

Chapter 1.32

Addressing the Credibility of Mobile Applications

Pankaj Kamthan
Concordia University, Canada

INTRODUCTION

Mobile access has opened new vistas for various sectors of society including businesses. The ability that anyone using (virtually) any device could be reached anytime and anywhere presents a tremendous commercial potential. Indeed, the number of mobile applications has seen a tremendous growth in the last few years.

In retrospect, the fact that almost *anyone* can set up a mobile application claiming to offer products and services raises the question of credibility from a consumer's viewpoint. The obligation of establishing credibility is essential for an organization's reputation (Gibson, 2002) and for building consumers' trust (Kamthan, 1999). If not addressed, there is a potential for lost consumer confidence, thus significantly reducing the advantages and opportunities the mobile Web as a medium offers. If a mobile application is not seen as credible, we face the inevitable consequence of a product, however functionally superior it might be, rendered socially isolated.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. We first provide the motivational background necessary for later discussion. This is followed by introduction of a framework within which different types of credibility in the context of mobile applications can be systematically addressed and thereby improved. Next, challenges and directions for future research are outlined. Finally, concluding remarks are given.

BACKGROUND

In this section, we present the fundamental concepts underlying credibility, and present the motivation and related work for addressing credibility within the context of mobile applications.

Basic Credibility Concepts

For the purposes of this article, we will consider credibility to be synonymous to (and therefore

interchangeable with) believability (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953). We follow the terminology of Fogg and Tseng (1999), and view credibility and trust as being slightly different. Since trust indicates a *positive* belief about a person, object, or process, we do not consider credibility and trust to be synonymous.

It has been pointed out in various studies (Fogg, 2003; Metzger, 2005) that credibility consists of two primary dimensions, namely *trustworthiness* and *expertise* of the source of some information. Trustworthiness is defined by the terms such as well-intentioned, truthful, unbiased, and so on. The trustworthiness dimension of credibility captures the *perceived* goodness or morality of the source. Expertise is defined by terms such as knowledgeable, experienced, competent, and so on. The expertise dimension of credibility captures the *perceived* knowledge and skill of the source. Together, they suggest that “highly credible” mobile applications will be perceived to have high levels of *both* trustworthiness and expertise.

We note that trustworthiness and expertise are at such a high level of abstraction that direct treatment of any of them is difficult. Therefore, in order to improve credibility, we need to find quantifiable attributes that can improve each of these dimensions.

A Classification of Credibility

The following taxonomy helps associating the concept of credibility with a specific user class in context of a mobile application. A user could consider a mobile application to be credible based upon direct interaction with the application (*active credibility*), or consider it to be credible in absence of any direct interaction but based on certain pre-determined notions (*passive credibility*). Based on the classification of credibility in computer use (Fogg & Tseng, 1999) and adapting them to the domain of mobile applications, we can decompose these further.

There can be two types of *active credibility*: (1) *surface credibility*, which describes how much the user believes the mobile application is based on simple inspection; and (2) *experienced credibility*, which describes how much the user believes the mobile application is based on first-hand experience in the past.

There can be two types of *passive credibility*: (1) *presumed credibility*, which describes how much the user believes the mobile application because of general assumptions that the user holds; and (2) *reputed credibility*, which describes how much the user believes the mobile application because of a reference from a third party.

Finally, credibility is not absolute with respect to users and with respect to the application itself (Metzger, Flanagin, Eyal, Lemus, & McCann, 2003). Also, credibility can be associated with a whole mobile application or a part of a mobile application. For example, a user may question the credibility of information on a specific product displayed in a mobile application. We contend that for a mobile application to be labeled non-credible, there must exist at least a part of it that is labeled non-credible based on the above classification by at least one user.

The Origins and Significance of the Problem of Mobile Credibility

The credibility of mobile applications deserves special attention for the following reasons:

- **Delivery Context:** Mobile applications are different from the desktop or Web environments (Paavilainen, 2002) where context-awareness (Sadeh, Chan, Van, Kwon, & Takizawa, 2003) is a unique challenge. The delivery context in a changing environment of mobile markup languages, variations in user agents, and constrained capabilities of mobile devices presents unique challenges towards active credibility.

8 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/addressing-credibility-mobile-applications/26514

Related Content

M-Learning with Mobile Phones

S. So (2007). *Encyclopedia of Mobile Computing and Commerce* (pp. 419-423).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/learning-mobile-phones/17111

Establishing A Personalized Information Security Culture

Shuhaili Talib, Nathan L. Clarke and Steven M. Furnell (2011). *International Journal of Mobile Computing and Multimedia Communications* (pp. 63-79).

www.irma-international.org/article/establishing-personalized-information-security-culture/51662

Semantic Handover among Distributed Coverage Zones for an Ambient Continuous Service Session

Rachad Nassar and Noémie Simoni (2013). *International Journal of Handheld Computing Research* (pp. 37-58).

www.irma-international.org/article/semantic-handover-among-distributed-coverage/76308

A Novel Power-Efficient Data Aggregation Scheme for Cloud-Based Sensor Networks

Abhishek Bajpai, Shashank Yadav, Naveen Tiwari, Anita Yadav and Mansi Chaurasia (2022). *International Journal of Mobile Computing and Multimedia Communications* (pp. 1-14).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-novel-power-efficient-data-aggregation-scheme-for-cloud-based-sensor-networks/297964

Health and Fitness Wearables

Mike S. Butler and Paul E. Luebbers (2016). *Wearable Technology and Mobile Innovations for Next-Generation Education* (pp. 58-78).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/health-and-fitness-wearables/149600