Information Classification on University Websites: A Cross-Country Card Sort Study

Ather Nawaz[1], Torkil Clemmensen[2] and Morten Hertzum[3]

[1, 2] Department of Informatics, Copenhagen Business School, Howitzvej 60, DK-2000, Copenhagen, Denmark
[3] Computer Science, Roskilde University, DK-4000, Roskilde, Denmark

[1] an.inf@cbs.dk, [2] tc.inf@cbs.dk, [3] mhz@ruc.dk

Abstract. Websites are increasingly used as a medium for providing information to university students. The quality of a university website depends on how well the students' information classification fits with the structure of the information on the website. This paper investigates the information classification of 14 Danish and 14 Pakistani students and compares it with the information classification of their university website. Brainstorming, card sorting and task exploration activities were used to discover similarities and differences in the participating students' classification of website information and their ability to navigate the websites. The results of the study indicated group differences in user classification and related task performances differences. The main implications of the study were that (a) the edit distance appears a useful measure in cross-country HCI research and practice and (b) the comparative approach of thematic and taxonomic analysis can be used to understand classification and website structure.

Keywords: website structure, information architecture, classification, categorization, card sorting,

1 Introduction

It is often a challenge to retrieve information from large complex websites such as university websites. The challenge may, however, not be the same in different countries. A key issue in good website design is the classification of the information on the website [1-3]. If the website information is classified in a manner that fits well with the user's perception of the topics, then information retrieval on the website is efficient, and may even be experienced as satisfying [4, 5]. Most of the cross-cultural studies of websites have focused on the usability, language biases, and structure of Asian and Western websites. Little work appears to have been done investigating the structure of the websites in communities that have recently joined the global Internet community [6]. In this study we compare two websites – a Danish university website and a Pakistani university website – to investigate differences in their structure, and whether these differences match the way in which the local users of the websites classify information.

In the existing website studies, the content holders are usually seen as the ones who determine how the information is structured [7]. It is, however, well-known that designers' decisions about the structure of a system may not match how users think about the system [8]. This problem intensifies in cross-cultural settings where designers with one cultural background make websites for users with another cultural background. Two ways of improving our understanding of the interrelation between cultural background and website structure are to (a) compare across countries the structure of websites developed locally and used locally and (b) study how well the structure of such websites matches the way in which the target users classify the information that is accessible on the website. In this study we do both, by having Danish and Pakistani university students make card sorts of the information on their respective university websites and find information on the websites. We chose university websites as our object of study because university websites in different countries must provide support for a similar set of activities (e.g., information about available study programmes, about class schedules for current courses, and about access to resources such a libraries). We chose Danish and Pakistani university websites for this study because there are sizeable cultural differences between these two countries and because website structure and use in Pakistan has not received much research attention.

Previous studies of websites and cultural background have suggested that culture is visible in websites through so-called cultural markers [9, 10]. These studies find that users' cultural background has an impact on their understanding and perception of the website. Our study adds to the existing knowledge about the structure of websites by showing how the two university websites differ in their information structure, in spite of similarities in the activities they support. The paper is organized as follows: In the next section we describe literature relevant to the classification of information, particularly website information. Then, we explain the method of our empirical work, which comprises brainstorming, card sorting, and information-retrieval tasks, and we present our results. Finally, we discuss implications of the results and possible extensions of this study.

2 Relevant Literature

2.1 Information Classification

In website design, the classification explains how the information is distributed across different hierarchical levels of website pages and what labelling is used to group information on a webpage. Websites use different classification and navigation structures such as network, linear, global, local, contextual, and embedded [11, 12]. Barber and Badre [9] identified the localized elements of an interface and termed them *cultural markers*, which are specific to a given culture. But *cultural markers* emphasize only the interface elements that are preferred within a particular cultural group and do not talk about the information classified on the website. Different countries may display profound differences in the structure of website information. Isa et al. [10] explored the relationship between culture and website structure. The

study found that users have their own understanding of the structure of the information on a website, and that this understanding differs systematically across groups of users [10].

Information classification is understood as the placement of information at different levels of a website and it affects the findability of the information. Allen [13] investigated the effect of information depth on the response time and error rate at each hierarchical level of a website. The study found that response times became longer for searches deeper into the website. The study participants made more errors when the information to be retrieved were at deeper levels [13]. Rau et al. [14] compared the knowledge representation of students in US, mainland China and Taiwan on four websites. For participants from Taiwan and mainland China, the study showed advantages of a thematic structure with respect to error rate on information-retrieval tasks [14]. Kralisch and Yeo [15] investigated the impact of culture, language and medical knowledge on users' information categorization. The study suggests that culture influences the users' preferences in information categorization, their attitudes, and their behaviour, whereas language predominantly affects the users' beliefs about ease of use and usefulness. All these studies consider the users' cultural background as an important factor in conceptualising the information structure of websites but mainly emphasize the user interface and language use on websites.

2.2 Mental Model and Classification of website

The classification of information is important to human-computer interaction (HCI), information science, the psychology of interaction, and cognitive anthropology. A mental model is a cognitive structure of concepts and procedures that users apply when selecting the relevant goals, choosing and executing appropriate actions, and understanding what happens when they interact with a computer system [16]. The concepts of classification and categorization are interchangeably used in the literature of information management, HCI and Information Systems. A classification is a clustering of information that shares a common property [3, 17]. It is a set of metaphorical boxes which contain the information that has common themes [3]. In addition to information classification and navigation on the websites, culture is an important aspect of website structure. In this study we explain culture as information classification tendencies shared by a particular group of people with same nationality, and we describe their mental model using card sorting.

2.3 Thematic and taxonomic classification

The information classification of a website may be different for different participants. Most importantly, each participant can classify the items in a thematic or taxonomic structure.

A thematic classification classifies items into groups according themes, each of which includes all the elements that relate to the category name of all grouped items in that category. The items in a thematic classification are related to each other through a coherent story or situation. The items in a thematic structure are related to

each other on the lower level [14]. In a thematic classification of banana, monkey and panda, the two items banana and monkey go together. Banana and monkey provide a thematic classification based on eating habits and a coherent story of the situation that monkey eats banana.

A taxonomic structure classifies items into groups according to the function or inferences drawn from the items in the group [14]. The study of Rau et.al (2004) used the notion of 'functional' to explain taxonomic classification. The items are related to each other through higher level abstraction, the group name of the categories.

a) Thematic b) Taxonomic



Fig. 1. Classification structure of Thematic and Taxonomic categorization

In a taxonomic classification, panda and monkey are grouped together because they are similar at a higher level of abstraction. The higher level abstraction is the common property of panda and monkey that they are both *mammals*. Smiley and Brown (1979) examined the conceptual preference of people and found that young and old individuals preferred thematic classification while school age and college adults preferred taxonomic classification [18]. Rau and Choong (2004) explained classification from an example that cleaning liquids such as *dishwash liquid, bathtub cleaner, toilet bowl cleaner* and *detergent* are usually grouped together as cleaning products in supermarkets, because of their cleaning function. These cleaning liquids are not grouped together according to their relations. *Dishwash* liquid is grouped with other kitchen items according to their relation with other kitchen items [14].

Fig. 1 presents a more complex example that is closer to a website structure. *Fig. 1(a)* is a taxonomic classification with seven groups. The items in each group of the taxonomic classification are related to each other through higher levels of abstraction. It also explains that classified items in a group inherit properties from the group name. *Fig. 1(b)* is a thematic classification of items into three groups. The items in each group of the thematic classification are related to each other and can be explained without the group names *'football'*, *'cricket'* and *'swimming'*. The classified items in the thematic classification have a coherent story of the situation for each group.

3 Method

To investigate the match between the structure of university websites and their users' classification of the information accessible on the websites, we performed a card-sorting study with students from two universities. A cross-case analysis [19] was performed of the two university websites. The study was conducted in the usability laboratory at the University of Management and Technology (UMT) in Lahore, Pakistan, and the usability laboratory at Copenhagen Business School (CBS) in Copenhagen, Denmark.

3.1 Card sorting

Card sorting is a technique aligned with Kelly's personal construct theory [20]. It assumes that people make sense of the world through classification and that people can describe their own classification of the world with reasonable validity and reliability [20, 21]. Card sorting provides insight into how users classify information and, thereby, how they construe their world, illuminating the otherwise often tacit ways in which they group, sort, and label information and objects [21-23]. The general idea of card sorting is to ask participants in interviews or workshops to sort labelled paper cards into piles. The analyst then compares the different participants' sorting of the cards. Card sorting has been used in multiple studies of knowledge organization and information classification. For example, Chen and Occena [24] used card sorting to investigate domain experts' ways of organizing their knowledge, Martine and Rugg [25] measured the perceived similarity of webpages using card sorting, and McLaughlin and Mandin [26] used card sorting to assess the clinical curriculum and medical students' knowledge organization.

3.2 Participants

A total of 14 Danish university students at CBS and 14 Pakistani university students at UMT participated in the study. Nielsen [27] reports that for practical purposes approximately 15 users are enough to reach a correlation of 0.90 in a card sort but recommends twice as many for a big project.

To recruit participants, a message was posted on a Facebook page of the university. The message contained a link to a document that explained the purpose of the study, the criteria for participation, and the activities and duration of the experiment. The message and document were posted in English and in the local language (Danish in Denmark and Urdu in Pakistan). In Denmark, we also applied snowball sampling by asking each recruited participant to point out a possible future participant among their acquaintances. We required that all participants should be 20-35 years of age, hold citizenship in the country, be residents of the country, have been born and raised in their country, have attended primary school in the country, and have lived in their country for most of their lives but they may have been abroad for part of their later education. We aimed for an equal number of male and female participants. All participants should have at least 5 years of experience using computers and the

Internet. We excluded participants with experience as software or hardware developers – including analysts, designers, programmers, and testers.

Table 1. Participants' demographics

N = 28	Danish	Pakistani
Years of age (M ± SD)	22.6 ± 1.3	21.3 ± 3.3
Number of study years (M ± SD)	16.07 ± 0.9	15.0 ± 1.7
University-website use in minutes/week (M ± SD)	108.2 ± 131.6	12.2 ± 11.1
Male (%)	50	50
Female (%)	50	50

Table 1 shows demographic information about the participants. There was no age difference between Danish and Pakistani participants, $t(26) = 1.34$, $p = 0.2$, but a significant difference in number of years of study, $t(26) = 2.07$, $p < 0.05$. There was also a significant difference in weekly use of the university website, $t(26) = 2.7$, $p < 0.05$. The Pakistani participants explained in interviews that they mainly used other sources for information about their university. We attained a balanced gender distribution in both groups.

3.3 Procedure

All the sessions were conducted individually. The participants were welcomed in the usability lab and signed an informed consent form. Then, the test leader introduced the participants to card sorting, and asked them to fill in a questionnaire with questions about their, age, study years, internet use, and time spent on the university website during the last week. The experimental part of the sessions comprised three activities, to be described below: brainstorming, card sorting, and information-retrieval tasks. Each participant received a gift voucher of 200 DKK.

Brainstorming. Once the participants had filled in the questionnaire, they were provided with a set of,*5* x *5 cm* blank index cards in two colours. Participants were asked to indicate elements of website content on cards of one colour and names of groups of website content on cards of the other colour. And, participants were asked to sort their element cards into the groups defined by their group cards in such a way as to create a site map for a university website. The participants were told that they did not have to make a grouping similar to that of their own university website. As recommended in previous studies, participants were requested to justify the created website structure orally [28, 29]. The intension of this brainstorming activity was to elicit the participants' understanding of what information to include on a university website and how to structure it. Participants were provided 15 minutes for this brainstorming activity.

Card sort. For the card sort, the participants were provided with 50 index cards. They were also provided with six category names, each representing a page on their

local university website (CBS[1,2] and UMT[3]). The Danish and Pakistani participants received separate sets of cards. The selection of web pages for the cards was done by two researchers [29]. Both sets of 50 cards were in English because both university websites were in English. We used a semi-closed card sort, in which participants begin with predefined cards and groups but are allowed to rename groups, add new groups, and remove groups [30, 31]. The participants were asked to sort the cards into groups that constituted what they would consider a natural classification of the website content. Participants were provided 15 minutes for this activity. Fig. 2 shows brainstorming and the card sorting materials.



Fig.2. Part of the brainstorming and card-sorting data

Information-retrieval tasks. The participants were asked to solve five information-retrieval tasks on the website of their local university. The tasks involved the participants' routine information retrieval from the website. As an example, one of the tasks was: *Please find the contact information of the person/secretary who can provide you further information about Hostels. Please notify the instructor when you finish.* Due to the differences between the Danish and Pakistani websites, Danish and Pakistani participants received tasks that were pair-wise similar, but not identical. Participants were provided three minutes for each task.

The university websites of CBS and UMT (Fig. 3) that were used as material for the study were selected because we had full access to these sites and because they were considered representative for the class of university websites in the respective regions.

3.4 Data analysis

The *brainstorming* data were analyzed by characterizing the type of classification that was present in the categories and subcategories created by the participants. Three independent coders (i.e., the authors) analyzed the brainstorming data by coding each group as *thematic* categorization, *taxonomic* categorization, or *other*. The coders first

[1] http://uk.cbs.dk/
[2] https://e-campus.dk/
[3] http://www.umt.edu.pk/

coded about one fifth of the data as an individual training exercise and then collectively discussed their coding. As a result of the training it was decided that when participants made multi-level groups that involved *taxonomic* classification at one level and *thematic* classification at another then that group was coded as *other*. Then the coders individually coded the remaining brainstorming data. Table 2 shows the pair-wise agreement between the coders and the kappa values (a statistical measure of the inter-rater agreement of categorical items). The kappa values are fairly moderate, according to the interpretation given by Altman [32] . The agreement varies between 59 and 68 percent with the kappa value varying between 0.39 and 0.52.

a) University website in Denmark



b) University website in Pakistan



Fig. 3. Screenshots of the two university websites

To analyze the *card sort* data we calculated, for each participant, the distance between the structure of the information on the website and the participant's classification of the information as represented in the participant's card sort. The distance between two classifications is the number of disagreements between them. That is, a distance of one means that a single card is placed differently by a participant compared to how the information is structured on the university website [23, 33]. This resulted in an average distance between the Danish university website and the Danish participants' card sorts and an average distance between the Pakistani university website and the Pakistani participants' card sorts. We also calculated the average distance between all pairs of Danish participants' card sorts and the average distance between all pairs of Pakistani participants' card sorts. To calculate the distances, we used the UW Card Sort Analyzer[4].

The data from the *information-retrieval tasks* were analyzed by determining how long participants took to answer the tasks and how many tasks participants answered correctly. Tasks not solved within the allocated three minutes were treated as incorrect. The answers to the information-retrieval tasks were at different depths in the website structure. That is, the answers were a different number of clicks away from the position at which participants started solving each task. The depth was

[4] http://www.cs.washington.edu/research/edtech/CardSorts/

determined for each task and labelled low, medium, or high. We contend that higher depth corresponds to higher task complexity.

Table 2: Inter-rater reliability of coders

		All categories
Coder No. 1 vs. Coder No. 2	Number of agreement	115
	Number of disagreement	79
	Proportion of agreement	59%
	Consensus (Kappa)	0.39
Coder No. 1 vs. Coder No. 3	Number of agreement	132
	Number of disagreement	61
	Proportion of agreement	68%
	Consensus (Kappa)	0.524
Coder No. 2 vs. Coder No. 3	Number of agreement	127
	Number of disagreement	66
	Proportion of agreement	65%
	Consensus (Kappa)	0.472

4 Results

Below we first analyze the brainstorming data, then the card-sort data, and finally the information-retrieval tasks.

4.1 Brainstorming

Table 3 shows that the Danish participants made 7.1 first-level categories during the brainstorming session, whereas the Pakistani participants made 6.7 first-level categories. There was no effect of participant group on the number of categories, $t(26) = 0.58$, $p = 0.6$. Seven (50%) of the Danish participants made second-level categories during their brainstorming session, whereas only three (21%) of the Pakistani participants made second-level categories. There was no effect, $t(26) = 1.59$, $p = 0.1$, of participant group on the number of second-level categories.

There was a significant difference between the two groups in the percentage of *taxonomic* categories, $t(26) = -4.26$, $p < 0.001$, and *other* categories, $t(26) = 3.42$, $p < 0.01$. There was no significant difference, $t(26) = 0.36$, $p = 0.7$, between the two groups in the percentage of *thematic* categories.

Table 3. Card-based brainstorming

N = 28	Danish	Pakistani
Number of Categories in brainstorming (M $\pm$ SD)	7.1 $\pm$ 2.0	6.7 $\pm$ 1.0

Number of participants who made sub-categories	7	3
Percentage of Taxonomic categories (M ± SD)	30.8 ± 9.9	51.2 ± 15.0
Percentage of Thematic categories (M ± SD)	34.2 ± 12.7	32.2 ± 15.5
Percentage of Other categories (M ± SD)	32.8 ± 16.1	13.6 ± 13.6

Danish participants used a mixture of taxonomic and thematic categories and therefore many of the Danish participants' categories ended up being coded as *other*, whereas Pakistani participants made more use of taxonomic classification and did not group information into many categories. The brainstorming data showed some differences between the participants in their classification of university-website information. This suggests that the information on such websites should be structured differently to match how Danish and Pakistani students classify information.

4.2 Card sort

To investigate the quality of the structure of the information on the two university websites, we analyzed how well this structure matched the way participants classified the same information. Table 4 shows the average distance between the structure of the website content and the participants' card sorts of the website information. The Danish participants had an average distance of 22.4 from the website, the Pakistani participants had a distance of 26.1. There was a significant difference in distance for Danish and Pakistani participants, $t(26) = -4.7$, $p < 0.01$, indicating that the two websites match their users' classification of the website content to different extents.

Table 4. Distance between website structure and participants' card sorts

N = 28	Danish	Pakistani
Distance from website to card sort of all cards (M + SD)	22.4 ± 2.1	26.± 2.6
Number of cards on which a majority of participants agree	34	19

For each card we determined the number of participants who classified the card in the same way – that is, placed it in the same group. We then selected the subset of cards classified in the same way by a majority (50% or more) of the participants. This was done separately for Danish and Pakistani participants. A majority of the Danish and Pakistani participants agreed about the classification of subsets of 34 and 19 cards, respectively.

4.3 Information-retrieval tasks

Finally we analyzed whether the task completion times and success rates of the information-retrieval tasks were affected by the depth at which answers to the tasks were located. For Danish participants the average task completion time for tasks at low, medium, and high depth was 62 seconds ($SD = 56$), 67 seconds ($SD = 53$) and 82

seconds (*SD* = 62). The Danish participants' average success rate for tasks at low, medium and high depth was 85% (*SD* = 36), 92% (*SD* = 27) and 82 % (*SD* = 62) respectively. For Pakistani participants the average task completion time for tasks at low, medium and high depth was 58 seconds (*SD* = 39), 88 seconds (*SD* = 59) and 134 seconds (*SD* = 51), respectively. The Pakistani participants' average success rate for tasks at low, medium and high depth was 92% (*SD* = 26), 86% (*SD* = 36) and 50% (*SD* = 38), respectively.

Fig. 4 shows the relationship between task completion time and the depth at which the answers to the tasks were located. Compared to the Pakistani participants, the task completion time for the Danish participants did not increase across depths. The Pakistani and Danish participants spent about the same time on low-depth tasks but the time for Pakistani participants increased as depth increased.

a) Danish participants b) Pakistani participants



Fig. 4. Relationship between task completion time and information depth

Fig. 4 shows the relationship between success rate and the depth at which the answers to the tasks were located. For Pakistani participants we found a decrease in success rate as answer depth increased. For Danish participants we found no relationship between success rate and answer depth. Both of these analyses suggest that the website structure affected participants' information retrieval**.**

5 Discussion

This cross-case study of university websites uses card-based brainstorming, card sorting, and information-retrieval tasks to investigate the participants' ways of organizing website information. We find both disagreement and similarities between the Danish and Pakistani participants. The differences can be interpreted as cultural differences in cognitive sorting style and as country-specific conditions related to the use of the internet by each group of participants.

b) Danish participants b) Pakistani participants



Fig. 5. Relationship between success rate and information depth

For the card-based brainstorming, the analysis of *taxonomic* and *thematic* categorization shows that the Pakistani participants tend to use *taxonomic* classification more than the Danish participants. The Pakistani participants classify information in categories where information can mostly be related to higher levels of abstraction. The Pakistani participants' shallow classification may be explained by a study in South Africa on culture, literacy and web dimensions which states that more communication practice on web enhances users' experience to categorize information in different ways. Danish participants made multilevel classification during brainstorming. Due to the spread of the contents in multiple sub-categories, Danish participants used a mixture of taxonomic and thematic categorisation at different levels. For the brainstorming, the Danish and Pakistani participants were provided with the same scenario and can therefore be compared,

The difference in Danish and Pakistani participants' card sorts was measured using the edit distance. Previous work suggests that for websites an edit distance of 4 to 5 for comparisons of 20 website elements indicates closely related contents [23]. On this basis the participants in our study were far from each other in their categorization of the 50 cards with website content. The web content may be categorized differently for numerous reasons. The information may, for example, fit in multiple categories. Content such as *'Contact us'* can be placed in either of the main categories including *'Facilities', 'Library'*, and *'Admission'*. Another reason for the high edit distance may be that the contents on some cards, e.g., *'alumni'*, were not understood by the participants and their different interpretations of these cards would then result in placing the cards in different categories.

For the agreement within a group about the placement of cards of web contents, the majority of the Danish participants agreed about the placement of 76% of the contents. Conversely, the majority of the Pakistani participants agreed about the placement of only 38% of the contents. This difference may indicate that the Danish website provides convenient services to facilitate on-line activities for Danish participants [34]. Another reason for this difference may be that due to the convenient services, the Danish participants make more use of their university website.

Regarding the relationship between task completion time and answer depth, Pakistani participants finds it difficult to locate high-depth answers. Also, Pakistani participants' success rate decreases with increasing answer depth. A possible reason

for this decrease may be that Pakistani participants spent less time on their university website compared to Danish participants.

Methodologically, this study provides an initial investigation of an approach that can be used in cross-country comparisons of website content and structure. We used taxonomic and thematic categorisation to compare and contrast the participants across countries. This method can provide insight into users' classification criteria. To minimise the impact of having two different websites in the experiment, we chose the same genre for both websites. We measured the usability of the websites to ensure that there were no important differences in the usability of the two websites. Furthermore, since both websites concern major, urban universities, we expected them to be at equal levels of quality.

6 Conclusion

This card-sort study offers an approach to the study of cross-country differences in the structure of university websites and user classification of website contents. Pakistani students tend to use more taxonomic classification, but fewer levels of categories, as compared to Danish students. The study also finds similarities between Pakistani and Danish users, for example in the retrieval of website content that is not located deep in the website hierarchy. The edit distance appears to be a useful measure in cross-country analyses of website structure. Furthermore, comparing websites developed locally and used locally can be a valuable comparative approach in cross-country HCI research and practice. The current study is limited by its focus on two websites and by the moderate number of participants from each of the two countries. Another limitation of study is that only one genre of website was researched. In this study we conducted the analysis of thematic and taxonomic classification on the basis of the card-based brainstorming data. In a forthcoming study we will apply the analysis of taxonomic and thematic classification to card sorts of actual website content.

References

1. Dumais, S. and H. Chen. *Hierarchical classification of Web content*. in *Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information* 2000. Athens, Greece ACM.
2. Parsons, J. and Y. Wand, *Using cognitive principles to guide classification in information systems modeling.* Mis Quarterly, 2008. **32**(4): p. 839-868.
3. Lakoff, G., *Women, fire, and dangerous things*1990: Univ. of Chicago Press.
4. Cole, C., et al., *A classification of mental models of undergraduates seeking information for a course essay in history and psychology: Preliminary investigations into aligning their mental models with online thesauri.* Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 2007. **58**(13): p. 2092-2104.
5. Bernard, M., *Constructing user-centered websites: The early design phases of small to medium sites.* Usability News, 2000. **2**: p. 2000.

6. El Said, G. and K. Hone. *Cross-Cultural Web Usability: An Exploration of the Experiences of Egyptians Users*. in *International Workshop on Internationalisation of Products and Systems (IWIPS 2001)*. 2001. Milton Keynes.
7. Bachiochi, D., et al., *Usability studies and designing navigational aids for the World Wide Web*. Computer networks and ISDN systems, 1997. **29**(8-13): p. 1489-1496.
8. Norman, D.A., *User centered system design*1986: Erlbaum.
9. Barber, W. and A. Badre. *Culturability: The merging of culture and usability*. in *The Fourth Conference on Human Factors and the Web*. 1998. Basking Ridge, NJ.
10. Isa, W., N.L.M. Noor, and S. Aidid, *Culture Influences to Website Information Architecture: An Empirical Investigation*. International Symposium of Information Technology 2008, Vols 1-4, Proceedings - Cognitive Informatics: Bridging Natural and Artificial Knowledge, ed. H.B. Zaman, et al.2008, New York: Ieee. 671-678.
11. Morville, P. and L. Rosenfeld, *Information architecture for the world wide web*2006: O'Reilly Media, Inc.
12. Broughton, V., *Faceted classification as a basis for knowledge organization in a digital environment: the bliss bibliographic classification as a model for vocabulary management and the creation of multidimensional knowledge structures.* The New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia, 2002. **7**(1): p. 67-102.
13. Allen, R., *Cognitive factors in the use of menus and trees: An experiment.* Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on, 2002. **1**(2): p. 333-336.
14. Rau, P.L.P., Y.Y. Choong, and G. Salvendy, *A cross cultural study on knowledge representation and structure in human computer interfaces.* International journal of industrial ergonomics, 2004. **34**(2): p. 117-129.
15. Kralisch, A., A. Yeo, and N. Jali. *Linguistic and cultural differences in information categorization and their impact on website use*. 2006. IEEE.
16. Carroll, J., *HCI models, theories, and frameworks: Toward a multidisciplinary science*2003: Morgan Kaufmann Pub.
17. Bowker, G. and S. Star, *Sorting Thing Out.* How to think like a knowledge worker: a guide to the mindset needed to perform competent knowledge work, 2008: p. 28.
18. Smiley, S. and A. Brown, *Conceptual preference for thematic or taxonomic relations: A nonmonotonic age trend from preschool to old age* 1.* Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1979. **28**(2): p. 249-257.
19. Yin, R., *Case study research: Design and methods*2009: Sage Publications, Inc.
20. Kelly, G., *The psychology of personal constructs (Vol. 2).* Clinical diagnosis and psychotherapy, 1991.
21. Rugg, G. and P. McGeorge, *The sorting techniques: a tutorial paper on card sorts, picture sorts and item sorts.* Expert Systems, 1997. **14**(2): p. 80-93.
22. Donna Spencer, T.W. *Card sorting: a definitive guide*. 2009 December 1, 2009]; Available from: http://www.boxesandarrows.com/view/card_sorting_a_definitive_guide.

23. Deibel, K. and R. Anderson, *Using edit distance to analyze card sorts.* Expert Systems, 2005. **22**(3): p. 129-138.
24. Chen, C. and L. Occenã, *A knowledge sorting process for a product design expert system.* Expert Systems, 1999. **16**(3): p. 170-182.
25. Martine, G. and G. Rugg, *That site looks 88.46% familiar: quantifying similarity of Web page design.* Expert Systems, 2005. **22**(3): p. 115-120.
26. McLaughlin, K. and H. Mandin, *Using" concept sorting" to study learning processes and outcomes.* Academic Medicine, 2002. **77**(8): p. 831.
27. Nielsen, J., *Card sorting: How many users to test.* Jakob Nielsen's Alertbox, 2004.
28. Medin, D., et al., *Categorization and Reasoning among Tree Experts: Do All Roads Lead to Rome?* 1.* Cognitive Psychology, 1997. **32**(1): p. 49-96.
29. Ross, N., *Culture & cognition: implications for theory and method*2004: Sage Publications, Inc.
30. Geven, A., et al. *Always-on information: services and applications on the mobile desktop.* 2008. ACM.
31. Lewis, K. and P. Hepburn, *Open card sorting and factor analysis: a usability case study.* Electronic Library, The, 2010. **28**(3): p. 401-416.
32. Altman, D., *Practical statistics for medical research*1991: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
33. Nawaz, A. and T. Clemmensen. *Cultural differences in the structure of categories among users of clipart in Denmark and China.* in *7th Danish HCI Research Symposium*. 2007. Copenhagen, Denmark.
34. Tung, L., Y. Xu, and F. Tan, *Attributes of Web Site Usability: A Study of Web Users with the Repertory Grid Technique.* International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 2009. **13**(4): p. 97-126.