

Chapter 8

Assessing Degree of Acceptance

ABSTRACT

This chapter extends the methodology developed for quantifying the risk of misinformation by adding an approach to measure the degree of acceptance. Assessment of this parameter of the model developed in the previous chapter is essential for practical use of the approach and modeling developed. Degree of acceptance is subjective measure of whether the provided information describes a product that meets buyer's expectation. It represents how the buyer interprets the provided description of the product. This measure is essential for a buyer's purchase decision.

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of the risk of misinforming likelihood, as presented in the previous chapter, requires knowing the subjectively assumed minimal degree of product's quality that makes the product acceptable for considering as candidate for purchasing. Degree of acceptance is another subjective parameter that needs measuring. The real challenge is how to collect relevant data. This chapter stresses survey design and data processing.

The survey, conducted in 2008 (see Appendix 2), is the one designed to collect data regarding degree of acceptance and is explored in this chapter. It is an updated version of the survey conducted in 2006 and presented in the previous chapter. This survey was designed in three parts. In the first part the respondent is offered a five-level Likert scale to answer the questions related to her/his needs to do a particular

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-8800-3.ch008

work, as in the previous surveys – to use a computer application, and to estimate the suitability of the product to allow effective accomplishment of this work. The second part addresses the issue of evaluation of the degree of acceptance – what is acceptable to accomplish an activity, and the third part was designed to allow evaluation of the risk of misinforming in competing messages (see the next chapter). For more details you can look at Christozov, Chukova & Mateev (2006, 2007, 2008, 2009).

GENERAL NOTES

In the previous section we introduced one approach to quantify the risk of misinforming. One of the parameters of the model is “Degree of acceptance” - q_{ij} . To illustrate the approach used to evaluate the risk likelihood by the collected in Survey 2006 data, the constant 0.5 for the degree of acceptance for all clients and all product’s properties was used. This chapter addresses the issue of how to collect data that allows us to evaluate this parameter.

Assessing what is acceptable performance as recognized by the customer is difficult for the cases of optimists and pessimists. One category underestimate what properties are needed, and the other overestimates them. From other side, these two categories of customers are the most interesting from the point of view of evaluating the risk of misinforming. It is a mutually agreed assumption that pessimists tend to set the degree of acceptance too high, and optimists – too low in comparison with their subjective assessment of the properties and suitability of the product. If a customer is pessimist and assess that a hard disk with 500GB capacity will be fully enough, more likely he or she will report acceptable level of the disk capacity at 750GB or even 1.0TB.

In this chapter an approach for evaluating the degree of acceptance of the product with respect to subjective expectations of individuals and related to activities they consider needed is proposed. The approach is presented, as well as data collection and data processing, in the context of one-to-one informing process as part of a business trading transaction. Adding procedure to evaluate the “degree of acceptance” completes techniques for evaluation of all relevant variables for the methodology to measure the likelihood of the risk of misinforming for this the simplest case of informing process.

DEGREE OF IMPACT OF THE RISK OF MISINFORMING

The degree of acceptance is related to the importance, needs, of given categories of activities to the customer. The assumption is obvious – for the one customer who

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/assessing-degree-of-acceptance/338742

Related Content

The Role of Knowledge Sharing on Organisational Innovation: An Integrated Framework

Kijpokin Kasemsap (2014). *Quality Innovation: Knowledge, Theory, and Practices* (pp. 247-271).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-role-of-knowledge-sharing-on-organisational-innovation/96658

Culture and Strategy

(2021). *Relating Information Culture to Information Policies and Management Strategies* (pp. 1-19).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/culture-and-strategy/256359

Analyzing Information Quality in Virtual Networks of the Services Sector with Qualitative Interview Data

Helinä Melkas (2007). *Challenges of Managing Information Quality in Service Organizations* (pp. 187-212).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/analyzing-information-quality-virtual-networks/6548

Seeing Information Cultures

(2021). *Relating Information Culture to Information Policies and Management Strategies* (pp. 124-158).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/seeing-information-cultures/256366

The Concept of Sharing Risks: Warranty

(2024). *Quantitative Measures and Warranty Coverage of the Risk of Misinforming* (pp. 237-251).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-concept-of-sharing-risks/338756