International Journal of Business and Management Invention
ISSN (Online): 2319 – 8028, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 801X
www.ijbmi.org || Volume 5 Issue 6 || June. 2016 || PP—09-10

How Rankings Superiorly Differ Than Ratings?

Talatu Muhammad Barwa Phd
Department of Business Administration and Entrepreneurship, Bayero University Kano

ABSTRACT: *Despite ranking and rating being greatly considered similar and being used and referred interchangeably ranking and rating have a severe distinction amongst them. Generally, rating and ranking measurements criterion and both have had numerous advocacies of different theories, views and proposals. This paper solely serves the purpose of considering the differentiation and distinction between Rankings and Ratings and furthermore concludes how one is superior to the other. Critics have presented the points that ratings are a drawback as they tend to consequent as generally appointing all subjects high rankings, and one ratings entail the factor of multicollinearity or the feasibility of predicting one rating from the other with a considerable extent of correctness.*

Keywords: *Ratings, Rankings, Differentiation, Rating scales, Researches, Strategy, Respondent, Measurement.*

I. BRIEF DIFFERENTIATION OF RATINGS AND RANKINGS

1.1 Ratings

Ratings are entailed by the rating scales that can be referred to as a variety of numerous groupings, which are made and developed, with sole purpose of deriving or generating information or data from either qualitative or quantitative aspect. A very common example of the rating scales that are often used can be the Likert scale and a numbering (e.g. 1-10) scale. The level of the quality of a product, or whatever might the subject be, is represented by the rating group that the rater thinks reflects the reality, in his/her personal perception. Rating usually consists of Likert scales which present different points on the scale for the respondent to represent the level of extent of their agreement to a statement. Even though the Likert scale may consist of any much numbers yet standard number used in studies is either till 5 or 7 (Harzing, 2009). The Likert and the number scale may look as (see Fig 1.1).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Figure 1.1

The ratings may be measured at different categories of levels. The levels may be categorized into three major categories, which include: Ordinary level, Interval level and Ratio level. The ordinary level mainly uses the information/ data or numbers that mainly identify the subject the level of its position. Such levels, normally only cover the personal opinions of the respondents. Furthermore, the Interval level mainly consists of the level of difference between the points without a zero point of a subject. A good example can be the temperature in Celsius ◦C. Lastly the ratio level mainly consists of the difference between the points with a zero level. The example can be age, price, mass, and other measurements that have a zero point.

As for the measurements, more than just one rating scale is essential for comparing the quantitative and qualitative information and data and moreover, in a Polytomous Rasch model for mathematical and numerical evaluation and scoring (Andrich, 1977, pp. 357-74). In conjunction with that, it is essential for there to be more than one question or rating so as to meet the reliability criteria of Cronbach's Alpha that and to see the efficacy. (CRONBACH, 1951, pp. 297-333).

Rating scales are also enormously in use by a considerable number of websites that allow the users to rate different products, items and various other services. A very good example can be the websites that allow the user to rate various entertaining movies, season and etc. A few famous websites of suck kind can be listed as; IMDB, Rotten Tomatoes, tv.com. A lot of firms and businesses also use the rating scales in the surveys and product researches.

1.2 Rankings

Ranking can be referred to the relationship between a group of products/ items or any other subject for research. Considering a group of three subjects one of the item might be rated as 'second' while the other one of the three will be higher than the second; 'first' and the third one lower than the second; 'third'. However two or more

items might possibly be ranked as equal at the first/second place and vice versa. Referring to the mathematical terms ranking might be called as 'Weak ordering" where instinctive opinions of ranking a set in an order is followed.

Through minimization of the in-depth actions and steps, ranking can be very helpful to sequence multifarious data and consistent with the set criterion. As for an example; if a valuable consumer in a clothing store describes his taste and his personal likes and dislike of choices to the salesman, he will rank the available stock as per the relevant choices of the consumer to present it to him form the best to the worst in order

There are possible chances and occurrences where unique rankings cannot be assigned. For instance, in a short sprint rate there is a probability of two participants having the same finishing time. Hence in the case of same or equal measurement, one of the following strategies might be adapted.

1.3 Standard competition ranking ("1-2-3-3-5" ranking)

Adapting such a strategy would mean to rank the equal measurements with the same number and then rank the next after skipping a number as in the brackets above. Supposing, if the measurements that were equal were either both 3rd then the number that ought to be skipped would be fourth (the next number); replaced by the repetition and vice versa. In the mentioned example the ranking might look as (1,2,3,3,5). Such a strategy is constantly used in intense competitions if the participants might be measured equal and consequently, it does not affect the ranking of other competitors. Elaborating; if the there were four participants who did better than "X", yet "X" will be ranked as 5th, despite two of them being equal in ranking.

1.4 Modified competition ranking ("1-2-4-4-5" ranking)

Adapting such a strategy would mean to rank the equal measurements with the same number, which is two higher than the rank before it, as shown in the brackets above (dissimilar to the Standard Competition Ranking). Supposing, if the measurements that were equal were both 3rd then the number that ought to be skipped would be 2nd (the number before it). In competitions such a strategy is adapted so as to guarantee that to secure a rank one, the subject must be better than *all* the others below. Elaborating; if the there were five total participants and "X", only two participants are measured to be better, yet "X" will be ranked as 4th, in conjunction with the equal in measurement, despite only two being better in measurement.

1.5 Dense ranking ("1-2-3-3-4" ranking)

Adapting such a strategy would mean to rank the equal measurements with the same number and then rank the next with the following number that comes after, as shown in the brackets and vice versa. Hence the ranks are as per the measurements rather than the positions. If only two participants in race have been measured to better than "X", then X will be ranked as 3rd along with the one with equal measurement, whereas the next rank will yet be 4th, despite the Fifth participant being the Fifth to finish.

II. CONCLUSION

Despite ratings being easily interpretable and the feasibility of same rating of two subjects or more, unlike Ranking, Ratings have a very limited number of categories to accurately rate a subject. Considering an example of a rating scale from 1-5, the respondent might not be even willing to rate the subject even a "One" and hence lesser. Therefore, this consequently leads to inaccurate collection of data. Ratings scales are monotonous and hence the tediousness can lead to respondents skimming through the rating scale and assigning a rate on possibly random basis (Alwin & Krosnick). Ergo, ranking can be considered to be distinctive in a superior approach than rating.

REFERENCES

[1]. Alwin, D., & Krosnick, J. The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings.
[2]. Andrich, D. (1977). A Rating Formulation for Ordered Response Categories. Psychometrika , 357-74.
[3]. CRONBACH, L. J. (1951). COEFFICIENT ALPHA AND THE INTERNALSTRUCTURE OF TESTS. Psychometrika , 297-333.
[4]. Harzing, A.-W. (2009). RATING VERSUS RANKING: WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO REDUCE RESPONSE ANDLANGUAGE BIAS IN CROSS-NATIONAL RESEARCH? International Business review.