

# Usability in Mobile Computing and Commerce

**Kuanchin Chen**

*Western Michigan University, USA*

**Hy Sockel**

*DIKW Management Group, USA*

**Louis K. Falk**

*University of Texas at Brownsville, USA*

## USABILITY STANDARDIZATION

Usability is an acknowledged important aspect of any system or product design. Many times it is related to not only product features, but also ultimately profit that can be generated from the product. Good interface design promotes higher mutuality (feeling similar and connected), which in turn leads to higher levels of involvement and a favorable impression of credibility.

Many practitioners and researchers (such as Jakob Nielsen, 2000) have elaborated on usability aspects, but few have agreed upon a unifying definition. In 1998 the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) defined usability as the “Extent to which a product can be used by specified users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction in a specified context of use” (ISO 9241-11, 1998, p. 2). From this definition it can be construed that effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction are three pillars for usability measures. In this regard, the ISO defines:

- Effectiveness as the “accuracy and completeness with which users achieve specified goals,”
- Efficiency as the “resources expended in relation to the accuracy and completeness with which users achieve goals,” and
- Satisfaction as the “freedom from discomfort, and positive attitudes towards the use of the product.”

The ISO standard acknowledges that the level of usability depends highly on the intended context of use (e.g., users, hardware, software, and social environments). Researchers have demonstrated that the three ISO usability components are distinct. Frøkjær, Hertzum, and Hornbæk (2000) found only a weak relationship among the three usability components. Walker,

Fromer, Di Fabbrizio, Mestel, and Hindle (1998) found that efficiency did not translate into user satisfaction. These empirical studies suggest that efficiency, effectiveness, and satisfaction may be independent aspects of usability and a causal relationship among them may be weak or even nonexistent.

## OTHER DIMENSIONS OF USABILITY

Findings from studies such as Sing (2004), Hilbert and Redmiles (2000), and McLaughlin and Skinner (2000) support ISO recommendation in that usability is highly contextual and is built on factors such as the user’s past experience with similar systems, the role they play, and the environment the product is used in. In addition, user expectations and priorities toward usability also depend on the role they play and the position they hold.

Sing (2004) cites studies that include software usability components of (a) flexibility: users perceive the system can adapt to their preferred style of interaction, (b) ease of learning: users perceive that it is easy to gain required knowledge to achieve a satisfactory level of competence, and (c) ease of remembering: it is easy for users to recall system features after a period of time.

Hilbert and Redmiles (2000) offer similar dimensions of usability: (a) learnability: the system is easy to learn and (b) efficiency: the system is efficient to use. Once a user masters the system, a higher level of productivity is possible: (c) memorability: the system should be easy to remember even for casual users, (d) errors: the system should have a low error rate and (e) satisfaction: the system should be pleasant to use.

McLaughlin and Skinner (2000) examined five usability components on new IT implementations: (a) checkability: the system’s ability to ensure information

correctness, (b) confidence: users' confidence in their ability of using the system and also in the system itself, (c) control: the system offers the user control, (d) ease of use, (e) speed of use, and (f) understanding.

## USABILITY EVALUATION METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

### Evaluation Methods

The approach undertaken for usability assessment varies depending on the intended goals and the available features of the product. Ivory and Hearst (2001) outlined a taxonomy view of usability test methods as:

- **Method class:** Testing, inspection, inquiry, analytical modeling, and simulation.
- **Method type:** Log file analysis, guideline review, surveys, GOMS analysis, genetic algorithms, and so forth.
- **Automation type:** None, capture, analysis, and critique.
- **Effort level:** Minimal effort, model development, informal use, and formal use.

Interested readers should consult Ivory and Hearst's study for more details.

### Usability Instruments

As with most assessment procedures, usability assessment depends highly on how closely the instrument follows or achieves the intended goals. Since there is a strong tie between the context of use, usability goals, and the measuring instruments, it is difficult to build a comprehensive usability instrument for all circumstances. This section shows a brief survey of usability instruments (Table 1) with a focus on software usability.

## USABILITY IN MOBILE COMPUTING

Mobile wireless devices enabled by cell-phone technology, such as portable computing devices (PCDs), personal digital assistants (PDAs), global positioning systems (GPSs), and geographic information systems (GISs), are being used online to create a mobile commerce (m-commerce) environment. While features that these devices support bear a high level of resemblance to

Table 1. Usability instruments

Instrument	Application	Usability Dimension
(1) Software usability measurement inventory (SUMI) (Kirakowski & Corbett, 1993) SUMI is intended as an instrument to measure perceived software quality from the end user standpoint. SUMI consists of 50 questions measuring quality of use in five usability aspects.	Software	Efficiency, affect, helpfulness, control, and learnability.
(2) Web site analysis and measurement inventory (WAMMI) ( <a href="http://www.wammi.com">http://www.wammi.com</a> ) WAMMI consists of 20 questions to measure the five aspects of Web site usability. The assessment result is compared against a database of similar Web sites to generate the final overall usability rating.	Web sites	Attractiveness, controllability, efficiency, helpfulness, and learnability.
(3) Measuring the usability of multimedia systems (MUMMS) ( <a href="http://www.ucc.ie/hfrg/questionnaires/mumms/index.html">http://www.ucc.ie/hfrg/questionnaires/mumms/index.html</a> ) MUMMS targets the assessment of use quality in multimedia systems. It uses the same usability dimensions as SUMI.	Multimedia systems	Efficiency, affect, helpfulness, control, and learnability.
(4) Usability task questionnaire (Sing, 2004) Sing's usability task questionnaire consists of 25 Likert-type questions and two open-ended questions. The goal of this questionnaire is to assess six usability components.	Electronic stores	Effectiveness, efficiency, flexibility, easy to learn, easy to remember, satisfaction
(5) WebQual (Barnes, Liu, & Vidgen, 2001; Barnes & Vidgen, 2002) WebQual is an instrument based on quality function deployment (QFD), which is a structured process to capture "voice of the customer" through each state of product or service development. The current version of WebQual is a 23-question instrument to measure the three quality dimensions of Web sites.	WAP and Web sites	Information quality, interaction and service quality, and usability

5 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/usability-mobile-computing-commerce/17573](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/usability-mobile-computing-commerce/17573)

## Related Content

---

### Steering Generative AI Toward Beneficence: A Review of Constructive Deepfake Applications

Mitra Amini, Veena Tewari, Swapnil Morande, Mohit Kukreti and Amitabh Mishra (2024). *Navigating the World of Deepfake Technology* (pp. 283-294).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/steering-generative-ai-toward-beneficence/353623](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/steering-generative-ai-toward-beneficence/353623)

### Streaming Revolution: Tracing the Evolution of OTT Media From Its Origins to the Present

Nitesh Behare, Vinayak Chandrakant Shitole, Shubhada Nitesh Behare, Shrikant Ganpatrao Waghulkar, Tabrej Mulla and Suraj Ashok Sonawane (2024). *The Rise of Over-the-Top (OTT) Media and Implications for Media Consumption and Production* (pp. 8-31).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/streaming-revolution/337662](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/streaming-revolution/337662)

### Multicast of Multimedia Data

Christos Bouras, Apostolos Gkamas, Dimitris Primpas and Kostas Stamos (2008). *Multimedia Technologies: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1781-1788).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/multicast-multimedia-data/27190](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/multicast-multimedia-data/27190)

### Mobile Magazines

Tom Pfeifer and Barry Downes (2006). *Handbook of Research on Mobile Multimedia* (pp. 555-572).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/mobile-magazines/20990](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/mobile-magazines/20990)

### Quality of Service Issues in Mobile Multimedia Transmission

Nalin Sharda (2008). *Mobile Multimedia Communications: Concepts, Applications, and Challenges* (pp. 45-63).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/quality-service-issues-mobile-multimedia/26780](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/quality-service-issues-mobile-multimedia/26780)