International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

When Mobile App Data Fails: Data-Quality Problems, Trust-Related Responses, Post-Adoption Intentions, and Governance Expectations

Authors:

Florian Blaschke (f.blaschke@deutschehochschule.de)
Deutsche Hochschule für angewandte Wissenschaften (DHAW), Potsdam, Germany
ORCiD: 0000-0003-2124-2458

Carsten Giebe (publikation-giebe@gmx.de)
Hochschule Fresenius - University of Applied Sciences, Berlin, Germany
ORCiD: 0000-0003-2335-4808

Abstract:

Mobile applications increasingly mediate access to consequential information, yet user-centred evidence on which data-quality dimensions matter most, which failures users encounter, and how such experiences relate to trust-related and post-adoption responses remains fragmented. This cross-sectional online survey study analysed 477 respondents. Descriptive statistics addressed perceived importance, failure types, and reported responses, while two chi-square tests examined whether prior negative data-quality experience was associated with responsibility attribution and support for stricter platform controls. Accuracy was rated important or very important by 95.0% of respondents, followed by timeliness (92.2%), completeness (89.7%), and understandability (84.1%). Negative experiences were reported by 260 respondents (54.5%); among them, inaccurate data were the most frequent problem (49.6%). In this routed subsample, 96.2% agreed that reliable data increased trust, 93.8% reported a reduced-use intention when data were poor, 90.0% reported non-recommendation, and 88.5% reported deletion willingness when inaccuracies were frequent. Prior negative experience was associated with responsibility attribution, $\chi^2(2, N = 477) = 8.024$, $p = .018$, Cramer's $V = .130$, and support for stricter platform controls, $\chi^2(2, N = 477) = 7.199$, $p = .027$, Cramer's $V = .123$. These modest associations indicate experience-contingent differences in governance expectations without supporting causal inference. The findings connect multidimensional data-quality perceptions with a trust-related response and stated post-adoption intentions and distinguish expectations directed toward developers from those directed toward platform operators.

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)

Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026

https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Keywords:

Mobile Applications, Data Quality, Information Quality, Trust-related Responses, Post-adoption Intentions, Platform Governance

Submitted: 2026-01-04. Revised: 2026-03-26. Accepted: 2026-05-17.

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Introduction

Mobile applications are now routine interfaces for communication, finance, navigation, shopping, health, and other information-intensive activities. Lu et al. (2025) describe mobile-app user experience as a combination of usability, acceptance, contextual fit, feedback, and emerging technological features rather than interface ease alone. Inaccurate, outdated, incomplete, or difficult-to-understand information can affect how users evaluate an app and whether they continue to rely on it.

Wang and Strong (1996) conceptualise information quality as multidimensional and argue that it should be evaluated from the data consumer's perspective; fitness for use extends beyond accuracy to contextual and representational qualities. In their systematic review, Daikeler et al. (2025) identify accuracy, completeness, and timeliness among the most recurrent dimensions across data-quality frameworks. They noted that the appropriate combination depends on the data and use context. Fadahunsi et al. (2025) include accuracy, completeness, interpretability, and timeliness among the broader 14 dimensions of their clinical information quality framework. This reinforces the need to assess content as users encounter it within operational systems.

These quality dimensions also matter after an app has been adopted. In telecommunication applications, Situmorang et al. (2025) report on the relationship between application quality, outcome quality, and continuance intention. Ukaegbu and Fan (2025), studying mobile health, identified trust as an important link between users' evaluations and continued use. In a large-scale analysis of AI-app reviews, Massenon et al. (2025) find that accounts of factually incorrect outputs are accompanied by frustration and distrust. These observations highlight the relevance of user-reported information failures to quality assurance in deployed applications.

Sharif et al. (2026) assess broad dimensions of mHealth app quality, while Situmorang et al. (2025) examine continuance of telecommunication apps through mobile service quality. These studies provide less direct evidence on how users prioritise discrete data-quality dimensions. Ko and Woo (2025) evaluate the perceived quality of information in mental health apps. Massenon et al. (2025) analyse incorrect outputs reported in reviews of AI-powered mobile apps. Zaman et al. (2025) examine concerns and suggestions regarding features in XR app reviews. These domain-specific studies do not jointly describe recalled failure categories, a trust-related response, reduced-use intention, non-recommendation, deletion willingness, and rating disposition within a general mobile-app survey. Seo and Lee (2025) establish app-store operator control, and Wu and Han (2025) associate a platform policy with changes in developer update behaviour. The relationship between prior data-quality failure experience and expectations of developer responsibility and platform controls remains comparatively underexamined.

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

To examine these gaps, the study uses data from a cross-sectional survey of mobile app users. The analysis examines how users rated the accuracy, timeliness, completeness, and understandability of the data, as well as the types of failures reported and the trust-related and post-adoption responses of those who experienced poor data quality. It also compares responsibility attribution and support for stricter platform controls between respondents with and without prior negative data-quality experience. RQ1-RQ3 are descriptive; two chi-square tests address the comparisons specified in RQ4.

The analysis ranks the data-quality dimensions from the users' perspective, documents the distribution of recalled failures, and describes trust-related and stated post-adoption responses in the routed failure-experience subsample. By considering distinct dimensions and failure categories alongside several post-adoption responses, the analysis avoids treating them as a single trust or behaviour construct. The comparison of respondents with and without prior negative experience identifies differences in expectations directed toward developers and platform operators, informing app-level assurance and platform-level quality controls.

The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: Which dimensions of mobile-app data quality are perceived as most important by users?

RQ2: Which types of data-quality failures are most frequently experienced by mobile-app users?

RQ3: What trust-related and behavioural consequences do users with prior negative data-quality experiences report?

RQ4: Are prior negative data-quality experiences associated with expectations regarding developer responsibility and platform-level data-quality controls?

Theoretical Background

Data Quality in Mobile Applications

Wang and Strong (1996) conceptualise data quality as fitness for use from the data consumer's perspective, making both intrinsic correctness and the context in which information is interpreted and applied relevant to quality. In their review, Daikeler et al. (2025) describe data quality as multidimensional and context-sensitive. They explain that frameworks vary by data type, analytical purpose, and level of granularity. DeLone and McLean (2003) position information quality as a central component of system success because users evaluate output quality alongside system and service characteristics.

Lu et al. (2025) synthesize mobile-app user experience through scenarios, themes, design features, and methodologies, including user requirements, feedback, and context. Accordingly, informational output can be treated here as part of the experienced application service. Sharif et al. (2026) validate four combined factors in the mHealth Apps Rating Inventory: Usability and Content Quality, Security and

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Technical Requirements, Design and User Experience, and Notification Management and User Guidance. This places content quality within a broader architecture of application quality. Ko and Woo (2025) illustrate, through their evaluation of mental health apps, why information attributes can be isolated without removing them from their mobile usage context.

Dimensions of Mobile Data Quality

Fadahunsi et al. (2025) include accuracy (whether information correctly represents the relevant state of the world), completeness (whether required information is present), timeliness (whether information is sufficiently current), and interpretability (whether users can understand the information supplied) among the broader set of 14 dimensions in their clinical information quality framework. Rather than reducing data quality to the absence of errors, Wang and Strong (1996) place these dimensions within intrinsic, contextual, and representational categories. In their systematic review, Daikeler et al. (2025) identified accuracy, completeness, and timeliness as recurring dimensions across modern data quality frameworks. However, their relative importance depends on the use case.

Lu et al. (2025) identify usability, user acceptance, and design progress as major themes in the mobile-app user-experience literature. In their evaluation of mental-health apps, Ko and Woo (2025) use a user version of a rating instrument that captures perceived information quality alongside engagement, functionality, and aesthetics. Sharif et al. (2026) combine usability and content quality within the validated factor "Usability and Content Quality," supporting their joint assessment within mHealth app quality.

Data Quality and Digital Trust

Bryant et al. (2026) model cognitive, affective, and behavioural trust when examining the adoption and usage of location-based service apps, rather than treating trust as a single, undifferentiated belief. Within this framework, reliable informational performance may be relevant to cognitive trust because the study's cognitive-trust indicators included accuracy and reliability. Repeated data-quality failures could therefore make reliance seem riskier, although Bryant et al. (2026) did not test this implication directly. In the context of mobile health, Ukaegbu and Fan (2025) position trust as a link between users' perceived capabilities, usefulness, ease of use, and continuance intention. This study uses digital trust as the theoretical context, but the empirical measure is a single trust-related response rather than a validated multidimensional trust scale (Bryant et al., 2026).

For apps that generate or curate consequential content, the trust implications of information failure are especially apparent (Massenon et al., 2025). Examining three million reviews of AI-powered mobile applications, Massenon et al. (2025) identify user-reported incorrect and fabricated outputs as a software-quality problem accompanied by frustration and erosion of trust. Their findings support the idea

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

of treating accuracy failures as trust-related events while acknowledging that not every reported failure results in a consistent change in trust.

Data Quality and Stated Post-Adoption Responses

Bhattacherjee (2001) distinguishes between initial acceptance and continuance, arguing that continued use depends on satisfaction, confirmation of expectations, and perceived usefulness after experiencing a system. In telecommunications applications, Situmorang et al. (2025) link application and outcome quality to continuance intention, demonstrating that quality evaluations remain relevant post-adoption. Kostopoulos et al. (2025) treat repeated use and willingness to remain with a mobile app as related to, yet conceptually distinct from, loyalty and engagement.

They distinguish related aspects of retention, loyalty, and engagement. For the present study, non-recommendation, deletion willingness, and rating disposition extend the response profile beyond continuance by capturing different aspects of reliance, retention-related evaluation, and reputational feedback. From reviews of mobile XR apps, Zaman et al. (2025) extract actionable feature concerns and suggestions. They also treat ratings and review helpfulness as quantitative signals of users' perceptions of quality. Considering stated verification, reduced-use intention, non-recommendation, deletion willingness, and rating disposition together provides a broader response profile without implying that the items form a single latent construct or represent observed behaviour (Zaman et al., 2025).

Developer Responsibility and Platform Governance

Mobile app ecosystems distribute authority unevenly. Developers create and maintain applications, while platform owners control distribution infrastructure, technical standards, access conditions, and key governance mechanisms (Seo & Lee, 2025). In their study of Google's control over Samsung within the app store ecosystem, Seo and Lee (2025) demonstrate how architectural and institutional advantages enable an app store owner to exert substantial control over another ecosystem participant. Wu and Han (2025) link Apple's tracking policy to changes in the update frequency of mobile gaming apps, demonstrating how platform policy can influence developer behaviour.

However, governance expectations do not imply that users transfer all responsibility from developers to platforms (Seo & Lee, 2025; Wu & Han, 2025). In a mobile payment context, Ghosh et al. (2025) identify structural assurance and robust technological and legal backends as trust facilitators within the wider service environment. Zaman et al. (2025) demonstrate that user feedback hosted by platforms can pinpoint quality issues and direct feature refinement, establishing a potential monitoring link between user experience and developer response. Thus, responsibility attribution and support for stricter platform controls are treated as separate outcomes without presuming that platform governance displaces developer responsibility (Seo & Lee, 2025; Wu & Han, 2025).

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Methodology

Research Design

A cross-sectional online survey was conducted in Germany among German-speaking respondents using Microsoft Forms between January and March 2025. Participants were recruited through personal, professional, and university-related networks, producing a non-probability convenience/network sample. Because the invitation circulated through overlapping networks rather than a defined sampling frame, no defensible response-rate denominator was available. A population sampling frame was not available for the present analysis. The findings are therefore interpreted as evidence about the analysed sample rather than as nationally representative estimates.

Sample

The analytical sample comprised 477 respondents with 477 unique respondent identifiers. All variables used for full-sample analyses were complete. Most respondents self-classified as advanced users (54.5%) or experts (39.2%), and 93.1% reported using mobile apps several times per day. Communication (45.5%) and social-networking apps (24.7%) were the most frequently reported primary categories. Gender was approximately balanced. Table 1 provides the sample profile.

Characteristic	n	%
Self-rated app experience		
Beginner	5	1.0
Occasional user	25	5.2
Advanced user	260	54.5
Expert	187	39.2
Mobile-app use frequency		
Rarely	1	0.2
Several times per week	14	2.9
Once per day	18	3.8

WOHLLEBE & ROSS
Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Characteristic	n	%
Several times per day	444	93.1
Average daily app time		
Less than 1 hour	39	8.2
1-2 hours	214	44.9
3-4 hours	154	32.3
More than 4 hours	70	14.7
Primary app category		
Communication	217	45.5
Social networks	118	24.7
Entertainment	39	8.2
Finance	39	8.2
All other categories	64	13.4
Gender		
Female	244	51.2
Male	232	48.6
Diverse	1	0.2
Employment status		
Student	89	18.7

WOHLLEBE & ROSS
Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Characteristic	n	%
Employed	323	67.7
Self-employed	33	6.9
Unemployed	10	2.1
Retired	13	2.7
Other	9	1.9

Table 1: Sample characteristics (N = 477)

Note: Percentages are based on N = 477. Primary app categories below 5% were combined for presentation only.

Survey Measures

Four five-point importance items measured the perceived importance of timely, accurate, complete, and understandable mobile-app data (1 = not at all important; 5 = very important). A binary item recorded whether respondents had previously experienced poor or inaccurate data in apps. Respondents answering yes selected the problem type encountered most frequently: incorrect or inaccurate data, outdated data, unclear or difficult-to-understand data, missing data, or no problem.

The same routed subsample answered six five-point agreement items (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) concerning data verification before use, reduced use when data are poor, increased trust when data are reliable, non-recommendation of apps with poor data, deletion of apps with frequent inaccuracies, and the influence of data problems on poor ratings. The full sample also indicated whether primary responsibility lay with developers, app-store/platform operators, or both equally, and whether platforms should introduce stricter controls (no, unsure, yes). Five binary variables represented independently selected improvement measures and were treated as multiple-response items.

Data Coding and Validation

Responses were coded according to the predefined response categories and checked for completeness, range, and internal consistency. This validation identified no duplicate respondent identifiers, uncodable nonblank responses, or out-of-range analytical values. All 260 respondents who reported a prior negative experience completed the routed failure and response items. The

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

corresponding fields were blank for all 217 respondents without a prior negative experience, exactly matching the questionnaire routing.

These 217 blanks were treated as structural missing values rather than as disagreement or ordinary item nonresponse. No imputation was performed. RQ1 and RQ4 use the full sample (N = 477), while failure-type and trust/behaviour analyses for RQ2 and RQ3 use only the eligible failure-experience subsample (n = 260). Multiple-response measure variables were coded 0 when not selected and 1 when selected; their percentages are not expected to sum to 100%.

Statistical Analysis

The analysis was limited to procedures that directly answered RQ1-RQ4 or validated the data. Frequencies and percentages summarised categorical variables. Five-point items are presented with complete response distributions, medians and interquartile ranges, and collapsed top-two-category percentages for interpretability. No significance tests were used to rank the four importance dimensions.

Two Pearson chi-square tests of independence compared respondents with and without prior negative experiences on (a) three-category responsibility attribution and (b) three-category support for stricter platform controls. For each test, the chi-square statistic, degrees of freedom, p value, sample size, Cramer's V, and minimum expected frequency were calculated. Every expected count exceeded five. Because the two tests addressed distinct RQ4 outcomes, no multiplicity adjustment was applied. No regression, factor analysis, subgroup mining, or exploratory model selection was conducted.

Results

Sample Characteristics

The analysed sample consisted predominantly of experienced mobile-app users: 447 respondents (93.7%) identified as advanced users or experts, and 444 (93.1%) used apps several times daily. Most respondents spent between one and four hours per day using apps (77.1%). This concentration is relevant to the study of post-adoption perceptions but limits generalisation to infrequent or novice users.

Importance of Data-Quality Dimensions

RQ1 asked which data-quality dimensions users prioritised. Accuracy ranked highest: 453 respondents (95.0%) rated it important or very important. Timeliness followed at 92.2%, completeness at 89.7%, and understandability at 84.1%. Accuracy and timeliness both had a median of 5, whereas completeness and understandability had a median of 4. No respondent selected 'not at all important' for any of the four dimensions.

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Dimension	Not at all important	Slightly important	Neutral	Important	Very important	Important + very important	Median (IQR)
Accuracy	0 (0.0)	2 (0.4)	22 (4.6)	147 (30.8)	306 (64.2)	453 (95.0)	5 (4-5)
Timeliness	0 (0.0)	7 (1.5)	30 (6.3)	155 (32.5)	285 (59.7)	440 (92.2)	5 (4-5)
Completeness	0 (0.0)	6 (1.3)	43 (9.0)	236 (49.5)	192 (40.3)	428 (89.7)	4 (4-5)
Understandability	0 (0.0)	10 (2.1)	66 (13.8)	230 (48.2)	171 (35.8)	401 (84.1)	4 (4-5)

Table 2: Perceived importance of mobile-app data-quality dimensions (N = 477)

Note. Cells report n (%). IQR = interquartile range. Response scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = very important.

Experienced Data-Quality Failures

A prior negative experience with poor or inaccurate app data was reported by 260 respondents (54.5%); 217 (45.5%) reported no such experience. Within the routed failure subsample, incorrect or inaccurate data were the most frequent problem (49.6%), followed by outdated data (25.4%), unclear data (13.8%), and missing data (10.8%). One respondent who had reported a prior negative experience selected the available 'no problem' response for the most frequent problem item.

Problem type	n	%
Incorrect or inaccurate data	129	49.6
Outdated data	66	25.4
Unclear or difficult-to-understand data	36	13.8
Missing data	28	10.8

WOHLLEBE & ROSS
Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Problem type	n	%
No problem	1	0.4

Table 3: Most frequently experienced data-quality problem among respondents with prior negative experience (n = 260)

Note: Percentages use the routed failure-experience subsample as denominator and sum to 100% subject to rounding.

Trust-Related and Stated Post-Adoption Responses

Among respondents who had experienced poor or inaccurate data, 250 (96.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that reliable data increased their trust in an app. This item represents a trust-related perception rather than a comprehensive digital-trust measure. Respondents also reported reduced-use intention when data were poor (93.8%), non-recommendation (90.0%), and deletion willingness when inaccuracies were frequent (88.5%). A smaller but still substantial share, 74.6%, agreed that data problems influenced a poor-rating disposition. Verification before use was more divided: 51.2% agreed, 19.6% were neutral, and 29.2% disagreed.

Response	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree + strongly agree	Median (IQR)
Verify data before relying on it	15 (5.8)	61 (23.5)	51 (19.6)	109 (41.9)	24 (9.2)	133 (51.2)	4 (2-4)
Use app less if data are poor	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	15 (5.8)	111 (42.7)	133 (51.2)	244 (93.8)	5 (4-5)
Trust app more if data are reliable	0 (0.0)	3 (1.2)	7 (2.7)	101 (38.8)	149 (57.3)	250 (96.2)	5 (4-5)
Do not recommend app if data are poor	0 (0.0)	2 (0.8)	24 (9.2)	99 (38.1)	135 (51.9)	234 (90.0)	5 (4-5)
Delete app if data are frequently inaccurate	0 (0.0)	5 (1.9)	25 (9.6)	104 (40.0)	126 (48.5)	230 (88.5)	4 (4-5)

WOHLLEBE & ROSS
Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Response	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree + strongly agree	Median (IQR)
Data problems influence a poor rating	3 (1.2)	17 (6.5)	46 (17.7)	118 (45.4)	76 (29.2)	194 (74.6)	4 (3-5)

Table 4: Trust-related and behavioural responses in the failure-experience subsample (n = 260)
Note: Cells report n (%). Structural skips are excluded. Response scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

Responsibility and Platform-Governance Expectations

In the full sample, 54.1% assigned primary responsibility for mobile-app data quality to developers, 8.0% to platform operators, and 37.9% to both equally. Responsibility attribution differed by prior negative experience, $\chi^2(2, N = 477) = 8.024$, $p = .018$, Cramer's $V = .130$. Respondents with prior negative experience more often selected developers as primarily responsible (59.6% versus 47.5%) and less often selected shared responsibility (32.3% versus 44.7%); direct platform-primary attribution was nearly identical across groups.

Overall, 61.8% supported stricter platform controls, 27.3% were unsure, and 10.9% opposed them. Support was 66.5% among respondents with prior negative experience and 56.2% among those without it. The association was statistically significant but modest, $\chi^2(2, N = 477) = 7.199$, $p = .027$, Cramer's $V = .123$. For descriptive context, regular data-quality reviews were selected by 74.0% of respondents, removal of inaccurate apps by 56.4%, joint platform-developer solutions by 54.3%, highlighting relevant user reviews by 48.0%, and developer data-checking tools by 36.1%.

Expectation or measure	No prior negative experience (n = 217)	Prior negative experience (n = 260)	Overall (N = 477)
Primary responsibility			
Developers	103 (47.5)	155 (59.6)	258 (54.1)
Platform operators	17 (7.8)	21 (8.1)	38 (8.0)
Shared equally	97 (44.7)	84 (32.3)	181 (37.9)

WOHLLEBE & ROSS
Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Expectation or measure	No prior negative experience (n = 217)	Prior negative experience (n = 260)	Overall (N = 477)
Should platforms introduce stricter controls?			
No	23 (10.6)	29 (11.2)	52 (10.9)
Unsure	72 (33.2)	58 (22.3)	130 (27.3)
Yes	122 (56.2)	173 (66.5)	295 (61.8)
Selected improvement measures (multiple response)			
Regular data-quality reviews	168 (77.4)	185 (71.2)	353 (74.0)
Remove apps providing inaccurate data	133 (61.3)	136 (52.3)	269 (56.4)
Joint platform-developer solutions	115 (53.0)	144 (55.4)	259 (54.3)
Highlight reviews reporting data-quality problems	95 (43.8)	134 (51.5)	229 (48.0)
Provide developers with data-checking tools	64 (29.5)	108 (41.5)	172 (36.1)

Table 5: Governance expectations by prior negative data-quality experience

Note: Cells report n (within-group %). Responsibility: $\chi^2(2, N = 477) = 8.024$, $p = .018$, Cramer's $V = .130$; minimum expected count = 17.29. Stricter controls: $\chi^2(2, N = 477) = 7.199$, $p = .027$, Cramer's $V = .123$; minimum expected count = 23.66. Improvement measures are independent 0/1 selections, so their percentages do not sum to 100%; no inferential tests were conducted for individual measures.

Discussion

Interpretation of Main Findings

Users placed the greatest importance on accuracy, followed closely by timeliness and completeness. More than four in five also rated understandability as important. Daikeler et al. (2025) and Fadahunsi et al. (2025) both treat accuracy, timeliness, completeness, and interpretability as distinct aspects of data

WOHLLEBE & ROSS
Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

quality. Although understandability ranked below the other dimensions, its absolute endorsement remained high.

The reported failure types complement these importance ratings. More than half of the sample reported a prior negative experience, and nearly half of that subsample identified inaccurate data as the most frequent failure. Outdated, unclear, and missing data were less common but collectively represented about half of reported failures. Accuracy was therefore central but did not account for data quality as a whole. Wang and Strong (1996) define quality beyond accuracy, and Daikeler et al. (2025) identify multiple recurring dimensions in current frameworks.

The failure-experience subsample reported a trust-related perception, reduced-use intention, non-recommendation, deletion willingness, and rating disposition. Agreement was strongest for reliable data increasing trust and poor data reducing intended use; non-recommendation and deletion willingness also received broad endorsement. Situmorang et al. (2025) relate application and outcome quality to continuance intention in telecommunication apps, and Ukaegbu and Fan (2025) identify trust as relevant to continuance in mobile health; both relationships are compatible with the trust-related and reduced-use responses reported here. Kostopoulos et al. (2025) distinguish repeated use, loyalty, and engagement within app stickiness, providing a comparison for the broader set of stated post-adoption responses. Because the survey is cross-sectional and the items were answered only by respondents with prior negative experiences, the results describe reported perceptions and intentions rather than causal effects or observed behaviour.

Responses concerning verification were less uniform than responses to the other items. Just over half agreed that they verify app data before relying on it, while almost three in ten disagreed. Recognising the consequences of poor data did not necessarily coincide with a stated practice of checking it. This pattern supports locating quality assurance within apps and ecosystems rather than assuming that users can independently verify every informational output.

RQ4 showed differences associated with prior negative experience in both governance outcomes. Respondents with prior negative experience were more likely to assign primary responsibility to developers and also more likely to support stricter platform controls. Prior experience coincided with stronger expectations directed toward both app-level assurance and ecosystem-level oversight, without implying that the two outcomes constitute a single accountability model. The Cramer's V values indicate modest associations.

Theoretical Contribution

The study connects the consumer-oriented concept of multidimensional data quality with reported mobile-app post-adoption responses. It separates accuracy, timeliness, completeness, and understandability rather than modelling a broad quality composite, and considers experienced failure

categories alongside a trust-related perception and distinct stated intentions. DeLone and McLean (2003) distinguish information quality from broader system quality in the IS success tradition. The present structure retains that distinction while adapting it to app-specific usage and feedback.

The governance results add a comparison based on respondents' prior experience with data-quality failures. In their analysis of Google and Samsung, Seo and Lee (2025) show how an app-store owner can exercise rule-setting and architectural power over another ecosystem actor. Wu and Han (2025) associate Apple's tracking policy with changes in developers' update behaviour. In this survey, prior failure experience was associated with both stronger developer-primary attribution and stronger support for platform controls. These comparative associations, rather than the overall ranking of general governance measures, are the relevant finding; their modest size does not establish how particular controls would perform.

Non-recommendation, deletion willingness, and rating disposition are examined alongside a trust-related perception and reduced-use intention. Zaman et al. (2025) show that user feedback and ratings in XR app reviews can signal quality concerns and guide refinement. Massenon et al. (2025) identify incorrect and fabricated AI-app outputs in reviews accompanied by distrust and frustration. Respondents with prior data-quality failures reported several distinct post-adoption responses, but the survey does not show whether those intentions were enacted.

Implications for Mobile-App Developers

Developers should treat accuracy assurance as a first control priority while maintaining explicit controls for currentness, completeness, and understandable presentation. Suitable practices include validation at ingestion and display, source and timestamp checks, missing-field monitoring, exception logging, plain-language review of labels and instructions, and a defined process for handling data-quality complaints. These implications follow from the observed prioritisation and response patterns; the survey did not directly assess the effectiveness of these practices.

Monitoring should combine technical signals with user feedback. Zaman et al. (2025) show that review text from mobile XR apps can expose feature concerns and guide targeted refinement. Massenon et al. (2025) illustrate the value of classifying user-reported incorrect or fabricated outputs as identifiable quality events. Developers can tag data-quality complaints, triage them by severity and recurrence, connect them to release and source changes, and communicate corrections transparently. These practices focus on dimensions and improvement mechanisms measured in the survey without assuming additional user preferences.

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Implications for Platform Operators

Support for stricter platform controls was reported by 61.8% of respondents, and regular data-quality reviews were the most selected general improvement measure. The responses indicate support for ecosystem-level assurance, but not a particular enforcement mechanism. On this basis, platform operators could combine risk-based review, reporting channels that distinguish data problems from generic defects, guidance and checking support for developers, monitoring of recurrent complaints, and proportionate escalation for consequential inaccuracies.

Platform-level controls should preserve the distinction between ecosystem oversight and developers' app-level responsibility. Seo and Lee (2025) document platform control through Google's position in the app-store ecosystem, and Wu and Han (2025) associate Apple's tracking policy with changes in app update frequency. Respondents, however, most often assigned primary responsibility to developers. The reported preferences support developer-centred responsibility alongside platform oversight; the specific recommendation that platforms support and audit developer assurance remains an interpretation of those findings.

Limitations and Future Research

The study has several limitations. Its cross-sectional, self-report design does not identify causal effects, temporal ordering, or observed app behaviour. Recruitment through personal, professional, and university-related networks produced a non-probability convenience sample without a defensible response-rate denominator, which limits generalisability and precludes claims of national representativeness. The sample also contains very high proportions of frequent and experienced app users, so its perceptions may not generalise to novices or infrequent users. Because the routed response items were asked only of respondents with prior negative experiences, the resulting 217 structural skips were handled correctly but the distributions cannot describe respondents who were not asked those questions.

Digital trust was measured with a single trust-related item rather than a validated multidimensional scale. The behavioural items capture stated responses and intentions rather than objective usage, recommendation, deletion, or rating behaviour, and app-data quality was not measured technically. Asking respondents to select the single most frequent problem prevents analysis of co-occurring failures. Recall and common-method effects are also possible because the variables were reported in the same survey, and the two statistically significant governance associations were modest.

Future research should combine user surveys with logged app behaviour, objective data-quality incidents, review histories, and app-specific context. Longitudinal designs could test whether a documented failure precedes changes in trust, usage, recommendation, deletion, or ratings.

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Experiments could compare correction notices, provenance cues, timestamps, validation warnings, and recovery messages. Comparative studies across app categories and jurisdictions could also examine when developer assurance, platform review, and joint governance are most appropriate.

Conclusion

Mobile-app users in this sample placed the greatest emphasis on accuracy, but timeliness, completeness, and understandability were also widely rated as important. More than half reported a prior negative data-quality experience, most often involving inaccurate information. Among these respondents, reliable data elicited a strong trust-related response, while poor data corresponded to stated reduced-use intention, non-recommendation, deletion willingness, and rating disposition.

Prior negative experience was also associated with different responsibility attributions and stronger support for platform controls, although both relationships were modest. Developers remain central to data validation and maintenance, while platform operators can provide review, monitoring, reporting, developer support, and proportionate control mechanisms. The findings descriptively distinguish perceived importance across data-quality dimensions and reported responses to different failure scenarios; the separately tested associations concern prior negative experience, responsibility attribution, and support for stricter platform controls.

Acknowledgments

OpenAI ChatGPT and Codex were used as AI-assisted tools to support drafting, language editing, literature-search support, document formatting, and statistical coding. All statistical results, references, interpretations, and final manuscript content were reviewed by the authors, who assume full responsibility for the content.

References

Bhattacherjee, A. (2001). Understanding information systems continuance: An expectation-confirmation model. *MIS Quarterly*, *25*(3), 351-370. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250921

Bryant, M. J., Wilde, S. J., Coles, G., Sorwar, G., & Bui, V. (2026). Mobile app usage and adoption through the lens of cognitive, affective and behavioral trust constructs. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, *42*(5), 3393-3417. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2531289

Daikeler, J., Fröhling, L., Sen, I., Birkenmaier, L., Gummer, T., Schwalbach, J., Silber, H., Weiß, B., Weller, K., & Lechner, C. (2025). Assessing data quality in the age of digital social research: A systematic review. *Social Science Computer Review*, *43*(5), 943-979. https://doi.org/10.1177/08944393241245395

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (2003). The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success: A ten-year update. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *19*(4), 9-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2003.11045748

Fadahunsi, K. P., Wark, P. A., Mastellos, N., Neves, A. L., Gallagher, J., Majeed, A., & Car, J. (2025). A novel framework to assess clinical information in digital health technologies: Cross-sectional survey study. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, *13*, e58125. https://doi.org/10.2196/58125

Ghosh, A., Mishra, R., & Mishra, A. (2025). Role of network externalities and trust facilitators in shaping mobile payment application continuance intentions: Variations across stages of adoption. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *43*(8), 1553-1575. https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-06-2024-0417

Ko, S., & Woo, H. (2025). Users' needs for mental health apps: Quality evaluation using the user version of the Mobile Application Rating Scale. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *13*, e64622. https://doi.org/10.2196/64622

Kostopoulos, I., Stocchi, L., Pourazad, N., & Michaelidou, N. (2025). Mobile applications' stickiness: A review and future research program. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2025.2479830

Lu, G., Qu, S., & Chen, Y. (2025). Understanding user experience for mobile applications: A systematic literature review. *Discover Applied Sciences*, *7*, 587. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-025-07170-3

Massenon, R., Gambo, I., Khan, J. A., Agbonkhese, C., & Alwadain, A. (2025). 'My AI is lying to me': User-reported LLM hallucinations in AI mobile apps reviews. *Scientific Reports*, *15*, 30397. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-15416-8

Seo, H., & Lee, C. S. (2025). Institutional approach to platform governance: Google's control over Samsung in app store ecosystem. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, *33*(3), 1233-1257. https://doi.org/10.1080/19761597.2025.2533334

Sharif, R., Tagharrobi, Z., Farzandipour, M., & Rahimi, H. (2026). Development and validation of the mHealth Apps Rating Inventory (mARI): A comprehensive tool for assessing the quality of mobile health applications. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, *205*, 106124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2025.106124

Situmorang, B. Y., Rabbani, T. M., Dominica, V. A., Handayani, P. W., & Fitriani, H. (2025). Continuance intention to use telecommunication mobile applications in Indonesia based on mobile service quality theory. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *11*, 101444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101444

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org

International Journal of Mobile Applications and Technologies (ISSN: 2944-5671)
Volume: 02 Issue: 01 Year: 2026
https://doi.org/10.51137/wrp.ijmat.1077

Ukaegbu, O. C., & Fan, M. (2025). Examining the influence of personal eHealth literacy on continuance intention towards mobile health applications: A TAM-based approach. *Health Policy and Technology*, *14*(4), 101024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2025.101024

Wang, R. Y., & Strong, D. M. (1996). Beyond accuracy: What data quality means to data consumers. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *12*(4), 5-33. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1996.11518099

Wu, W., & Han, W. (2025). Does digital platform governance improve process innovation? Evidence from Apple's tracking policies. *Economic Modelling*, *152*, 107298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2025.107298

Zaman, N., Goldberg, D. M., Qiao, Z., & Abrahams, A. S. (2025). More than meets the eye: Feature concerns and suggestions in mobile XR app reviews. *Decision Support Systems*, *195*, 114475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2025.114475

WOHLLEBE & ROSS

Discover publication opportunities:
www.wr-publishing.org