

WHAT YOUR SITE IS ACTUALLY DOING.

One page: what is working, what is costing you visitors, and what to fix next. A phone-and-desktop teardown of the live site: 4 phone loads + 2 desktop loads. No login, no insider access, no Harvv pixel needed. The full evidence is at the bottom.

August 26, 2026

External scan

4 MOBILE + 2 DESKTOP LOADS • NO PIXEL DATA

WORKING

What's already working. These held up across every load.

1.8s Speed is good.

1.5MB The page is about 1.5 MB across 180 requests. That keeps it quick on mobile data and cheap to load repeatedly.

0 No JavaScript errors on load.

100/100 Lighthouse scores SEO 100/100. The fundamentals Google looks for are present.

COSTING YOU

Ranked by what hurts conversion most. Full evidence below.

24/57 Tiny buttons are hard to tap on mobile

3 A floating widget is covering a clickable element

tags Meta Pixel (Facebook) is installed but misconfigured

41% Add quotations so AI engines cite this page



Nothing spilled past the edge at either 390px (phone) or 1366px (desktop), so the structure is responsive.

4

Google Analytics tracking broken

faint

Some text is low-contrast and hard to read

FIXING NEXT

TAP TARGETS, OBSCURED CONTROL AND IMAGE SIZES.

3 small changes, on the pages people actually land on: Tiny buttons are hard to tap on mobile; A floating widget is covering a clickable element; Images have no width or height set (layout is stable for now). We re-measure the same samples after.

3 HOURS

AI SEARCH VISIBILITY

How visible is whitewolfmarketing.com to AI search?

ChatGPT, Perplexity, and Google AI Overviews are the new front page. The AI checks in this report are a preview. A free account turns them into a live 0 to 100 score, tracked daily and benchmarked against your competitors.

[See the full AI report, free](#)

01

Findings, ranked by what hurts conversion most

SEVERITY	FINDING	HOW WE KNOW
HIGH	Tiny buttons are hard to tap on mobile MOBILE ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG) CONVERSION 8 ELEMENTS 24 of 57 tappable items on this page (42%) measure under 24 pixels on their shorter side, below the 24px floor WCAG 2.5.8 sets for accessibility and well under the platform minimums (Apple recommends 44pt, Android 48dp) for reliable tapping, and the same ones came up small on every test load. When visitors can't hit what they expect to, they get frustrated and many of them leave instead of trying again. THE EXACT ELEMENTS WE FOUND: • a 1x1 "Skip to content" • a 270x21 "Brand Strategy" • a 270x21 "Website Development" • a 270x21 "SEO & Organic" • a 270x21 "Paid Media" • a 270x21 "Social Media" • a 270x21 "Content & Editorial" • a 270x21 "Automation & Systems"	
HIGH	A floating widget is covering a clickable element BOTH CONVERSION ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG) 3 ELEMENTS 3 clickable elements are sitting underneath a fixed overlay (div.e-con-inner over a "Social Media"), so a visitor who tries to tap them hits the widget on top instead. The element is there and looks fine in a preview, it just can't be reached. Move the floating widget to a clear corner, lower its z-index, or add spacing so it never overlaps your links and buttons. THE EXACT ELEMENTS WE FOUND: • a "Social Media" under div.e-con-inner • a "Automation & Systems" under div.elementor-widget-container • a "Instagram" under div.cky-notice	

LOW

Images have no width or height set (layout is stable for now)

BOTH

PERFORMANCE

SEO

6 IMAGES

52 of 52 images don't declare width and height. Your layout currently stays stable (measured Cumulative Layout Shift is 0, which is fine), most likely because space is reserved another way (CSS), so this is not causing visible jumps today. It is still worth setting explicit dimensions or a CSS aspect-ratio so a slow connection or a future style change cannot reintroduce shift.

THE EXACT IMAGES WE FOUND:

- [revisit.svg](#) "Revisit consent button"
- [close.svg](#)
- [whitewolf-logo-dark.png](#)
- [whitewolf-logo-dark.png](#)
- [6076026909aca.png](#) "Client logo"
- [ACGC.png](#) "Client logo"

LOW

Unused JavaScript is being downloaded

BOTH

PERFORMANCE

Code that never runs on this page still costs download and parse time on every visit. Splitting or removing it speeds up load. Lighthouse measured: Est savings of 375 KiB.

LOW

Unused CSS is being downloaded

BOTH

PERFORMANCE

Style rules that this page never uses still block rendering while they download. Trimming them frees the paint path. Lighthouse measured: Est savings of 315 KiB.

LOW

The page is heavy to download

BOTH

PERFORMANCE

Total page weight is high. On a phone with patchy data, that is extra seconds of blank screen before the page is usable. Lighthouse measured: Total size was 2,862 KiB.

LOW

The page loads from a lot of third-party services

BOTH

Around 25 separate outside domains load on this page (analytics, ads, chat widgets, fonts). Each one is a connection that can be slow, fail, or change behavior outside your control.

How we know: median across loads

HIGH

Meta Pixel (Facebook) is installed but misconfigured

BOTH

TRACKING

Meta Pixel installed but no Lead/Purchase/Checkout event fires on this page, only PageView. Your Meta ad sessions can't be optimized for conversions until you track at least one downstream event.

HIGH

Add quotations so AI engines cite this page

BOTH

AI SEARCH

SEO

Generative engines (ChatGPT, Perplexity, AI Overviews) lift sourced, attributed quotes almost verbatim, and quotations are the single strongest citation lever (studies measure roughly +41%). Add 1-2 attributed expert quotes or blockquotes to the pages below. (Found across a sample of 8 pages from your sitemap, a partial crawl rather than your full site.)

MEDIUM

AI search crawlers are blocked

BOTH

SEO

8 EXAMPLES

Your robots.txt blocks 8 AI crawlers (gptbot, google-extended, claudebot, ccbot, bytespider, applebot-extended, amazonbot, meta-externalagent). Those engines (ChatGPT, Perplexity, Google AI Overviews, Claude) cannot read your site, so your content cannot be cited or shown in AI search.

THE EXACT EXAMPLES WE FOUND:

- gptbot
- google-extended
- claudebot
- ccbot
- bytespider
- applebot-extended
- amazonbot
- meta-externalagent

HIGH

Google Analytics tracking broken

BOTH

TRACKING

CONVERSION

The Google Analytics request failed to complete on every one of the 4 test loads. If real visitors hit the same failure, GA is missing those visits and the dashboard has no way to flag it. Conversion numbers, audience counts, and channel attribution are all undercounting. Worth checking the tag loading order and any consent banner that might be blocking the request.

HIGH

Some text is low-contrast and hard to read

BOTH

ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG)

Text that does not stand out enough from its background is hard to read for many visitors, and fails accessibility guidelines Google checks.

LOW

Security headers are missing or weak

BOTH

SECURITY

The server response is missing browser-hardening headers that protect visitors and are a standard security and agency checklist item. Missing or weak here: HSTS (Strict-Transport-Security, which forces HTTPS on return visits). These are set at the server, CDN, or host level (most platforms expose them in settings or a config file) and do not change how the site looks or performs.

LOW

Headings skip levels

BOTH

ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG)

Jumping from an H1 straight to an H4 breaks the document outline that screen readers and search engines rely on.

LOW

Some text is too small to read on phones

MOBILE

ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG)

CONVERSION

18 chunks of text come in under 12 pixels on this page. Most visitors don't zoom, they just skim past anything that small. Bumping the smallest body text to 14 pixels makes the page read without effort.

How we know: median across loads

Accessibility findings are automated checks against Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 and 2.2. They flag potential barriers and legal risk, not a certification or a determination of compliance with the ADA, Section 508, or EN 301 549. Automated testing catches only a subset of issues; a full conformance review needs manual and assistive-technology testing by a qualified reviewer.

FROM FINDING TO FIX

Want the fix, not just the finding?

Install Harvv and we turn each issue above into a ready-to-paste prompt for your AI coding assistant. Drop it into Cursor, Claude, or Copilot and the diagnosis becomes a concrete code change, written against this exact page.

Get the fix prompts

"How we know": **unlabeled** = a deterministic fact, identical on every load (e.g. element sizes). Most findings are this kind, so we only mark the exceptions: **median across loads** = a noisy lab metric, reported as a median. **real-user field data** = Google CrUX, actual Chrome visitors.

Structural and AI-search checks crawl up to 8 pages from your sitemap (a sample, not your full site). "Broken" means a link returned 404, 410, or 5xx, or did not respond; access-controlled pages (401, 403) are not counted.

02

Performance: phone, desktop, and real visitors

METRIC	MOBILE	DESKTOP	READ
TTFB (lab median)	550 ms	531 ms	LAB
FCP (lab median)	1.0s	1.0s	LAB
LCP (lab median)	1.8s	2.0s	GOOD
Page weight (median)	1.5 MB	1.6 MB	OK

Google Lighthouse (lab): Performance **26** mobile / **48** desktop, SEO **100**, Accessibility **88**, Best Practices **96**.

Lab numbers are from a headless mobile browser on an unthrottled connection: treat them as a floor, not a typical experience. Add a Google API key to light up real-user field data (CrUX) and Lighthouse scores.

03

Tiny buttons are hard to tap on mobile

24 of 57 tappable items on this page come in below the platform minimums for reliable tapping on a phone (Apple recommends 44pt, Android 48dp; WCAG 2.5.8 sets 24px as the hard accessibility floor). The same ones came up small on every one of the 4 test loads, so this is the page itself, not a fluke.

When customers can't tap what they expect to, they get frustrated and many of them leave. They don't file a bug. They don't try again. They just leave. A desktop dashboard can't see this because it's the difference between a thumb and a cursor.

The buttons measuring below the minimum on this scan:

- a 1x1 "Skip to content"
- a 270x21 "Brand Strategy"
- a 270x21 "Website Development"
- a 270x21 "SEO & Organic"
- a 270x21 "Paid Media"
- a 270x21 "Social Media"
- a 270x21 "Content & Editorial"
- a 270x21 "Automation & Systems"

The fix is CSS-only on most sites: add padding around the icon (don't just change the icon size) so the actual tap area is at least 44x44 pixels. No redesign, no new assets.

04

Technical SEO & structured data

CHECK	RESULT
Title	Austin Marketing Agency & Web Studio White Wolf Marketing (59 chars)
Meta description	149 chars
H1	1 on page
Canonical	PRESENT
Structured data (JSON-LD)	1 block(s)
Open Graph	TITLE + IMAGE

05

The fix checklist

Everything to fix, priority first, each tagged with the screen it affects and a rough effort. Work top to bottom.

☐ Tiny buttons are hard to tap on mobile MOBILE CSS ONLY

☐ A floating widget is covering a clickable element BOTH CSS ONLY

☐ Images have no width or height set (layout is stable for now) BOTH CSS ONLY

☐ Unused JavaScript is being downloaded BOTH VARIABLES

☐ Unused CSS is being downloaded BOTH VARIABLES

☐ The page is heavy to download BOTH SMALL

☐ The page loads from a lot of third-party services BOTH DEV AFTERNOON

☐ Meta Pixel (Facebook) is installed but misconfigured BOTH VARIABLES

☐ Add quotations so AI engines cite this page BOTH VARIABLES

☐ AI search crawlers are blocked BOTH VARIABLES

☐ Google Analytics tracking broken BOTH DEV AFTERNOON

☐ Some text is low-contrast and hard to read BOTH VARIABLES

☐ Security headers are missing or weak BOTH VARIABLES

☐ Headings skip levels BOTH VARIABLES



Some text is too small to read on phones

MOBILE

CSS ONLY

Effort is a rough read from the outside: "CSS only" means no new assets or backend work, "1 line" means a single tag, "Dev afternoon" means a developer needs to touch tracking or scripts.

06

What this report cannot tell you

Everything above is from the outside, looking at the page on a simulated phone and desktop. The questions that actually decide revenue need real visitors. Install the Harvv pixel (one script tag, 16 KB, zero personal data, no engineering project) and within about 72 hours you'd know which buttons real customers tapped and missed, how often Google Analytics is missing visits, and exactly where mobile shoppers stalled and left. This report shows you where to look. The pixel shows you how often it happens, and to whom.

07

How we did this, and what it can't prove

- **4 mobile + 2 desktop loads** of one URL from headless Chrome (iPhone viewport at 390px, desktop at 1366px), August 26, 2026. Enough loads to separate real defects from random noise, not a full-site crawl.
- **Lab numbers, not real-user numbers** (no field data was available for this run). Real devices on real networks run slower.
- **Friction is inferred, not counted.** We can prove a button is small. We can't, from the outside, count how often it causes a missed tap. That requires the pixel on a live page.
- **This page rotates its content** load to load, which is on its own a reason a single-shot scan can't be the last word on it.

About Harvv, the source of this teardown

Harvv is a behavioral UX analytics platform (harvv.com). A lightweight JavaScript pixel captures how real visitors behave on a site (dead clicks, rage clicks, scroll depth, Core Web Vitals, JavaScript errors, and 50+ other signals) and the engine turns them into prioritized, plain-English findings. This teardown is the outside-in version of that: the same detectors run against a public page, with no pixel installed.

How to read it. Every finding here is a reproducible, automated measurement, not an opinion: element sizes, contrast ratios, load metrics, and structured-data checks that anyone can re-run against the same URL. The method is stated in full above. Automated testing catches a subset of issues, so this is a starting point, not a certification.

Full disclosure. Harvv makes the pixel that would measure the friction these findings imply, so we have a commercial interest. That is exactly why the findings are kept to things a reader can verify independently, and

why nothing here is inflated: an unreproducible claim would undermine the tool it is meant to demonstrate.

Prepared by Harvv (harvv.com), a behavioral UX analytics platform. Last updated August 26, 2026.