difficulties with the search facility and
892 the shopping trolley, and a lack of information about product availability.
893 Users believed these issues had an impact on their experience using the online
894 grocery system, and thus had negative associations leading to stressful situa-
895 tions. In this self-service environment, where virtually no support from the
896 online grocery store is available, these key elements of an online grocery store
897 must function effectively for the store to be successful. Many of the identified
898 problems could be overcome with a relatively small investment from the online
899 grocery system owner.
900

901 This chapter has presented a case study of a self-service online grocery
902 system. It has been shown that users of such systems experience some issues
903 when interacting with the systems. Although most of the traditional stressors of
904 self-service for groceries are removed when transferred online, new stressors are
905 created that need to be managed.

906

907

908 References

909

- 910 ABS (2003–04) 6530.0 Household Expenditure Survey, Australia: Summary of results
911 (Reissue), Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra
- 912 Ahuja M, Gupta B, Raman P (2003) An Empirical Investigation of Online Consumer
913 Purchasing Behavior. *Commun ACM* 46(12):145–151
- 914 Aylott R, Mitchell VW (1998) An Exploratory Study of Grocery Shopping Stressors. *Int J*
915 *Retail Distrib Manag* 26(9):362–373
- 916 Badre A (2002) *Shaping Web Usability: Interaction Design in Context*. Addison-Wesley,
917 Boston, MA
- 918 Bannister P (2002) The Best Ten Practices of Online Retailing. http://ecommerce.internet.com/news/insights/trends/article/0,3371,10417_979861,00.html. Accessed 12 December
919 2005
- 920 Bara J, Dorazio P, Trenner L (2001) *The Usability Business Making the Web Work*. Springer,
921 London
- 922 Bellman S, Lohse GL, Johnson EJ (1999) Predictors of Online Buying Behavior. *Commun*
923 *ACM* 42(12):32–38
- 924 Benbunan-Fich R (2001) Using Protocol Analysis to Evaluate the Usability of a Commercial
925 Web Site. *Inf Manag* 39(2):151–163
- 926 Cochran WG, Cox GM (1957) *Experimental Designs*. Wiley, New York
- 927 Coles Myer Ltd (2005) Annual Report 2005: Maintaining Momentum. http://www.colesmyer.com/library/Investors/FinancialReports/2005/annual_report_2005.pdf.
928 Accessed 17 August 2006
- 929 Consumer Union of U.S. (2000) Food Fight. <http://www.consumerreports.org/cro/index.htm>. Accessed 2 May 2003
- 930 Davis FD (1989) Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of
931 Information Technology. *MISQ* 13(3):318–340
- 932 Freeman M (2003) The Current State of Online Supermarket Usability in Australia. Paper
933 presented at the 14th Australian Conference on Information Systems (ACIS), Perth,
934 Australia, 26–28 November
- 935 Freeman M (2006) Perceptions of the ordering process of online grocery stores. Paper
936 presented at the IR 7.0 Conference: Internet Convergences, Brisbane, Australia, 27–30
937 September
- 938 Freeman M, Hyland P, Soar J (2003) Usability of Supermarkets in Australia. Paper presented
939 at the 4th Annual Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Computer-Human
940 Interaction New Zealand Chapter, Otago, New Zealand, 3–4 July
- 941 Freeman M, Norris A, Hyland P (2006) Usability of online grocery systems: a focus on errors.
942 Paper presented at the OZCHI 2006 Conference: design: activities, artefacts and environ-
943 ments, Sydney, Australia, 20–24 November
- 944 Geuens M, Brengman M, S'Jegers R (2003) Food Retailing, now and in the Future.
945 A Consumer Perspective. *J Retailing Consum Serv* 10(4):241–251
- 946 Goldstein A (2002) Online Shopping Settles into Sensible Routine. *E-Commerce Times*
- 947 Hannen M (2002) Shopping That Clicks. *Bus Rev Wkly* 24(4):66–67
- 948 Harlam B, Lodish L (1995) Modeling Consumers' choices of Multiple Items. *J Mark Res*
949 32(4):404–419

- 946 Heikkila J, Kallio J, Saarinen T at al. (1998) Analysis of Expectations on Electronic Grocery
947 Shopping for Potential Customer Segments. *Aust J Inf Syst* 6:56–69
- 948 Hicks M (2002) Plug in to Consumers - Usability Testing, Tools Help Prevent Site Flaws,
949 Reveal Secrets to Web Success *eWeek* 19(4):45
- 949 Hölscher C, Strube G (2000) Web Search behavior of Internet experts and newbies. Paper
950 presented at the WWW9 – Computer Networks Conference, Amsterdam, 15–19 May
- 951 Hong W, Thong J, Tam K (2004) Design product listing pages on e-commerce websites: an
952 examination of presentation mode and information format. *Int J Hum-Comput Stud*
953 61:481–503
- 954 ISO 9241-11 (1998) Ergonomic Requirements for Office Work with Visual Display Terminals
(VDTs) – Part II: Guidance on Usability, International Organization for Standardization
- 955 James M (2001) Site Usability Key to Converting Casual Users into e-Shoppers. *New Media*
956 *Age* 17:7
- 957 Kempiaik M, Fox MA (2002) Online Grocery Shopping: Consumer Motives, Concerns, and
958 Business Models. *First Monday* 7(9)
- AQ1 958 Lewison DM (1994) *Retailing*, 5th edn. Macmillan College Publishing Company, New York
- 959 Lohse GL, Spiller P (1998) Quantifying the Effect of User Interface Design Features on
960 Cyperstore Traffic and Sales. Paper presented at the CHI'98 Conference on Human
961 Factors in Computing Systems, Los Angeles, California, USA, 18–23 April
- 962 Mandel T (1997) *The Elements of User Interface Design*. John Wiley and Sons, New York
- 963 McGovern G (2001) Information Architecture Versus Graphic Design. http://www.clickz.com/design/site_design/article.php/945631. Accessed 2 December 2005
- 964 MyWebGrocer (2001) Online Grocery Shopping: Learnings From The Practitioners. www.fmi.org/e_business/webgrocer.html. Accessed 26 March 2004
- 965 Nielsen J (2000a), *Designing Web Usability*. New Riders, Indianapolis
- 966 Nielsen J (2000b) Test With 5 Users, Alertbox, March 19. <http://www.useit.com/alertbox/20000319.html>. Accessed 21 February 2005
- 967 Nielsen J (2001) Search: Visible and Simple (Alertbox). <http://www.useit.com/alertbox/20010513.html>. Accessed 31 May 2006
- 968 Nielsen J, Levy J (1994) Measuring Usability Preferences vs. Performance. *Commun ACM*
969 37(4):66–76
- 970 OI WY (2004) The Supermarket: An Institutional Innovation. *Aust Econ Rev* 37(3):337–342
- 972 Phelps J, Nowak G, Ferrell E (2000) Privacy concerns and consumer willingness to provide
973 personal information. *J Public Policy and Mark* 19(1):27–41
- 974 Polegato R, Zaichkowsky J (1994) Family Food Shopping: Strategies Used by Husbands and
975 Wives. *J Consum Aff* 28(2):278–299
- 976 Preece J (2000) *Online Communities: Designing Usability, Supporting Sociability*. Wiley,
977 Chichester
- 978 Pritchard WN (2000) Beyond the Modern Supermarket: Geographical Approaches to the
979 Analysis of Contemporary Australian Retail Restructuring. *Aust Geogr Stud*
980 38(3):204–218
- 980 Raijas A (2002) The consumer benefits and problems in the electronic grocery store. *J Consum*
981 *Serv* 9(2):107–113
- 982 Raymond J (2001) Databasics: No More Shoppus Interruptus. *Am Demogr* 23(5):39–40
- 983 Rubin J (1994) *Handbook of Usability Testing: how to plan, design and conduct effective tests*
984 . Wiley, New York
- 984 Tilson R, Dong J, Martin S et al. (1998) A Comparison of Two Current E-Commerce Sites.
985 Proceedings of the 16th Annual International Conference on Computer Documentation,
986 Quebec, Canada, 24–26 September
- 987 Vrechopoulos AP, O'Keefe RM, Doukidis GI et al. (2004) Virtual Store Layout: As Experimental
988 Comparison in the Context of Grocery Retail. *J Retailing* 80(1):13–22
- 988 Yen H, Gwinner K (2003) Internet retail customer loyalty: the mediating role of relational
989 benefits. *Int J Serv Ind Manag* 14(5):483–500
- 990