REPUTATION SYSTEM IN INDIA

Dr. Janak Singh Kushwah

(Department of Commerce)

Govt. College Joura Dist. Morena (M.P.)

ABSTRACT

Reputation systems arte programs or algorithms that allow users to rate each other in online communities in order to build trust through reputation. Some common uses of these systems can be found on E-commerce websites such as ebay, amazon.com, and Etsy as well as online advice communities such as stack Expchange. These reputation system represent a significant trend in decison support for internet mediated service provisous. With the popularity of online communities for shopping, advice, and exchange of toehr important information, reputation system are becoming vitally important to the onld experiecne. The idea of reputation systems is the even if the consumer cants physically try a product or service, or see the person providing Information, that they can be confident in the information that they can be confident in the outcome of the exchange through trust built by recommender systems.

Introduction :-

In e-commerce environment, as participants are not physically present, to assess the reliability of the product, selling and buying something is not easy. Customers are unable to see the product, verify its quality and the rist of being cheated by other party is also high. Although many technologies exist to make the transactions more secure but they remain insuffiecient to build a trustful reputation about the seller or product. It becomes solely individuals decision of whome to trust and which product to buy. In such circumstances, established mechanism of reputation systems assist usesrs to make decisions in online shopping.

Online reputation system gives clue about the quality of product of a product or service. However there is a chance of attack on reputation system to either degrade the

reputation score or boost the reputation score for a particular product/service. Dealing with malicious ratings in reputation systems has vbeen rtecognized as an important but difficult task A reputation system becomes ineffective when the number of genuine uses is less than their malicious counterpart. This rating score becomes very important for both parties companies and consumers as consumers make decision based on this score and on the other side companies get to know about the reputation of products and can take appripriate actions to improve the quality of product for customer satisfactions.

Types :-

Online :-

Howard Rheingold sttes that online repuation systems are computer based technologies that make it possible to manipulate in new and powerful ways an old and essential human trait. Rheingold says that these systems arose as a result of the need for internet uses to gain trust in the individuals they transact with online. the trait he notes in human groups is that social functions such as gossip keeps us u to date on who to trust, who other people trust, who is important, and who decides who is important. Internet sites such as EBay and amazon, he argues, seek to make use of this social trait and are built around the contributions of millions of customers, enhanced by reputation systems that police the quality of the content and t ransaction exchanged through the site.

Reputation banks :-

The emerging sharing economy incrases the improtance of trust in peer to peer marketplaces and services. Uses can build up reputation and trust in individual systems but usually donts have the ability to carry those reputations to other systems. Rachel Botsman and Roo Rogers argue in their book hat mine is yours (2010) that it is only a matter of time before there is some form of network that aggregates reputaton capital across multiple forms of collaborative consumption.

Maintaining effective reputation systems :-

The main function of reputation systems is to build a sense of trust among uses of online communities. As with brick and mortar stores, trust and reputation can be built through customer feedback

.

Standardization attempt :-

The IETF proposed a protocol to exchange reputation data. It was originally aimed at email applicatons, but it was subsequently developed as a general architecture for a

reputation based seervice. Followed by an email-speciic part. However the workhorse of email reputation remain with DNSxLs, Which do not follow that protocol. THose specification dont say how to collect feedback – In fact, the granularity of email sending entities makers it impractical to collect feedback directly from recipients – but are only concened with reputation quety / response methods.

Reputation as a Resource :-

High reputation capital often confers benefits upon the holder. For example , a wide range of studies have found a positive correlation between seller rating and asking price on ebay, Indicating that high reputation can help users obtain more money for their iterms. High product reviews on online marketplaces can also help drive higher sales volumes.

Attack Classification :-

Attracks against reputation system are classified based on the goals and methods of the attacker.

Slef-Promoting Attack. The attacker falsely increases their own reputation. A typical example is the so-called sybil attack where an attacker subverts the reputation system by creating a large number of pseudonymous entities, and using them to gain a disproportionately large influence. A reputation systems vulnerability to a sybil attack depends on how cheaply sybils can be generated, the degree to which the reputation system accepts input from entities that do not have a chain of trust linkng them to a trusted entity, and whether the reputation system treats all entities identically.

Defense strategies :-

Here are some strategies to prevent trhe above attacks.

Preventing Multiple Identities.

Mitigating Geenratino of False Rumors.

Mitigating spreading of False Rumors.

Preventing short-Term abuse of the system.

Mitigating Denial of service attack.

Conclusion :-

Merelly having uniform accounting standard will not authomatically bring uniformity, sereral regulatory attempts are required to ensume compliance with every requirement of such standard as well. The overall compliance ratio is as low as 41.54

percent and 43.68 percent for indian and global companies respectively. Both Indian and global companies Irreespective of their nationality, are not complying with even half of the reqqurements of IFRS 6 : this is an alarming situation Karapinar et al. (2012) had ignored investigating compliance with all the above parameters except point 5. Whereas Abdo (2016) Has missed only point 6 and 7 bt all the above findings (Except point 4 and 5) contradict with his findings because of detailed content analysis applied in this study. Thus, the conclusion in this study is very distinct from prior studies. Following suggestinons are submitted to improve IFRS 6.

A Common provblem is unfair ratings which are used to unfairly increase or decrease the reputation of an entity. THis system ensumres only true and trusted feedfbacks are displayed, rejecting the false and ill intentional feedback, thus providing a trustful reputatrion score for a specific product or service so as to support relying parties taking the right decision while interacting with an e-commerce application.

References :-

1. *Josang, audun (2000). A survey of trust and reputation systems for online serfvice provision. Decision support systems. 45. 618-644.*

2. *Tanz, jason (May 23, 2014) How airbnb and Lyft finnally Got americans to truast Each other.*

3. *Botsman, Rachel (2010) Wat mine is yours. New York : Harper Business. ISNB 978-0061963544.*

4. *Nathaniel Borenstein : Murray S. Kucherawy (November 2013). An architecutrue for Reputation Reporting. doi : 10.17487/RFC7070.RFC 7070 Retrieved 20 April 2017.*

5. *John Livine (February 2010) DNS Blacklists and Whitelists.*

6. *Winfree, jason, A (2003) Collective Reputation and quality (PDF). American agricultural Economics Association Meetings.*

7. *What is a bounty. ? How can I start One. ? Help Center.*

8. *Vavilis, S, : Petkovic M : Zannone, N (2014) A reference model for reputation systems Decision Support System : 61 : 147-154.*

9. *D Quercia, S. Hailes, L. Capra. Lightweight Distributed Trust propagation. ICDM 2007.*

10. *R. Guha, R Kumar P. Raghavan, A Tomkins. Propagation of Trust and Distruct.*