



Short Communication

An assessment with respect to Deceiving the users for its Good

Saba Bashir^{1*} and Sahaar Bashir²

¹Department of Computing, Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, 22-E Block-6 P.E.C.H.S., Karachi, 75400 Sindh, Pakistan

²School of Nursing and Midwifery, Aga Khan University, stadium road, Karachi 74800, Pakistan
sah_lalani@live.com

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 22nd August 2016, revised 12th September 2016, accepted 20th September 2016

Abstract

This paper discusses the deception revolving around human computer interaction. Malevolent deception refers to the trickery that causes harmful effects while benevolent deception denotes to the falsehood device that is used to benefit its users. Little they are aware of the term itself, especially people in Pakistan. This research highlights about the views of people regarding existence of benevolent deception. The study analyzes a purpose of benevolent deception and the reasoning discussing its need. The results conclude that most of the participants neither trust system/internet nor they are aware about the term benevolent deception. The survey also proves that the users do not prefer being deceived even if it for their own good. Most of the participants thinks that it is misleading and should be eliminated.

Keywords: Deception, Human computer interaction, Benevolent deception.

Introduction

Deception basically refers to the tricks used to get what you want overshadowing the idea of what others wants. If we talk about Human Computer Interaction, there are mainly two types of deception-Malevolent Deception and Benevolent Deception. Deceiving that causes a harmful effect to the user is Malevolent Deception. For instance, sending a user some other place they would prefer not to go, showing deluding content or false information, deliberately duplicate content and doorway pages that sidetrack guests without their insight.

However, some deceptions are the charitable tricks; it is the falsehood invention to benefit the people using it rather than to deceive. This type of deception is known as benevolent deception. For instance, simply outside the Benrath Senior Center in Düsseldorf, Germany is a transport stop at which no transport stops. The seat and the official-looking sign were introduced to serve as a "nectar trap" to pull in patients with dementia who some of the time stray from the way, attempting to return home. Rather than wandering indiscriminately into the city and setting off a police seek, they see the sign and sit tight for a transport that will never come. Before long, somebody tenderly welcomes them back inside. It is considered as beautiful action to deceive someone¹. The fake transport stop at the Benrath Senior Center is, in its way, a bit of misleading innovation: a "UI" intended to sustain a practical figment. Also, it's not really the main case. Deceptive innovation exists in different structures and for different reasons, not every one of them clearly vile¹. On the off chance that you don't have any acquaintance with it as of now, you ought to: Many crosswalk and lift entryway close catches don't really fill in as publicized.

The main reason for these placebo buttons is to give the anxious individual a misguided feeling of organization. So also, the progress bars introduced on PC screens amid sending and receiving date keep up practically no association with the real measure of time or work left before the activity is finished. They are the unpleasant programming likeness somebody messaging to say, "On my way!"

But the fact is, do you think users should be deceived? Users should be treated with respect. They should not be lied. Also, users hate being cheated. "Great DESIGN IS HONEST." So holds one of the Ten Principles of Good Design, an arrangement of rules set around the notable German modern creator Dieter Rams in the 1970s. At the point when honesty is prized so very, is dishonest design essentially bad?¹

Focus of Study

Our focus of study introduces that benevolent deception is not known by the general population and despite the fact that they may have confronted it; they would not incline toward being deceived. Thus as shown in abstract, the target of this research paper is: i. To study the assessment on benevolent deception, ii. To liken our results with the speculation that makes a premise that users hate being misdirected. Our first goal gave us the premise to accomplish our second goal.

Research Approach

Participants: We gathered our information using a survey form related to benevolent deception. To distinguish the familiarity between set of users we made and assessed a set of hypothesis that is supported on the basis of benevolent deception and its preference and other researches in this background.

Procedure: The participants chosen for this research are distinguished as of 100 local users of different age groups and educational backgrounds (business, science, computer, etc).

Results and Discussion

To affirm our first goal, we experienced huge number of other research papers in this regard. Those information collected in the research papers, supported already, checking those hypothesis in the second goal. We then made a rundown of speculation proceeded with the talk which are as per the following.

Hypothesis: i. H1: User usually do not trust the system state, ii. H2: User does not know benevolent deception exists, iii. H3: User will not prefer being deceived even for its good.

We are setting ahead survey analysis that will display the result of local users to affirm the hypothesis.

Survey Analysis: Local users reacted to the review structure through which we break down the accompanying results.

Argument 1: User usually do not trust the system state: To assess whether the users trust the system state or not, the first survey question was whether they usually trust the system or internet?

56.5% of the respondents said ‘NO’ when asked “Do you usually trust the system or internet?”

Table-1
Trust on internet/system

Do you usually trust the system or internet?	
Yes	43.5%
No	56.5%

Our hypothesis 1 was ended up being false for users and assessment reasons that regardless of the amount of users doubt internet/system, despite everything they utilize it in their regular life.

Argument 2: User does not know what benevolent deception is: 78.8% of the respondents said ‘NO’ when asked “Do you understand the term ‘benevolent deception’ in human-computer interaction?” while 90.6%of the respondents said ‘YES’ when asked “Do you know some websites are deceiving?” 87.1% of the respondents answered ‘YES’ to the question “Do you know deception exists on system/internet? Whereas 55.3% of the respondents said ‘YES’ when asked “Have you ever come across a situation where you feel you are being deceived on system/internet?”

Table-2
Understanding of term

Do you understand the term ‘benevolent deception’ in human-computer interaction?	
Yes	21.2%
No	78.8%

Table-3
Knowledge about deceiving websites

Do you know some websites are deceiving?	
Yes	90.6%
No	9.4%

Table-4
Deception on internet/system

“Do you know deception exists on system/internet?”	
Yes	87.1%
No	12.9%

Table-5
Deceived on internet/system

Have you ever come across a situation where you feel you are being deceived on system/internet?	
Yes	55.3%
No	44.7%

This turned out that our hypothesis 2 is true and evaluation concludes that as people don’t know about benevolent deception.

Argument 3: User will not prefer being deceived even for its good: After being told that benevolent deception is actually benefiting its users, they were asked “Do you feel that benevolent deception should exist?” 66.7% of the respondents said ‘NO’. When asked “Do you feel such deception is misleading?” 87.1% of the respondents said ‘YES’. Whereas 61.2% of the respondents said ‘NO’ when asked “Would you prefer being deceived when it’s for your own good?”

Table-6
Existence of benevolent deception

Do you feel that benevolent deception should exist?	
Yes	33.3%
No	66.7%

Table-7
Deception as misleading

Do you feel such deception is misleading?	
Yes	87.1%
No	12.9%

Table-8
Preference on being deceived

Would you prefer being deceived when it's for your own good?	
Yes	38.8%
No	61.2%

This demonstrates our hypothesis 3 is valid for the clients as the outcomes says a 56% respondents said they don't incline toward being swindled despite the fact that it's for their own particular advantage.

Do we really need it?: Survey clearly shows user have no preference over deception even for their own good. So the question arrives, do we really need benevolent deception in Human computer interaction? Is it really necessary for the users to get deceived to get the advantage?

If we talk about some of the fake interfaces that are lying to us in the Human Computer interaction, like- Elevator "close" buttons don't generally close the entryways. Software progress bars don't guide to genuine progress. Mobile applications like Instagram say they've finished an activity when they might not have even begun. Like the white lies, we advise to grease up our

social communications, these "placebo interfaces" are intended to shield us from the mental weight of aggregate mindfulness. Frequently, we welcome them².

According to Matt Webb, Arnall's former BERG studio-mate-These Placebo UIs are a band-aid over "broken heuristics" in smart systems and they're not in any case successful—at any rate, not at something besides treating users like children². "The placebo UI is not improving you feel any about your absence of comprehension and control over the system—it's simply giving you some place to put your shitty sentiments," he includes. "Once in a while we require that. In any case, the placebo UI isn't including any worth. It's the best of every single horrendous world shy of settling the hidden issue with the framework."²

Conclusion

In our research paper we have presented our hypothesis and a survey that was conducted on the basis of that hypothesis. Our first hypothesis was about users trust on internet/system, that they do not usually trust system/internet as it appear as unsafe to most of the users. This has proved true. Our second hypothesis also has proved true as users don't know about the term benevolent deception and that it exists in system/internet. Third hypothesis was user's non preference of being deceived which also proved to be true.

In our research we have got the facts that hardly 40% to 45% people trust the system/internet while most of them refers to it as unsafe and tricky. Besides the fact that benevolent deception doesn't really harm its users, they consider it as misleading and do not prefer being deceived by it. The reason behind it seems to be non-awareness of benevolent deception and its advantages among users.

Table-1
Summary Evaluation

No	Hypothesis	Survey questions	Response	Conclusion
		Local users		
1	User usually do not trust the system state	Do you usually trust the system or internet?	YES: 43.5% NO: 56.5%	Hypothesis: True
2	User does not know what benevolent deception is	Do you understand the term 'benevolent deception' in human-computer interaction?	YES: 21.2% NO: 78.8%	Hypothesis: True
		Do you know some websites are deceiving?	YES: 90.6% NO: 9.4%	
		Do you know deception exists on system/internet?	YES: 87.1% NO: 12.9%	
		Have you ever come across a situation where you feel you are being deceived on system/internet?	YES: 55.3% NO: 4.7%	
3	User will not prefer being deceived even for its good	Do you feel that benevolent deception should exist?	YES: 33.3% NO: 66.7%	Hypothesis: True
		Do you feel such deception is misleading?	YES: 87.1% NO: 12.9%	
		Would you prefer being deceived when it's for your own good?	YES: 38.8% NO: 61.2%	

References

1. Greene K. (2014). How Should We Program Computers to Deceive.? Pacific Standard, <https://psmag.com/how-should-we-program-computers-to-deceive-eedbf653805a.d442ftmu4>, Retrieved August 27, 2016.
2. Pavlus J. (2015). "No UI" Design's Next Move: Fake UI. <http://www.fastcodesign.com/3048770/no-ui-designs-next-move-fake-ui> Retrieved August 27, 2016.
3. Cryer J. (2012). Asynchronous UI: When to lie. Word press, <https://jamescryer.wordpress.com/2012/03/18/asynchronous-ui/> Retrieved August 27, 2016.